

# ***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: 20 June 2020

I am slightly perplexed about use of a neologism (i.e. fracosity) which seems unnecessary here, as it simply denotes a fracture porosity estimation. Furthermore, area based estimations of porosity need to be carefully dealt with; in case of primary porosity (i.e. pore related, under hypothesis of homogeneous isotropic pore distribution) area and volume porosity assumes the same value, i.e.  $\text{Pore\_Area}/\text{Total\_Area} = \text{Pore\_Volume}/\text{Total\_Volume}$ , whereas, in case of strong anisotropic void distributions (i.e. also fracture porosity), some correction is needed. This latter is based on reciprocal orientations of scan line or area and analyzed fracture set. In this manuscript such a correction was

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



not applied or explained.

---

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

SED

---

Interactive  
comment

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

