



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@treeologic.com

Received and published: 8 April 2015

We really appreciate the effort of this review. We have addressed all the valuable comments. Please find below the comments and how we have addressed all of them. Also find attached the modified figures and the final version of the paper as supplement material.

Generally speaking and particularly in paragraph 1, it would be good to give the context with references on emergency management. For instance, (line 5) "time is the number one quality parameter" why? References? This remark is valid for the whole of your introduction; your article would be greatly improved if you gave more examples and references to submit your problematic

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



References have been added.

P 6005 line 11 – Please define “ICT”. Acronyms should be defined the first time they appear in the text.

Include the definition

P 6006 line 7 - Could you explain “the vertical and the horizontal axis”? I don’t quite understand what that is.

Explanation added.

P 6006 line 25-26 – “However, message mapping . . . vehicle types.” This is an important choice that must be explained.

Explanation added.

P 6008 line 17 - Please define “API”. Acronyms should be defined the first time they appear in the text. Accepted and fixed.

Added footnote with reference.

P 6009 line 16 – Please define “REST”.

Accepted and fixed. Added footnote with reference.

P 6009 – line 20 – “EMERGEL (EMERgency ELements)”: It is necessary to define EMERGEL the first time it appears in the text. Although it is defined in the abstract

Accepted and fixed. Added in the article body.

P 6009 – P6010 line 25 at 27 and line 1 at 5 - This paragraph should be placed rather in the introduction section. It also must be added references.

Rewritten but not removed. That paragraph establishes the basis of the key class “event”, reused from the DOLCE ontology, so the paragraph seems pertinent there. It has been rewritten though to seamlessly fit the section.

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



P6010 – Please define “DOLCE” and “RDF”

Accepted and fixed. Added footnotes with definitions and references.

P6011 – line 3 – What is it “tOWL”?

Accepted and fixed. Added footnote with definition and reference.

P6011– Please define “FOAF”, “WAI”, “W3C”

Accepted and fixed. Added footnotes with definitions and references.

P 6013 – line 4 at 7 - How did you formalize the expert knowledge? References? (1- curt et al, 2010) How do you define an expert? References? (2 - Zwingelstein, 1995)

Accepted and fixed. Added paragraph: “The initial approach was based upon a number of competency questions prepared by the ontology engineers to be addressed by the domain experts. The answers to these competency questions were the cornerstone of the first steps to model the ontology.” A domain expert in this case is easily identified: a professional expert in the domain, the opposite of an ontology engineer, whose skills are different.

P 6013 line -15 - What is it “IT crisis”?

It is not “IT crisis”, it reads “IT crisis management systems”, synonym of EMS.

P 6014 line 22 – Acronym of "Web Service" has already been used. It should be used directly

Changed in the whole document.

P 6014 line 24 – Change “Figure” 3 by “Fig. 3” for NHESS

Changed in all figures

Section 5 – Validation Section 5.1 - Would you have references on this experience feedback? TECHNICAL

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



References added in introduction of section.

TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS P6030 – Figure 4 - The level of quality of this figure is to improve. Especially, the green background is too dark. P6031 – Figure 5 - The font size of the text too small

Images have been edited for better understanding.

Please also note the supplement to this comment:

<http://www.nat-hazards-earth-syst-sci-discuss.net/2/C3629/2015/nhessd-2-C3629-2015-supplement.pdf>

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

NHESSD

2, C3629–C3634, 2015

Interactive
Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

C3632






Fig. 1.

Interactive Comment




Fig. 2.

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

