

**Interactive comment on “Interpretation of zircon corona textures from metapelitic granulites of Ivrea-Verbanò Zone, Northern Italy: Two-stage decomposition of Fe-Ti oxides” by Elizaveta Kovaleva et al.
F. Corfu (Referee)**

fernando.corfu@geo.uio.no

Received and published: 4 February 2017

The paper presents an interesting case of secondary zircon growth as a result of mineral reactions which liberate Zr during cooling and exhumation from high grade conditions.

Although the growth of zircon as a consequence of the break-down of ilmenite and rutile, or diffusion of Zr from these minerals during cooling has been described before, the present paper adds an important dimension documenting zircon formation during retrogression even at greenschist facies conditions.

Although one can follow the descriptions and discussions reasonably well, some parts are rather confused and there is much repetition.

We have cleaned up the text from most of the repetitions (except where repeating of information is necessary to develop the narrative for the presented thought).

Chapter 1 introduces the subjects and reviews the previous literature, but then much of this is repeated again in the second chapter, and then again in the discussion. **We tried to clean up the repetitions.** The latter needs a thorough restructuring, ideally discussing the changes in mineralogy, structures and zircon features and evolution in a logical time progression. **We have re-structured the discussion.** Here the discussion starts with the late events eventually getting to the early stages, and circling around and back several times. **We have fixed this problem – now everything is presented in logical time progression (as we suggest it).** Chapter 5.2 is mainly a lengthy repetition of what has been said before, with a number of contradictory statements added in. **Noted!**
Shortened and cleaned up.

I have marked the file and added some questions and comments there.

We have gone through the attached file and introduced all of your corrections. We answered and addressed all your comments.

My suggestion is to do a serious restructuring and condensation of the paper, sharpening the logic and cutting out the repetitions. A slender paper about 1/3 in size should be a result which the readers will greatly appreciate.

We have reduced the discussion where appropriate.

Febr. 4, 2017 F. Corfu

Thank you very much for your help!