

- S.K. Biswas, A. Dave, P. Garg, J. Pandey, A. Maithani and N.J. Thomas, (Eds.), Proc. Second Seminar on Petroliiferous basins of India. Indian Petrol. Pubs. Dehra Dun, v.2, pp.233-284.
- NAGESHWAR, D. and CHATTERJEE, B.K. (1997) Sandstones of Mesozoic Kachchh basin: Their provenance and basinal evolution. Indian Jour Petrol. Geol., v.6, No.1, pp.69-76.
- PAREEK, H.S. (1981) Basin configuration and stratigraphy, western Rajasthan. Jour. Geol. Soc. India, v.22, pp.517-527.
- QURESHY, M.N. and IQBALLUDIN (1992) A review of geophysical constraints in modelling of the Gondwana crust in India. Tectonophysics, v.212, pp.141-151.
- SIDDIQUI, H.N. (1963) The Jodhpur Malani divide separating the Barmer and Jaisalmer basins. Jour. Geol. Soc. India, v.4, pp.97-107.
- SINHA, S.K., YADAV, R.K. and QURESHI, S.M. (1993) Status of exploration in south Shahgarh sub basin of Jaisalmer-basin, Rajasthan. In: S.K. Biswas, A. Dave, P. Garg, J. Pandey, A. Maithani and N.J. Thomas, (Eds.), Proc. Second Seminar on Petroliiferous basins of India. Indian Petrol. Pubs. Dehra Dun, v.2, pp.285-333.

SEDIMENTARY FACIES AND STRATIGRAPHIC SIGNIFICANCE OF CUMBUM AND BAIRENKONDA TYPE SECTIONS OF NALLAMALAI FOLD BELT, CUDDAPAH BASIN, ANDHRA PRADESH by G. Lakshminarayana.
Jour. Geol. Soc. India, v.59, 2002, pp.167-177.

K.V.S. Reddy, Geological Survey of India, Southern Region, Bandalaguda, Hyderabad - 500 068, comments:

I would like to point out a technical flaw in the above paper.

If the Kakarla ridge (KR) displays F_1 isoclinal synform (Figs.1, 2 and 3) then:

- Structurally, Urakonda forms a major F_2 fold i.e., a refolded F_1 synform. If it so, such structures are uncommon in Cuddapah Basin, prior to cross-folding;
- Stratigraphically the older unit of Cumbum Formation occurs towards south along the plunge direction (SSW) of the synform, which is occupied by the younger Bairenkonda Formation towards north in the fold core. It is also uncommon while establishing stratigraphy from structure;
- Bhairavunikonda and/or Cumbum tank ridge quartzite towards west and east of Urakonda fold respectively are stratigraphically younger to Cumbum Formation and structurally occupies F_1 synformal (open to isoclinal) cores flanked by the Cumbum Formation only. These quartzites are not correlatable stratigraphically with the sequence in the Urakonda fold.

The aforementioned points imply that the data recorded/interpreted (structurally/stratigraphically) may not be correct / tenable.

The alternate plausible explanation is that Kakarla ridge forms the steeply dipping eastern limb, in which case:

- Structurally, Urakonda represents a major F_1 anti-

formal fold, marked by folding of bedding (S_0) and plunging moderately [inferred from the folded bedding (S_0) dips in the fold closure] towards SSW.

- Stratigraphically, the younger unit of Cumbum Formation occurs towards south along the plunge direction of the antiform, which is occupied by the older sequence of phyllite, phyllitic quartzite and thick, bedded orthoquartzite towards north in the fold core.

G. Lakshminarayana, Sandhyagiri Apartments, F-304, Kalyan Nagar, Gaddiannaram, P&T Colony (P.O.), Hyderabad - 500 060, replies:

- Shri Reddy should have specified 'common' and 'uncommon' structures along with examples and published references on the Cuddapah Basin;
- He has assumed SSW plunge, which is not shown/recorded by the author in Fig.1.
- Kindly see the first sentence of second para on p.169 and the line drawings.

Assumptions cannot form the basis for plausible explanation. Field data cannot be assumed/changed/alterd for the sake of convenient interpretation as attempted. Hence points 1 and 2 of the comments are untenable.

The above mentioned points indicate that the paper has not been thoroughly read. Hence, it is premature to use the term – "technical flaw".