

General remarks:

The manuscript is dealing with the eo-Alpine ductile Vinschgau shear zone, a thrust, and proposed a well-developed state-of-the art combination of structural work and Ar-Ar geochronology associated with with detailed and extensive electron microprobe work. The work could represent a model for future work on ductile shear zones.

During revision, the authors followed all comments and suggestions of the reviewer and explained all details, so that the reader can easily follow their arguments.

I recommend publication as it is, and the few typos etc. could be solved during proof-reading.

Specific remarks

Figure 1A: I suggest to use in legend of A) to use singular: „Permian-Jurassic cover“

L. 67: use plural for „zone“: „Large scale thrust- or normal-sense shear zones“

L. 71: „features from shallow depths conditions“: „depth“: use singular

L. 149-150: Make clear that the age of 450 Ma is for the Partschinser orthogneiss.

L. 232-233: „VSZ studied transects“: better: studied VSZ transects

L. 239: „basing“: better: „based“

L. 277: „Correct to „Phyllosilicate domains“

L. 278: „The abundance of calcite increases“ (not increase)

L. 347: You mean here Fig. 6a? (Fig. Xa)

L. 518-519: „Meliata-Hallstatt Ocean“: Potentially omit Hallstatt. The Hallstatt facies is now generally seen as outer shelf facies/upper continental slope facies.

L. 525: „at least 7-8 Ma before the pressure peak recorded by the Texel eclogites“: This open the question, whether the shear zone operated, at the Schlanders section, as thrust shear zone or as ductile normal normal fault at 97 Ma, when the eclogite-bearing Texel was down-doing to mantle depths. Potentially, these distinct processes are superposed on each other. However, this is a task for future work when more data are created for the Texel unit allowing a more detailed burial and exhumation history of the Texel unit.

L. 616: Correct to Franz (not Frantz)

L. 822: Sample (upper case).