

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

Since the table uploaded as PDF is not easy to read, I put here the comments and how we have addressed all of them. Please find in the previous comment the final version of the paper as supplement material.

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.

C3637

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?

As described in the test validation, different stakeholders including fireman, police, ontology experts and software engineeras have been involved in this project. You can find more information about it in <http://disaster-fp7.eu/>

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 and 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 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 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.

C3638

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?

A discussion about this has been added.

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? The scope of EMERGEL included 25 EU countries.

A brief explanation and a reference to the EMERGEL website has been included in section Conclusions What are the future plans for EMERGEL + DISASTER? Will it be applied for the whole European Union countries?

DISASTER + EMERGEL is the result of an FP7 EU funded research project. Future works, in collaboration with EU stakeholders, include the adaptation of these improvements in more scenarios. It was added to the Conclusions section.

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)

Fixed.

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

C3639