

Solid Earth Discuss., author comment AC2
<https://doi.org/10.5194/se-2021-77-AC2>, 2021
© Author(s) 2021. This work is distributed under
the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License.



Reply on RC2

Zbyszek Remin et al.

Author comment on "Deep vs shallow – two contrasting theories? A tectonically activated Late Cretaceous deltaic system in the axial part of the Mid-Polish Trough; a case study from SE Poland" by Zbyszek Remin et al., Solid Earth Discuss.,
<https://doi.org/10.5194/se-2021-77-AC2>, 2021

The manuscript entitled "Deep vs shallow – two contrasting theories? A tectonically activated Late Cretaceous deltaic system in the axial part of the Danish-Polish Trough; a case study from SE Poland" by Zbyszek Remin, MichaÅł Cyglicki and Mariusz Niechwedowicz contains valuable sedimentological, palynofacies, and heavy mineral data from the Szozdy section, Roztocze Hills in SE Poland.

The arguments presented by the authors to prove a shallow, cyclic marine sedimentation in the middle Campanian in SE Poland seem to be of significant importance for further investigations of the Upper Cretaceous succession in the area in terms of facies and bathymetric interpretations. The palaeotectonic model proposed by the authors constitutes good basis for these interpretations. It is worth emphasizing here that the delta system proposed in the manuscript is located in the area which, according to previous interpretations, was the axial and at the same time the most subsiding (and ?deepest) part of the Danish-Polish basin. The manuscript represents a substantial contribution to the scientific progress within the scope of Upper Cretaceous research, including the study of the Late Cretaceous inversion tectonics in SE part of the Trans-European sedimentary basin, i.e. the Danish-Polish Trough. At the whole, I agree with the presented interpretations and, consequently, I recommend accepting the manuscript for publication in Solid Earth Special Issue: Inversion tectonics – 30 years later; however, with necessary corrections (moderate revision).

Thank you for all these comments.

My main comments refer to Chapter 4: Material and Methods: I would suggest more complete description of the methods used. Particularly, the description of sedimentological and heavy mineral analyses is far too incomplete. Further suggestions for improvements are contained directly on the manuscript file.

We have added several information to Chapter 4 as suggested by the Referee (including those provided in the annotated pdf). Now they are more complete and more logical according to the suggestion of the Referee.

The manuscript is quite messy in terms of text, editorials and organization. The entire text

(body text, references and figure captions) requires careful editing by a native speaker.

Indeed the Referee provided several editorials corrections. All these comments and corrections were accepted by us and were corrected according to the journal's rules.

Additionally the manuscript was corrected by the native speaker.

The editorials which can easily be corrected by the authors are the following:

(1) Citations order in the text: do this chronologically or alphabetically, but be consistent; ***Done.***

(2) Figure captions: adjust according to the journal authors' guideline. ***Done.***

(3) Complete the missing or remove the unnecessary references: 11 references from the Reference list were not used in the text, and six references appearing in the text were not included in the References list. Please follow the Journal style of the References list and use an appropriate order. I am not sure if Papers with the status 'in prep.' should be included. ***Done.***

(4) Use British English or US English, be consistent. ***Done.***

Further editorial corrections and suggestions for modifications are indicated directly in the manuscript file. ***Thank you for all the editorial corrections.***