We would like to thank the reviewers and meta-reviewer for their helpful comments and encouraging words.

In this revision of the paper about LOV, we addressed all of your remarks and suggestions. Here are the modifications we did to the original submission (section numbers refer to the revised document):

###### Section by Section ######

- The Introduction has been re-written to include a clear motivation from the LOD community [meta-reviewer].

- We added a section 2 “LOV State” that now gathers previously scattered statistics about LOV dataset from the original submission. [Meta-reviewer; Reviewer1] We supplemented this section with statistics never shown before on how studying LOV ecosystem informs about Semantic Web adoption and practices.

- Section 3 has changed substantially, starting with the architecture figure [reviewer1].

- Section 3.1 “Tracking and Analysis” has been reviewed and now includes a full detail of the automatic analysis performed at the vocabulary and vocabulary term levels. We have fixed the reversed definition of inlinks/outlinks [Reviewer1; Reviewer3]. We provide details about the inter-vocabulary relationships (VOAF) along with real examples [Reviewer2]. Section 3.1.2 explains where the popularity measure comes from (LODStats) [Reviewer1; Reviewer2].

-Section 3.2 “Curation” is new and explicates the curation workflow for vocabulary insertion and review [Reviewer1].

-In section 3.3 “Data Access”, we fully reviewed the Search Engine part to provide a full mathematical description of the scoring applied on vocabulary terms ranking (providing more information on how we use the popularity metric and clarifying the innovative use of the value’s predicate a term has been matched on in the score) [Reviewer1; Reviewer3]. We removed the statistics about single/multiple terms search that were confusing and did not bring much to the paper. We made explicit in the “Data Dumps” subsection, the content of the 2 dumps we offer [Reviewer1].

-We shorten the section 4 “LOV as a support for Data Publication and Ontology Engineering”, removing the figure and keeping it to the essential [Meta-Reviewer; Reviewer1; Reviewer3]. Nevertheless we believe it is important to mention how LOV fits in the bigger picture of Ontology Engineering [Meta-Reviewer].

-Section 5 has been updated based on the latest use of LOV.

-In section 6, we added a section for datasets and vocabularies statistics including LODStats on which we rely extensively [Reviewer2].

-We added a section 7 “Discussion and Future Work” where we discuss the lessons learned and comment on LOV limitation and future development.

-We updated the conclusion in section 8.

###### Extra remarks ######

We checked and corrected any incomplete or wrong reference and link [Meta-Reviewer; Reviewer1; Reviewer3].

We asked native speakers from the domain to proof reading the paper and check for typos or use of weird expressions.

The URL <http://lov.okfn.org/dataset/lov/sparql> makes use of content negotiation and can be used by human through the UI or by applications using the SPARQL protocol [Reviewer3].

We make use of SPARQL Syntax simplification in our queries to shorten the query length. The WHERE clause can in that case be omitted and the query still be valid [Reviewer1].