

Author's response to the Associate Editor Initial Decision

Februray 5, 2015

Luis E. Lara

A corrected version was prepared according to the editor's comments. Here below is point by point summary of this changes.

1. General comment 1
The abstract was updated according to this comment with a brief introduction to the topic and some key points.
2. General comment 2
The introduction was updated regarding the state of the art and especially with a remark about of the novelty and/or impact in the present knowledge
3. General comment 3
The discussion was updated trying to make clearer our answer and what are the impacts in a broad sense
4. General comment 4
Conclusion were rewritten accordingly
5. General comment 5
Past tense is used for discussion
6. General comment 6
Units were formatted with negative exponents.
7. General comment 7
References were updated
8. Specific comments on the Abstract
All they accepted; Abstract rewritten
9. Specific comments on the Introduction

All they accepted; more background was given and especially we explain why is important this case-study in a more global sense

10. Specific comments on Material and Methods

All they accepted; site description moved to Material and Methods; format for time standardized. Format corrections done.

11. Specific comments on the Results

Paragraph modified and reorganized

12. Specific comments on Discussion

A short line on 'biogeo' focus was added although we feel that this focus is already met from the very begging being fossil our main age constrain.

We keep the focus on the uplift, not on the origin of the JFR so we reduced the emphasis on the plume hypothesis at the beginning.

13. Specific comments on Conclusions

- a. Paragraph updated and reorganized, with mention to the 'biogeo' focus in the Discussion.