

Interactive comment on “An automated method to build groundwater model hydrostratigraphy from airborne electromagnetic data and lithological borehole logs” by P. A. Marker et al.

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 16 March 2015

The paper "An automated method to build groundwater model hydrostratigraphy from airborne electromagnetic data and lithological borehole logs" by Marker et al. is a valuable contribution to the field of hydrogeophysics. It is an interesting case study showing how geophysical data can be used to improve an hydrogeological model at relatively large scale by defining more precisely the structure of the model.

However, I agree with referee 1 that there might be some confusion about the novelty of the paper. Especially, the title of the paper is misleading since the methodology to derive the hydrostratigraphy is the subject of the paper by Foged et al. (2014) and that the field case seems to be the same. The originality of the paper here is rather to

C575

compare several models with various complexity based on their hydrogeological output. Some work should thus be done to focus the paper more on its original aspects and not on already published material (already in the introduction).

Another concern, from my point of view, is that the authors claim that they reduce the structural uncertainty of their model. For me, the methodology is not sufficient to do that. Indeed, once the number of cluster is chosen, a unique model is drawn. It is true that this model is now based on geophysical data, but a unique model cannot be used to assess the uncertainty. Structural uncertainty has two causes: (1) the conceptualization of the geology, using alternative geological scenarios for example and (2) spatial uncertainty inside the geological scenarios itself linked to the location of the different facies and their respective relationships. Assessing structural uncertainty would require to allow for more models. It is well-known that geophysical inversion is not unique and that several models may explain the same data. This should be included in a structural uncertainty analysis which is not the case here since geophysics and clay fraction distribution are taken as certain. Moreover, the proposed methodology has two inversion steps (AEM data and CF data). Consequently, the limitations of arising from the inversion are present two times, such as the varying resolution, the effect of regularization and the risk of artifacts of inversion. Those limitations should be clearly stated in the text since it makes the model quite deterministic.

More details should be given on how the CF model is obtained. The petrophysical relationship is not shown. What are the two parameters linking clay fraction and resistivity? What are their respective ranges of variation? Are the obtained values physically plausible? With a locally dependent relationship, it is always possible to find a straightforward relationship which could subsequently affect the results. Few is said about the different scales for each data and model, borehole logs are fine-scale, geophysical data are representative of large volume and the hydrogeological model is a large scale model.

I do not really see the usefulness of the reference model. It is not clear how many

C576

facies are defined for this reference. Maybe a comparison of the approach with a method based on the direct interpretation of resistivity in hydrofacies would be more suited, to see the advantage of adding the CF step.

Specific comments can be found in the supplement pdf file.

Please also note the supplement to this comment:

<http://www.hydrol-earth-syst-sci-discuss.net/12/C575/2015/hessd-12-C575-2015-supplement.pdf>

Interactive comment on Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., 12, 1555, 2015.