

Answers

Reviewer C:

5) How is the overall organization of the manuscript?

Could be improved. (*)

Comments: Figures should be cited in the text in advance. For example, figure 2 should be presented in the next page.

[Answer 5](#): Figures rearranged according to their citations in the text

6) Is the manuscript fluently written (in English)?

No. Although readable, but needs revision. (*)

Comments:

The paper has several errors and should be revised by an English language expert. Many of the sentences could be improved. For example, in the last paragraph of section 4 it has been stated that:

“In Figure 2 a fragment of RDF file containing user information presented”. The sentence should be corrected as”
...user information is presented”

[Answer 6](#): manuscript writing revised.

7) Is the coverage of the topic comprehensive and balanced?

No, certain parts are over-stressed. (*)

Comments:

Much detail should be provided to the text. For example, it has been stated in the section 4 that “Request is stored as RDF statements to be processed next. In request process phase reasoning over RDF statements is done and consistency among statements is checked.” There is not any detail regarding the following questions:

-How request is transformed to RDF?

-How reasoning and consistency check is performed?

Similarly, missing details of sections 5 and 6 should be provided

[Answer 7](#): more details are now added to section IV and also some details added to sections V and VI.

8) Evaluate the technical correctness of the work

Comments:

The arguments are incomplete, but can be completed. (*)

[Answer 8](#): we also considered parameter names as an argument. In most cases but not all of them, names of parameters were meaningless words or letters or a combination of both. It was the reason that we had ignored them before.
