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Comment

it [the ms.] still suffer some important points that needs to be addressed. 1) The first one is that the overall interpretation seems heavily model driven. Indeed the E-W fractures are interpreted as forebulge-parallel extension, which make sense, but the systematic attribution of the N-S fractures to accros strike extension can be argued against: - an alternate interpretation would be to consider the N-S fractures as related to LPS, postponing the E-W, forebulge related fractures, leading to similar patterns than the one described.

Response

We thank the reviewer for this comment. We will add this text in the revised version “These could be also interpreted as layer parallel shortening (LPS)-related transverse extensional structures. However, LPS-related extensional structures include mm- to cm-long fractures filled with calcite (which is removed from pressure solution seams; Tavani et al., 2015 and references therein). The type (joints with no calcite infill) and size (tens of m-long) of transverse extensional structures described here are incompatible with layer-parallel shortening.

Comment

The occurrence of a NNESSW (what is the mean strike of it?) goes well into this alternate scenario, as the Ebro Basin underwent a regional 20° Clockwise rotation during paleogene, as reconstructed by the paleomagnetic data (Parès et al., 1988, Physics of the Earth and Planetary Interiors, Volume 52, Issue 3-4, p. 267-282). This rotation does not seem to have been considered by the authors, and I think this needs addressed.

Response

It has been recently demonstrated (after the initial papers describing paleomagnetic data in the Triassic red beds) that the Ebro basin has not experienced a general rotation during the Paleogene. Paleogene vertical-axis rotations in the Pyrenees are mainly related with displacement gradients of the thrust sheets, mostly resulting from the distribution of the Triassic salt detachment horizon (Sussman et al., 20014; Soto et al., 2006; Muñoz et al., 2013). In addition, older vertical axis rotations, can be related with the extensional and sinistral displacement of Iberia during Early Cretaceous (Dinarès-Turell and García-Senz, 2000; Gong et al., 2009). Apart from these vertical axis rotations, which are at present well documented, the Ebro basin and in detailed the eastern part of the Ebro basin where this is study has been located has not experienced any vertical-axis rotation as documented by paleomagnetic studies (Burbank et al., 1992; Taberner et al., 1999).
Two important things are missing to back up the interpretation of the authors: relative chronology; and observation and report of systematic occurrence of N-S joints with E-W joints.

**Response**
The few E-W striking joints systematically abut on the N-S striking set, indicating that E-W striking joints are cross-lands formed perpendicular to the master (N-S) joint set. This is well shown in figures 2D and 2E (for the NNW-SSE striking set), and it will be mentioned in the revised version.

**Comment**
I would be interested to see reported the length of the fracture tracks for each set. I am sure it could be of interest as well to solve the problem I mentioned in my first comment.

**Response**
This graph will be added

There is also minor remarks:

**Comment**
Page 2, line 26-27: “Even in arched systems, the forebulge, the foredeep, and the belt tend to be nearly parallel to each other locally” –> can you report related references?

**Response**
References will be added

**Comment**
Page 4, line 28-29: “The NE and SE portions of the study area are highly vegetated (Fig. 3d,e) and only a few joint traces have been mapped there.” –> how does it affect
the statistic? Why not leaving these out?

Response
We agree. Nodes with < 20 data have not been considered in our analysis. This will be mentioned in the new version of the ms.

Comment
Page 5: Why did you choose these lengths for the triangular mesh? Do you need it to be one order of magnitude longer than the longest fractures? Can you discuss the impact?

Response
The radius of the circular moving window is set to these values for these two reasons: 1) it is two orders of magnitude longer than the average length of joints; 2) it is larger enough to ensure that at each node the data number is >20

Comment
Figure 2 C-F: The north is not really clear from this representation.

Response
we will add the north.
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