

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

R. Casado et al.

ruben.casado@treelogic.com

Received and published: 8 April 2015

Firstly I would like to thanks for your useful comments to improve the document.

For better understaing, please find attached a table linking your comments and how we have addressed all of them.

In addition please find attached the final version of the paper after the review.

Please also note the supplement to this comment:

<http://www.nat-hazards-earth-syst-sci-discuss.net/2/C3626/2015/nhessd-2-C3626-2015-supplement.pdf>

C3626

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

C3627

Referee 2

Comment	Action
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 DISMA of Germany	Examples are already given in the introduction! It is the nature of an abstract to be more general than the paper it summarizes.
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?	This is not something to be decided by me. Normally a manuscript mentions the authors and not everyone involved.
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?	Accepted and fixed. Added footnotes with references for each case to help the reader.
Why was DISMA used for the test scenario instead of the other EMSs of Germany?	We selected these two concrete EMSs for practical purposes: members of the consortium in charge of executing this research had access and knowledge of these two software applications. In addition, both EMSs are really been used in the Netherlands and Germany respectively. This justification has been added to Section 5.
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.	A highlighting sentence has been added to 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?	References to the test scenario have been added. In general this section describes the conclusions from the test scenario. Thus the "general" significance does not differ from the test case significance.
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?	Functional and technical limitations are already defined in different sections. A overall discussion is presented in Section 5.4
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?	A discussion about this has been added. The scope of EMERGEL included 25 EU countries. A brief explanation and a reference to the EMERGEL website has been included in section Conclusions

Fig. 1.

C3628