

## Summary

Throughout the study, a number of claims are made that lack supporting information or empirical evidence. For instance, more support/background information for the REAL method could have been provided, and the claim made at the article's conclusion that Chimaera was useful for diagnosing ontologies was not evidenced in the study. Also, the group disliked how the sample size ( $n=8$ ) was too small to provide any significant conclusions. The group also discussed how it would be good to mention any difference between computer scientists and biologists relating to their navigation of each tool. Perhaps provide the results in a table where participants are grouped by profession (CS and biology) along with their evaluation. Lastly, the group discussed how an explanation of how the number of "correct" cases that could be possible for merging (Table 1) was derived, was absent from the article.