

Interactive  
Comment

# ***Interactive comment on* “Evaluation of positioning and density profiling accuracy of muon radiography by utilizing a 15-ton steel block” by H. K. M. Tanaka**

**H. Tanaka**

ht@postman.riken.jp

Received and published: 3 September 2012

**Abstract:** The dimension of the target volume is shown in Fig. 1. What width and length refer to is shown in this figure. In order to avoid an endless disputean argument which probably gets us nowhere, please provide some suggestions.

8-9 of the snow overburden on I do not think what he measured was the snow overburden. If you are sure he did, could you please show me the figure number or the statement in George 1955, that shows what he measured was the thickness of the snow? If my understanding is correct, he compared the reduction of the muon flux (2nd para. of p.457) with some his original reference curve (FIG. 4 of G1955) to calcu-

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



---

**Interactive  
Comment**

late the density length above, and again he compared the value he calculated with the densitylength from the drilling sample near the site(3rd para. of p.457).

9-11 agreed and will be corrected.

11 average density -> thickness average column density would be better.

13 agreed and will be corrected.

14 agreed and will be corrected.

24 agreed and will be corrected.

PAGE 645 1-2 This is completely understandable to me. Again, in order to avoid an endless disputean argument which probably gets us nowhere, please provide some suggestions.

18-19 Incomplete sentence.

21-22 agreed and will be corrected.

25-27 agreed and will be corrected.

---

Interactive comment on Geosci. Instrum. Method. Data Syst. Discuss., 2, 643, 2012.

[Full Screen / Esc](#)[Printer-friendly Version](#)[Interactive Discussion](#)[Discussion Paper](#)