

Interactive comment on “X-Ray CT analyses, models and numerical simulations – a comparison with common analytical methods of an experimental CO₂ study” by S. Henkel et al.

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 5 April 2016

The title of the paper is not self explaining, especially the second part, must be reconsidered

The overall quality of English language use throughout the paper is quite poor, must be definitely and significantly improved

Abstract: line 17ff: must be reorganized, both in wording and in red line of presentation

Introduction: same holds here: order of paragraphs is arbitrary not reasonable, seems like copy and paste from a summary report of different groups

Introduction is too short, it is of political nature not of scientific: who did similar research, what are major outcomes, where is state of the art, WHY do you this research

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



not WHAT did you do, the following sections are too descriptive, you explain what you do, but not why and you present results but you interpret them insufficiently

Fig 2 and 5,6 are especially poor quality of layout

I suggest to add a discussion section and shorten the conclusions to the main results

Interactive comment on Solid Earth Discuss., doi:10.5194/se-2016-36, 2016.

SED

Interactive
comment

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

