

Interactive comment on “A geophone-based and low-cost data acquisition and analysis system designed to microtremor measurements” by Ozkan Kafadar

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 10 July 2020

The author answered all the reviewers' questions and modified the manuscript accordingly. Anyway, the paper needs few minor revisions before its publication in this journal according to my comments given below:

1) In your reply to my first comment you added several sentences in the first paragraph of the introduction section. All the sentences better describe the different kind of seismic sensors. Anyway I do not completely agree with the final part of the sentence “On the other hand, geophones are velocimeter, which are often preferred in local seismic applications because of their excellent reliabilities, highly sensitivities and low costs.” I suggest to remove “low costs” because this is not true. Therefore, substitute “because

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



of their excellent reliabilities, highly sensitivities and low costs” with “because of their excellent reliabilities and highly sensitivities”.

2) Figure 9: substitute “H/V spectrum ratios” with “H/V spectral ratios”.

3) Figure 9: there is a perfect match between H/V spectral ratios obtained from data recorded by GeoBox and MicDAC above 2 Hz. On the other hand, below 2 Hz the H/V functions significantly differ each other. Could you explain why? Is this difference due to the different quality of sensors for frequencies below 2 Hz? Please, justify this possibly with the help of an additional figure if necessary.

Interactive comment on Geosci. Instrum. Method. Data Syst. Discuss.,
<https://doi.org/10.5194/gi-2020-11>, 2020.

[Printer-friendly version](#)[Discussion paper](#)