

Interactive
Comment

Interactive comment on “Review of some significant claimed irregularities in Scandinavian postglacial uplift in time scales from tens to thousands of years: earthquakes?” by S. Gregersen

C. Pascal (Editor)

christophe.pascal@rub.de

Received and published: 9 December 2013

Dear Søren,

In the light of the comments made by the reviewers, I have carefully edited your manuscript “Review of some significant claimed irregularities in Scandinavian postglacial uplift in time scales from tens to thousands of years: earthquakes?” submitted for eventual publication in Solid Earth.

Both Hilmar Bungum and Reviewer 2 agree on the relevance of the Ms and the scien-

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



tific quality of the work presented. However, the two reviewers also suggest implementation of a number of minor to moderate points in order to improve the paper. I have in addition a few minor comments (see below).

Before final acceptance of the paper, I would require a revised version of the Ms according to the criticisms previously raised and formal point-to-point answers to the reviewers' comments.

Best regards

C. Pascal

Specific comments: P1616, L3: I agree with Reviewer 2 the two sentences should be merged. P1619, L16: one should read "Olesen et al., 2004" P1625, L15-22: This paragraph appears to belong to the following section ("Claim 4") I particularly agree with comment (8) from H. Bungum stating that other local stress sources are driving the neotectonic activity of Fennoscandia. In particular I invite you to check the modelling study of Pascal and Cloetingh (2009). Also, as pointed out by H. Bungum the relative "regularity" of the uplift pattern needs to be discussed.

Interactive comment on Solid Earth Discuss., 5, 1615, 2013.

SED

5, C740–C741, 2013

Interactive
Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

