

# ***Interactive comment on “Benchmark study using a multi-scale, multi-methodological approach for the petrophysical characterization of reservoir sandstones” by Peleg Haruzi et al.***

**Joachim Gottsmann (Editor)**

j.gottsmann@bristol.ac.uk

Received and published: 12 August 2020

Dear Authors,

I have now received 2 independent reviews of your manuscript. Both reviews are positive and indicate substantial potential in your work for final publication in SE. Both reviewers agree that your manuscript represents a substantial contribution to the scientific progress on the petrophysical characterisation of sandstone.

That being said, both reviewers request that the ms be revised before I can consider it for my final editorial decision.

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



Reviewer 1 has made concrete suggestions as to how to improve the paper which I invite to consider in full.

SED

Reviewer 2 has also made concrete suggestions for improvement, but is slightly more critical of the approach as depicted in the current version of the ms. They, for example, request that Appendix A is moved to the main text. I second this request which should not be too arduous a task.

Interactive comment

There appears to be the opportunity to place your research in a broader context given the limitations and outstanding issues in rock characterisations mentioned in the introduction. It would help the reader to ensure that your research is placed in direct context to the current shortcomings both in the intro and the discussion.

Figures 9-12 are of poor quality and need your attention. I have a hard time reading the labels and axis descriptions. It is not obvious that some should read "lag" as the body of text is capped at the bottom.

In short, I expect to receive a thoroughly revised ms with a point-by-point record as to how the recommendations by the reviewers and myself have been dealt with.

With best wishes, J. Gottsmann

Executive Editor SE

---

Interactive comment on Solid Earth Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/se-2020-47>, 2020.

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

