

## ***Interactive comment on “Full-tensor gravity gradient eigenvector analysis for locating complex geological source positions” by Boxin Zuo et al.***

**C. Cevallos (Referee)**

Carlos.Cevallos@cgg.com

Received and published: 1 March 2017

The main problem is the definition of GTA:  $GTA = \Phi Z^* [\tan \varphi]^\beta \tan \varphi$  over the centres of mass of sources attains very large values.

This means that the GTA is an amplification filter of  $\Phi Z$ . The authors implicitly think it plots edges of sources by using its contours, but in practice there is no way to choose one contour over others. In general,  $\varphi$  locates the centres of mass of the sources, and  $\Phi Z$  has location and edge information. By multiplying them we lose information.

We could also define  $GGTA = \Phi ZZ^* [\tan \varphi]^\beta$ . Following the authors scheme GGTA would then be better than the GTA in defining location and edges as  $\Phi ZZ$  is much better than  $\Phi Z$  in defining location and edges.

C1

Finally, if  $\beta = \text{zero}$  then  $GTA = \Phi Z^* \tan \varphi$  and you obtain an amplified  $\Phi Z$  from which the edge information is mostly absent and if  $\beta = \text{some very large value}$  then  $GTA = \Phi Z^* \beta$  and the centre of mass information is mostly absent, this means that  $\beta$  is a “focussing” parameter: when far from sources it makes the GTA have information of only  $\Phi Z$  as we get nearer to the top of sources it makes GTA almost totally dependent on  $\varphi$ . The edges get lost in this process, that is, they become dependent on  $\beta$  in an unpredictable way.

My recommendation is to reject the manuscript.

---

Interactive comment on Nonlin. Processes Geophys. Discuss., doi:10.5194/npg-2016-75, 2017.

C2