Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., 2, C3626–C3628, 2015 www.nat-hazards-earth-syst-sci-discuss.net/2/C3626/2015/
© Author(s) 2015. This work is distributed under the Creative Commons Attribute 3.0 License.



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 http://www.nat-hazards-earth-syst-sci-d2015-supplement.pdf	s comment: liscuss.net/2/C3626/2015/nhessd-2-C3626-
	C3626

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

nhess-2014-213 Submitted on 29 Jul 2014 Data interoperability software solution for emergency reaction in the Europe Union R. Casado, E. Rubiera, M. Sacristan, F. Schütte, and R. Peters Referee 2

Comment	Action
Cite some examples of the cultural, semantic, and	Examples are already given in the
linguistic differences between European Union	introduction! It is the nature of an abstract
countries. Or in this case, between the LCMS of the	to be more general than the paper it
Netherlands and DISMA of Germany	summarizes.
It seems that there were a lot of experts involved in	This is not something to be decided by me.
the creation of the EMERGEL + DISASTER. However,	Normally a manuscript mentions the authors
were all of them identified in the manuscript? Who	and not everyone involved.
were the involved parties?	*
Some terms were mentioned in the manuscript, but	Accepted and fixed. Added footnotes with
were not discussed such as REST, DOLCE, tOWL,	references for each case to help the reader.
SPARQL. Is it safe to assume that these are well-	•
known terms?	
Why was DISMA used for the test scenario instead of	We selected these two concrete EMSs for
the other EMSs of Germany?	practical purposes: members of the
	consortium in charge of executing this
	research had access and knowledege 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	A highlightning sentence has been added to
interoperability was extremely highlighted. I suggest	the introduction.
that the authors emphasize this in the introduction.	
In Section 5.4, the authors discussed the general	References to the test scenario have been
In Section 5.4, the authors discussed the general significance of the EMERGEL + DISASTER, but did not	References to the test scenario have been added. In general this section describes the
	added. In general this section describes the
significance of the EMERGEL + DISASTER, but did not	added. In general this section describes the
significance of the EMERGEL + DISASTER, but did not discuss how it was significant during the test scenario. Add a discussion about what happened	added. In general this section describes the conclusions from the test scenario. Thus the
significance of the EMERGEL + DISASTER, but did not discuss how it was significant during the test scenario. Add a discussion about what happened	added. In general this section describes the conclusions from the test scenario. Thus the "general" significance does not differ from
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	added. In general this section describes the conclusions from the test scenario. Thus the "general" significance does not differ from
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	added. In general this section describes the conclusions from the test scenario. Thus the "general" significance does not differ from
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?	added. In general this section describes the conclusions from the test scenario. Thus the "general" significance does not differ from
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	added. In general this section describes the conclusions from the test scenario. Thus the "general" significance does not differ from the test case significance.
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 POISASTER? Add a section detailing the limitations of the study	added. In general this section describes the conclusions from the test scenario. Thus the "general" significance does not differ from the test case significance. Functional and technical limitations are already defined in differents sections. A
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.	added. In general this section describes the conclusions from the test scenario. Thus the "general" significance does not differ from the test case significance. Functional and technical limitations are already defined in differents sections. A
significance of the EMERGEL - DISASTER, but did not discuss how it was significant during the discuss how it was significant during the scenario. Add a discussion about what happened during and after the test. What were the problems encounteed (if any)? What was the significant difference between the actual scenario and the test scenario using EMERGEL - DISASTER? In the study of	added. In general this section describes the conclusions from the test scenario. Thus the "general" significance does not differ from the test case significance. Functional and technical limitations are already defined in differents sections. A
significance of the EMERGEL - DISASTER, but did not discuss how it was significant during the text scenario. Add a discussion what happened during and after the text. What were the problems encountered (if any)? What was the significant difference between the actual scenario and the text scenario using EMERGEL - DISASTER? Add section detailing the limitations of the study and incorporating those discussed in Section 5.4, unitations were discussed in Section 5.4, unitations were discussed in Section 5.4, through the authors address these limitations?	added. In general this section describes the conclusions from the test scenario. Thus the 'general' significance does not differ from the test case significance. Functional and technical limitations are already defined in differents sections. A overall discussion is presented in Section 5.4
significance of the EMBRGEL - DISASTER, but did not discuss how it was significant during the text scenario. Add a discussion with such that scenario add a discussion about what happened during and after the text. What were the problems encountered (if any)? What was the significant difference between the actual scenario and the text scenario using EMBRGEL - DISASTER? Add a section detailing the limitations of the study and incorporating those discussed in Section 5.4. Illumitations were discussed in Section 5.4. How did	added. In general this section describes the conclusions from the test scenario. Thus the 'general' significance does not differ from the test case significance. Functional and technical limitations are already defined in differents sections. A overall discussion is presented in Section 5.4
significance of the EMBRGEL + DISASTER, but did not discuss how It was significant during the text scenario. Add a discussion what happened during and after the text. What were the problems encountered (if any)? What was the significant difference between the actual scenario and the text scenario using EMBRGEL + DISASTER? Add a section detailing the limitations of the study and incorporating those discussed in Section 5.4, through the authors address these limitations; Why translate everything of why not proposed to the substance of the significant scenario and the significant scenario address these limitations; Why translate everything of why not just standardize everything for the whole European Union countries? Are the EMSs of other European Union countries;	added. In general this section describes the conclusions from the test scenaria. The conclusions from the test scenaria. The section of the test cases is defined to the test case significance. Functional and technical limitations are already defined in differents sections. A overall discussion is presented in Section 5.4. A discussion about this has been added. The scope of EMERGEL included 25 EU
significance of the EMERGEL DISASTER, but did not discuss how it was significant during the test scenario. Add a discussion what happened during and after the test. What were the problems encounteed (if any)? What was the significant difference between the actual scenario and the test scenario using EMERGEL DISASTER? Add a section detailing the limitation of the study and incorporating those discussed in Section 5.4. and incorporating those discussed in Section 5.4. When the subtract discussed in the subtract discussed the subtract discussed in Section 5.4. Why that shall be subtracted to the subtract discussed in Section 5.4. Why that shall be energy thing? Why not just standardise everything? Why thole European Union countries?	added. In general this section describes the conclusions from the test scenario. The test scenario may be seen added to the test scenario may be seen added to the test case significance does not differ from the test case significance. Functional and technical limitations are already defined in differents sections. A overall discussion is presented in Section 5.4 A discussion about this has been added.

Fig. 1.

C3628