

Interactive comment on “Alpine tectonic wedging and crustal delamination in the Cantabrian Mountains (NW Spain)” by Jorge Gallastegui et al.

Jorge Gallastegui et al.

jorge@geol.uniovi.es

Received and published: 24 May 2016

We would like to express our gratitude to the anonymous reviewer (#2). for his thorough review. The constructive comments helped to improve the manuscript. In this file, we will reply the major issues included in the revision. All changes will be added to the last version of the manuscript. We attach a commented pdf version of the final text after the revision from both reviewers as a supplement file. Lines and pages in our reply refer to those in the supplement file.

REPLY TO COMMENTS REFEREE 2

* The data description beginning on page 4 line 27 is hard to follow. Consider moving much of the detailed references to CDP numbers and reflector times to the figure captions

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



We agree with the comment. We have changed all references to CDP's to description in the figures. This makes the text easier for reading. However, we found it difficult to change the references to the times. We kept most of them.

* This paper is generally well written; however, consider replacing the many indefinite "it"s with the noun that they refer to. Also, you should consider rewriting the any sentence that starts with "There is" and bring the noun to the front. These suggestions will make your meaning more clear.

We agree again. According to your suggestion we have changed all sentences containing "it"s and "there is". We have even made more changes than you suggested in your corrections.

* Page 6 line 11: Why are the velocities from the refraction profiles consider reliable?

We consider that the values are reliable because the source is a good quality seismic experiment (Pulgar et al., 1996). In any case, we have changed the sentence a little bit "velocity values were used as they are the only data available in this area" (page 6 line 13).

* Attached is a scan of my hand-written editorial comments.

We have made all changes that you suggested in your hand-written document. While reading the text again, we have even found a few mistakes that are now corrected.

Please also note the supplement to this comment:

<http://www.solid-earth-discuss.net/se-2016-23/se-2016-23-AC2-supplement.pdf>

Interactive comment on Solid Earth Discuss., doi:10.5194/se-2016-23, 2016.

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

