



Interactive comment on “Data interoperability software solution for emergency reaction in the Europe Union” by R. Casado et al.

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 13 February 2015

GENERAL COMMENTS

This study presents a solution to address issues of interoperability among the EMSs of different countries in the European Union. Considering the cultural, semantic, and linguistic differences of the European Union countries, coordination during emergency situations may involve difficulties and may entail delays – during instances where time is of utmost importance. I find the study highly significant. However, I have some comments that I hope the authors can answer.

SPECIFIC COMMENTS

Cite some examples of the cultural, semantic, and linguistic differences between European Union countries. Or in this case, between the LCMS of the Netherlands and

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



DISMA of Germany.

It seems that there were a lot of experts involved in the creation of the EMERGEL + DISASTER. However, were all of them identified in the manuscript? Who were the involved parties?

Some terms were mentioned in the manuscript, but were not discussed such as REST, DOLCE, tOWL, SPARQL. Is it safe to assume that these are well-known terms?

Why was DISMA used for the test scenario instead of the other EMSs of Germany?

It was only in Section 5.1 that the significance of the interoperability was extremely highlighted. I suggest that the authors emphasize this in the introduction.

In Section 5.4, the authors discussed the general significance of the EMERGEL + DISASTER, but did not discuss how it was significant during the test scenario. Add a discussion about what happened during and after the test. What were the problems encountered (if any)? What was the significant difference between the actual scenario and the test scenario using EMERGEL + DISASTER?

Add a section detailing the limitations of the study and incorporating those discussed in Section 5.4.

Limitations were discussed in Section 5.4. How did the authors address these limitations?

Why translate everything? Why not just standardize everything for the whole European Union countries?

Are the EMSs of other European Union countries already translated? Or was it only done for the LCMS of the Netherlands and DISMA of Germany?

What are the future plans for EMERGEL + DISASTER? Will it be applied for the whole European Union countries?

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS

Be consistent with using the terms. Is it EMERGEL + DISASTER (page 6007, line 8) or is it DISASTER + EMERGEL (page 6019, line1)?

Address the following typographical errors.

wrong spelling: “resuses” (page 6010, line 10)

capitalization: “the” (page 6016, line 28)

capitalization: “the” (page 6017, line 13)

spell out: “2” (page 6018, line 4)

Interactive comment on Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., 2, 6003, 2014.

NHESSD

2, C3405–C3407, 2015

Interactive
Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

C3407

