

We would like to thank all the reviewers for their attention to the paper and for the helpful feedback in the form of their comments and valuable contributions to our paper. We have incorporated most of the suggestions made by the reviewers. A point-by-point response to the reviewers' concerns is provided in blue below.

This paper presents a platform produced during the InTaVia project to facilitate creating stories based on people and objects by integrating the database, visualisations and multimedia. The platform seems to be impressive, providing access to a large database, and supporting both exploration and content creation. I detail here what I believe are the strengths and weaknesses of the paper:

Strengths of the paper

- The paper is very clear and well written. The introduction is very clear and the motivation is convincing. Being able to have 'multi-hero' stories based on only one platform that enables users to search for data, explore it and create stories based on it would be very useful to take advantage of the available digital humanities data.
- The authors present three components of the platform that seem to cover the whole workflow from data search and manipulation to interactive stories. It is an impressive technical work.
- The authors present four case studies of videos created using the InTaVia platform. The resulting stories seem convincing.
- The authors discuss possible research perspectives of their work. I think the discussion about stories of humans vs objects is particularly interesting, as it raises questions on what makes an history interesting and how stories creators can make their stories more attractive.

We wish to express our gratitude for the appreciation of our efforts in designing and documenting our workflow, platform and use cases.

Weaknesses

- Even if the idea of the paper is very interesting, and the platform seems very useful, all components are described at a high-level and it is difficult to understand exactly how the system works, and thus I think it is difficult to know how easy it is for a user to complete the platform workflow. I would suggest the authors to include more images of the system, a video of how it works and the possibilities it provides or even the link to the platform, to know for example how are the animations between slides defined, or the different ways the user can arrange the information. Also I would suggest to explain how the system was designed, if for example there were final users involved in the process.

Thank you for these recommendations.

The development and the interactions with the tools have been already described in more detail in form of two others works ("The Multiple Faces of Cultural Heritage: Towards an Integrated Visualization Platform for Tangible and Intangible Cultural Assets" and "A Workflow Approach to Visualization-Based Storytelling with Cultural Heritage Data").

We now refer to them and the link to the platform within the introduction of section "3. The InTaVia Platform". The link to the stories is added in chapter 4 as well.

Furthermore, we added a video of the active work with the story creator to depict this as well. We have also added the link to the InTaVia prototype in the data availability section of the back matter.

- The research questions of the paper seem to cover the data management, exploration, and stories creation but describe more in detail the story editor. I would suggest stating more clearly that the focus will be in this part if it is the case, or further describing the visual analytics studio if this is also an important part of the contribution.

That is a good observation.

We explain that we will have an emphasis on the storytelling part in the introduction of section 3 and added references to further resources on the other components.

- The use cases are good examples of what can be done with the system, but I think it would be useful to discuss if the platform was tested with final users, to validate its usability.

As suggested we added information on our user-centered design approach in the introduction of section 3. Additionally, we added a section with some results of the final evaluation. We also added at the beginning of section 4, that the stories were crafted by domain experts in collaboration with the project team.

- Furthermore, I would suggest the authors to discuss about visualizations scalability, for example what happens if we depict multiple timelines in different parts of the world, or if many events occur in a small geographical area.

Thank you, these are missing but useful details so we adjusted the content as follows.

These details are also depicted in parts of the earlier papers but we added a paragraph to the discussion including a screenshot of our glyphs on maps and timeline and the scaling of them to highlight the scalability of our visualizations.

Summary: I think this paper presents a valuable contribution: a platform that supports the complete workflow from data manipulation to editing stories about persons and objects. The platform seems impressive. However, I think the paper could be strengthened by including more details about the system and its capabilities.

Thank you.