

General comments:

Comparison of the new version of MS with the ones submitted earlier show the only changes that the authors have made are on the title and adding couple of figure as well as kaftar Anticline. These modifications can not cover the main concern about the MS which Are as follow:

- 1- The purpose of the study is not clear. In the abstract and introduction section the effect of Dashtak Detachment as well as the Nezamabad fault is considered while at the end of introduction section only the effect of the detachment horizon on the fold style is considered as the main aim of the MS.
- 2- The role of Dashtack Formation on fold style variation of Paleozoic strata that are going to act as deep reservoir with Mezosoic-Cenozoic strata above the detachment must be either constrain by deep seismic line(s) or construction of Balanced cross section using fold geometry of strata above and below of this detachment zone where they are exposed (eastern part of Fars interior in North of Bandar Abbas proviene). Since the authors have used geological map of the Karbasi Anticline that is internal report of National Iranaian Oil Company, they might have also access to seismic lines.
- 3- To address the effect of Nezamabad transverse fault detailed field work on the fault geometry and kinematics have to be presented. In addition, data to document the basement nature of the fault is necessary.
- 4- If the outcome of the MS are going to contribute on oil exploration and the Nezamabad Fault that cross cut the Kaftar Anticline has disadvantage for the anticline to be considered as an structural Lot of names for the structure of the region is presented in the text but not addressed to maps or figures.
- 5- Detailed data on kinematics of the anticlines are not presented but is emphesied on their complexity. In addition, the geometry and kinematics of the Nezamabad fault which is the main fault under investigation in this study has not presented. Thus, it is not good to say "Based on received results may be the Nezamabad fault is located between G-G0 and F-F0 structural sections".
- 6- The structure of the presented data has to be improved and discussion section has to be written in a way that discusses the main purpose of the study.
- 7- The MS Language still need to be improved substantially in both English scientific style of writing.

Specific comments

- 1- Relevant references as to the importance of Dashtack Formation as a middle dtachment in Fars region are not addressed in introduction section.
- 2- Unlike the line 14-15 in section 2, there must be a seismic line across the Karbasi Anticline where an exploration well is drilled.
- 3- In line 15 of the section 2, present the method used for measurement of fold style elements.
- 4- There are lot of repeated phrase like " the karbasi and Kaftar anticlines are asymmetric strucutres" throughout the MS.
- 5- Sections 6, 7, 8 and 9 are devoted to fold geometry. So, better to combined them in a section.

- 6- Fig. 9 shows the proposed relation between the longitudinal thrusts and different fold style but the effect of the Nezamabad Fault as a transverse fault that is emphasized greatly in the Ms text can not be observed in this figure.
- 7- Unlike the MS text the presented sections in Figure 10 did not show the effect of the Dashtack detachment horizon on the fold style of the studied anticlines (as proposed on Figure 9).
- 8- Unlike the MS text the Nezamabad Fault (as shown in Fig. 13) does not affect the Karbasi Anticline.
- 9- If well data are used for writing of the MS, its data should be presented, for example on modification of Fig. 2.

In conclusion, the MS still needs substantial modification.