

Interactive
Comment

Interactive comment on “Jurassic–cretaceous deformational phases in the Paraná intracratonic basin, southern Brazil” by A. J. Strieder et al.

A. J. Strieder et al.

adelirstrieder@uol.com.br

Received and published: 19 June 2015

“Jurassic–cretaceous deformational phases in the Paraná intracratonic basin, southern Brazil” by A.J. Strieder et al. Submitted to Solid Earth (sed-7-1263-2015) A. J. Strieder, R. Heemann, P. A. R. Reginato, R. B. Acauan, V. A. de Amorim, and M. Z. Remde adelirstrieder@uol.com.br

1 Comments from Editor, 24 May 2015 (EC C699) “Dear Dr. Strieder, after having checked the reviewers comments, reviews converge to conclude that this manuscript can not be recommended for publication on Solid Earth. Reasons are as follows: not enough field data, kinematic analysis missing, no overprinting relationships among the different structures properly documented (with impact on the age of deformation). Furthermore, the ms. shows poor internal organisation (see comments from rev#1)

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



Interactive
Comment

and lacks of a clear statement on why this work should be of international interest (see comments from rev#2). Another critical point is the age of deformation (see rev#2): why is it assumed Jurassic-Cretaceous in time? Based on the reviewer's report and my own reading of the ms. the manuscript requires profound revision and almost total rewriting. At this point I am led to conclude that it would be best to simply start over with this manuscript and, eventually, prepare a new submission. The comments of the reviewers will be very helpful in this regard. The paper will be considered as a new contribution with a new revision stage. I am sorry to render a negative decision on the manuscript at this stage, but I believe this is in the best interests of both the journal and the author. sincerely, federico rossetti Interactive comment on Solid Earth Discuss., 7, 1263, 2015.”

2 Authors' comments Dear Dr. Federico Rossetti, Authors appreciated your comments, as also as that provided by Anonymous Referee #2. Anyway, Authors would appreciate if you both could explain, in a detailed way, that comments, or even provide supplementary notes, in order to help Authors understanding that statements, and improving the manuscript in a better way. Authors tried a number of improvements on the manuscript, and 4-5 versions of answers to comments. But, more and more doubts arose, because Authors do not know the exact way of your scientific thinking. Then, Authors give up presenting any version, and just attached a reviewed version of the manuscript, according supplement to AR#1. Just three statement examples you re-phrased from AR#2 that lead confusion: > “not enough ĩñAeld data”. How much data would be enough? > “kinematic analysis missing”. What are you meaning for “kinematic analysis”? An overview on published papers dealing with fault kinematic analysis shows minor to large differences among them. And, the present manuscript is among the most complete ones. > “lacks of a clear statement on why this work should be of international interest (see comments from rev#2: ‘why a reader not familiar with the regional geology should be interested in this paper?’)”. Documentation (records and analysis) of large-scale bi-directional contractional structures and their stress/strain regime is not a very common issue/subject. Anyway, Authors think that drillers, hydro-geologists,

[Full Screen / Esc](#)[Printer-friendly Version](#)[Interactive Discussion](#)[Discussion Paper](#)

geotechnical engineering, geologists, oil and gas companies (to point some) will certainly do know how to use these results for shale gas activities, or, much better, to protect Guarani Aquifer and the deeper ones in the Paraná Basin. Authors also think that these results will contribute, in next future, to build up a tectonic analysis (in the sense summarized by Fossen, 2010, pp. 18 *1) for the Mesozoic era of the Paraná Basin, and the Gondwana breakup. But, should this be addressed? Is it too much scholastic, or not? Thank you very much, with the best regards, Adelir J Strieder

*1) Fossen, H. 2010. Structural Geology. Cambridge University Press, New York (USA), 463 pp.

Please also note the supplement to this comment:

<http://www.solid-earth-discuss.net/7/C804/2015/sed-7-C804-2015-supplement.pdf>

Interactive comment on Solid Earth Discuss., 7, 1263, 2015.

SED

7, C804–C806, 2015

Interactive
Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

