Detailed Comments:

The authors proposed an ontology for workflow evolution and its provenance. They validated the proposed ontology through competency questions using SPARQL queries. Overall, I think the paper provides a good contribution to defining an ontology for the workflow evolution process, but I want to raise a few minor points.

- I found the use of ontology ProvONE to define a workflow unnecessarily complicated, and I felt that it would have been better to use a much simpler ontology like P-PLAN.

- It is also not clear how competency questions were answered. The corresponding SPARQL questions seem overly complex. A brief explanation will help clear up how queries would work. Is there a working server where these queries can be tested?

- I also would like to see more practical competency questions such as "What part of the workflow has been changed", showing the deleted / added input, output parameters or steps.

- In page 2 line 8, the authors stated "But these solutions rely on proprietary formats that make it difficult to reuse these solutions." Please elaborate on this.