

## Review Form Response

---

### Review FOSS4G Academic Track Submission

This form is for reviewing a FOSS4G Academic Track Submission.

Remarks to the editors \*

This paper should be accepted as the survey done here is original enough and the article well written. Nevertheless, the authors have an apparent lack of knowledge about open source and OGC. Moreover, this survey seems to be limited to British participants. Therefore, the conclusions should be more discussed.

Remarks to the author

This article is well written and the survey is original. The introduction and the literature review are well referenced.

Please consider the following comments and questions.

General observation:

- Reading this article, I had a strong feeling that this survey has been conducted only with UK participants. The acknowledgement confirmed this opinion. I think it should be interesting as well as necessary to mention the origins of the participants because the conclusions of this article would not be the same if you ask to people coming from developing countries (teaching to some of them every year, I am quite sure of this argument), e.g. not sure that the lack of computing power is a real problem for them at the moment.
- This article needs some more transitions to explain better the link between the different sections but mainly inside sections, particularly inside sections 4 and 5.
- The term "open source" needs to be homogenised as it is written both "open-source" and "open source".

-----

1. Introduction:

- Another author than Nedovic-Budic should be quoted as well as a more recent one because from 1998-1999 to present, a lot of barriers have been removed.
- "There are now a number of well-established GIS applications" --> could you precise this number: large, small, etc.

- Language corrections:

- policy developer --> policy developers
- and allow the performance --> and allows the performance
- is relative low --> is relatively low
- the adoption rate of GIS system --> the adoption rate of GIS
- add a question mark at the end of questions 1, 2 and 3
- made by GIS and highlight a way --> made by GIS, highlight a way

-----

2. Literature review:

- The acronym ATM should be fully written, so automated teller machine, as it is a priori not so well-known for non native English speakers
- Another example in Education should be added in 2.4
- in 2.3, last sentence: infrastructure --> infrastructures (?)

-----

3. Questionnaire survey and domain discussion:

- You wrote in the first paragraph that "participants need to have engineering background with relevant GIS knowledge". Therefore it is maybe useless to report their proficiency from 1 to 4 as 1 does not fit to this requirement. Moreover, there is a contradiction between what you wrote and the fact that some participants are beginners which it should not be the case.
- The second level of proficiency should be extended: "2) Beginner: just know general principles or ideas of GIS" --> "2) Beginner: just know general principles or ideas of GIS and how to use basic GIS functionalities" or at least you should write if the participants use often or not GIS software.
- What do you mean by "easier to learn GIS"? Do you know any reference or study about this way of building GIS? If yes, could you quote it.
- "training and lack of funding" --> "lack of funding and training" for the purpose of keeping the same order than in "cheaper, easier to learn"
- "Decision-support and planning using GIS are regarded as promising applications but these are apparently still seen as a secondary or future functions.": This observation should be put in relationship with the fact that you ask questions to engineers and not to decision-makers.
- In 3.2.1, "vi)" and "vii)" --> "(vi)" and "(vii)"
- The size of the 3.2.x titles is bigger than the 3.2 title one.
- In 3.2.2, you wrote "using ITN (Integrated Transport Network, an OS mapping product)". "OS" means in the OS community "open source" and not Ordnance Survey as it is the case here. So you have to write Ordnance Survey and not only OS.
- In 3.2.3, you write about a very specific topic of research and as far as I know, only the Ordnance Survey has a research team dedicated to the study of user needs.
- This survey is mainly based on the points of view of 22 people coming from a National Mapping Agency (the Ordnance Survey) and from research institutes. Therefore, it can not cover all user needs. Moreover, as GIS software or GI is now becoming a part of information systems as another module, the point of view from some private companies would be welcome. At least, the observations/conclusions that you made have to be correlated with the domain of activities of the participants. This point has to be clarified in the article.

-----

4. GIS Barriers and Potential Opportunities

- In this section, you write a list of barriers and a list of opportunities. Some links between the barriers and between the opportunities should be added. The reasons of the choice of your classification should be more explained.
- Add a dot at the end of the first sentence.
- in 4.1 "Lack of communication": "E-learning" --> "e-learning"

Recommendation \*

- Strong Accept and recommendation for inclusion in Transactions in GIS
- Strong Accept
- Weak Accept
- Reject

**Close**

\* Denotes required field

