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General comments
Thank you for the discussion paper. This is well-written with interesting data and presents a compelling case for geophysical imaging of the water table.

Specific comments
How do you justify selecting single values for the Archie’s Law exponents? There is a lot of published evidence that these parameters vary widely and the only reliable way to establish them is empirically for a given formation. Does using a realistic range of values from the published literature alter your Figure 7? You also use this to state it is “possible” for the electrical conductivity to be lower; what about using the potential ranges in these parameters to work out a probability that this is the case? It seems there are other likely explanations which should have more discussion, such as a change in lithology. You state at line 466 that this is not the case, i.e. no lateral lithological variation; why? Is that supported by the wider set of borehole data collected as part of this work? Is it not possible that the topographic feature indicates lateral variation in subsurface material?

I think the conclusion is too firm – without monitoring of the surface water and time-lapse data, I don’t think you can demonstrate that it is a recharge feature, unless you can exclude the possibility that the Poisson’s ratio and conductivity data are not both related to a lithological feature.
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