

Interactive comment on “Groundwater flow processes and mixing in active volcanic systems: the case of Guadalajara (Mexico)” by A. Hernández-Antonio et al.

E. Custodio (Referee)

emilio.custodio@upc.edu

Received and published: 12 March 2015

I cannot see how my previous remarks have been incorporated. Some comment follow to be considered if there is time to do so.

3H analyses are not inexpensive when electrolytic concentration is needed. The accuracy of data is not given and this is important.

Since 18O and 2H are highly correlated, one of them can be excluded from the statistical analysis or better 2H can be substitutes by excess deuterium to enhance the small differences in Fig 6 caption how and altitude has been given to the samples should be

C538

given to be sable to understand properly the plot; it seems that some altitude effect is present but looks too high

The calcedonia geothermometer does not point to the type of rock (basalt, andesite) as said in pp13

If possible fig 8 will improve introducing some more geological data instead of only rock classification

Interactive comment on Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., 12, 1599, 2015.