

## ***Interactive comment on “A web based spatial decision supporting system for land management and soil conservation” by F. Terribile et al.***

**Anonymous Referee #2**

Received and published: 1 April 2015

OVERALL COMMENT I think that the presented tool, is valuable, however, my recommendation is MAJOR REVISION because the readability of the manuscript is poor and impact measurements to evaluate its significance and usefulness are essential to conclude your work. The following points are my main concern to improve:

1) READIBILITY- You present a system of decision but in a so generic way that it is difficult until you find Table 3, to understand the usefulness of your tool. Apparently, you find a GIS with a system to make queries. The simplification of the manuscript structure is essential to understand its use. In addition, Material and Methods and Results are mixed which is quite confusing to follow the in the text (Chapter 3 explains M&M). Please, think of the following structure to modify the manuscript: 1. Introduction, where you explain the functions of your tool (as in Table 3, structure and models) so

C339

with it, define you objectives. The regulations mentioned in Table 1 should be directly related with these functions. 2. Material and methods. 2.1. Tool/GUI (architecture, language,etc) 2.2. Functions (with the specific models and usefulness) 2.3. Examples of application 2.4. Impact measures (surveys, internet downloads, number of visits, etc) 3. Results 3.1. Results of the examples of application (responded to the chapter 2.3.) 3.2. Results of impact measurements 4. Discussion: i) about similar tool; ii) about the interpretation of the impact measurements. 5. Conclusions (see also Overall Comment 2)

2) END USERS and IMPACT MEASUREMENTS – You state in the abstract that the end users helped, so I was wondering how? Measurements to support your discussion and conclusions are fundamental in this type of work for an open audience. You need any type of indicators or surveys to determine the usefulness. The authors must not evaluate their own work. You need to define the different group of users, and to establish the indicators suitable to evaluate your tool and its aims.

DETAILED COMMENTS 3) Title – I think that the term “soil conservation” is not suitable because you expect to carry out different functions so, maybe only “land management” is more appropriate.

4) Abstract –Line 9 – the decision types must be described or at least, more information should be given. It sounds really generic.

5) Line 20-21 (abstract) –How the end users helped? Who are them? Technicians? Can you explain which is the change of paradigm?

6) Introduction – (See also comment 1) Particular problems to solve must be described and only the regulations directly associated mentioned in Table 1.

7) Page 667. The objective is very open and generic (Figure 1 too), please, consider my comment 1.

8) Page 670. That’s an example of the difficulties to follow. You mentioned SWAP, but

C340

that is in a context not related with the rest of models.

9) Page 672-673 –The name of the tool should be mentioned previously even in the title.

10) Page 674 (line 23) –You do not present any evaluation so this sentence is not justified (see comment 2).

11) Page 675, lines 1-14. This must be included into the Introduction. Please, provide concrete objectives/ functions (see comment 1).

12) Page 675 –Chapter 3.1.1. and 3.1.2 are Material and Methods.

13) Discussion is not well-justified (see comment 1), you should compare other type of tools in other countries and to interpret the analysis of the tool impact.

14) Conclusions, see comment 2.

FIGURES 15) Figure 1 is very generic, it is not useful. 16) Figure 2 - Are the black lines contours? You need a legend.

TABLES 17) Table 1 - See comment 1 and 6. 18) Table 3 must be previous to Table 2 in order to explain the functions.

---

Interactive comment on Solid Earth Discuss., 7, 661, 2015.