Dear Piotr,

Thank you very much for your review which helped improve this manuscript. We addressed all of your comments and amended our manuscript where possible. Please see our below.
Please do not hesitate to contact us for further clarification of any of our responses.

Kind regards,
Dan Tamas on behalf of all authors

General Comments:

1. are quite numerous remarks on various oil and gas exploration aspects of these structures necessary, do they bring anything specific to the merit of this study?

A: we think it is important to mention the implication, however, we keep this short as, yes, it is not the main topic of the paper.

2. links between modelling results and presented natural examples are not 100% clear, make sure that each example is described in relation to at least one of the Experiments 1-5, with conclusion regarding interpretation of seismic data etc.

A: Sorry this part was not very clear, I think we generally focused a bit too much on the differences rather than the similarities. We adjusted this aspect throughout the paper and compared the finding with the natural examples presented.

1 Introduction

characterizes sedimentary

A: corrected

That

A: corrected

is it important for this paper …?

A: we think it is important to mention the implication, however, we keep this short as, yes, it is not the main topic of the paper.

2 Methodology

briefly explain in this sub-chapter why five, and how they differed

A: we explained this better in the methods.

3 Analogue modelling results

move this info to sub-chapter 2.1

A: we moved this as suggested.

which is

A: corrected

4.2 Examples from nature

discuss these natural examples more clearly in a context of obtained results of analogue modelling, with references to experiments 1-5 and clearly presented conclusions that could be drawn from these experiments for interpretation of seismic data etc.

then I do not fully understand why this particular example has been chosen in order to analyze and utilize results of analogue modelling …?

This suggests that presented natural examples do not really fit to the obtained results of analogue modelling … Please clarify what was the rational for selecting these particular examples for this study, this is not 100% clear to me

A: Sorry this part was not very clear, I think we generally focused a bit too much on the differences rather than the similarities. We adjusted this aspect throughout the paper and compared the finding with the natural examples presented.