

Interactive comment on “Silica diagenesis-driven fracturing in limestone: an example from the Ordovician of Central Pennsylvania” by Emily M. Hoyt and John N. Hooker

Vincenzo Guerriero (Referee)

vincenzo.guerriero@unina.it

Received and published: 19 June 2020

The described method of fracture porosity quantification is interesting, nevertheless authors may illustrate a comparison with more traditional methods such as scan line and scan area and the (eventual) advantages of the use of this criterion.

It's not clear to me whether the described method is applied over field or thin section images. Furthermore, authors should clarify if a lower threshold is adopted for fracture size (according to Ortega et al., 2006; Guerriero et al., 2010) or all existing fractures within the sampled area are accounted.

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



Interactive
comment

Furthermore, it is not clear to me why authors prefer the use of fracosity, which provides an estimation of porosity associated to all fractures falling within the investigated image/area, rather than fracture porosity associated to a single fracture set (e.g. horizontal set), in order to analyze a possible correlation between fracture intensity and silica content data. Best regards, Vincenzo Guerriero

Interactive comment on Solid Earth Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/se-2020-50>, 2020.

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)

