

# A Survey on Geocoding: Algorithms and Datasets for Toponym Resolution

Anonymous ACL submission

## 1 Response to Reviewers

We'd like to thank all reviewers for their constructive feedback. We've made the following changes to address the issues that were raised:

- We removed the word comprehensive, because though we do believe this is a comprehensive survey of geocoding, that word seemed to suggest to reviewers that this was a comprehensive survey of geographic information systems more broadly, which was not the intent.
- We added a paragraph to the introduction to show that, in terms of publication venues, geocoding is now well-situated as an NLP task, especially in the years since prior surveys. We therefore believe an NLP venue is an appropriate target audience for this survey.
- We revised the section describing the scope of the review to explicitly point out topics that were excluded from the survey because they were not about geocoding, but rather about other geographic information systems tasks. For example, we exclude user-level, document-level, and tweet-level classification, since they are not mention-level place name resolution, the geocoding task. Many of the references suggested by reviewers were of this type, though the couple that weren't have been integrated into the main text of the paper. (As also mentioned in the previous version of the article, we did not attempt to cover articles before 2010 as they have been covered in detail in prior surveys.)
- We added an analysis section to the end of each part of the survey (datasets, metrics, systems), to provide some additional insights and better prepare the reader for the more lengthy future work section at the end.

- We reduced the size of the figure and trimmed text in various places to make room for the above changes.

039

040

041