IJASM_241787 Submission Acknowledgement

Online Submissions <noreply@indersciencemail.com>

Mon, Jan 14, 2019 at 1:11 PM

Reply-To: Online Submissions <noreply@indersciencemail.com>, New Submissions Manager <newsubmissions@inderscience.com>

To: Dr Darius Antoni <darius.antoni@binadarma.ac.id>

Dear Dr Darius Antoni,

Thank you for submitting your article entitled "Critical Factors in Information Technology Capability for Enhancing Firm's Environmental Performance: Case of Indonesian ICT Sector" (Submission code: IJASM-241787) for the International Journal of Agile Systems and Management (IJASM).

Your article has been processed to be refereed.

You can track the progress of your article by logging in at the following Web page:

URL: http://www.inderscience.com/ospeers/login.php
Username: antoni6
Temporary Password: darius
This is a temporary password that you are requested to change at your earliest convenience. You must change your password before you can receive review reports from our review committee.

How long will take to review your article?
This depends on the journal. You should directly contact the editor of the journal if you haven't received any communication from the editor after six months of submission. If you do not receive a satisfactory reply from the journal editor, please contact submissions@inderscience.com

There are no charges for publishing with Inderscience, unless you require your article to be Open Access (OA). If you receive an email requesting payment in relation to your article (for example for editing or reviewing services), then you should ignore and delete the email – it is not a legitimate Inderscience email. If you are unsure, you can check with us at: submissions@inderscience.com

If you are considering publishing an Open Access article with us, remember that we will never request payment before your paper has been accepted.

Thank you for your interest in our journal.

Best regards,

pp. IJASM Editor
Inderscience Publishers Ltd.
newsubmissions@inderscience.com

Refereeing Process: Editor comments IJASM-241787

4 messages

Inderscience Online <noreply@indersciencemail.com>

Sun, Jun 16, 2019 at 8:48 PM

Reply-To: Inderscience Online <noreply@indersciencemail.com>, Submissions Manager <submissions@inderscience.com>

To: "Prof. Ferry Jie" <f.jie@ecu.edu.au>, Dr Darius Antoni <darius.antoni@binadarma.ac.id>, Dr Ahmad Abareshi <ahmad.abareshi@rmit.edu.au>, "Prof. John Mo" <john.mo@rmit.edu.au>

Dear Author(s),

We have received the review reports for your paper "Critical Factors in Information Technology Capability for Enhancing Firm's Environmental Performance: Case of Indonesian ICT Sector".

We require now that you implement in your submission the following recommendations made by the reviewers:

Reviewer A Comments:
==================
Originality of the work : Marginal
Engineering relevance : Good
Scientific relevance : Acceptable
Completeness of the work : Marginal
Acknowledgement of the work of others by references : Acceptable
Organization of the manuscript : Poor
Clarity in writing, tables, graphs and illustrations : Poor
Likelihood of passing the "test of time" : Poor

Is the technical treatment plausible and free of technical errors : No
Have you checked the equations and/or statistics? (if applicable) : No
Are you aware of prior publication or presentation of this work? : No
Is the manuscript free of commercialism? : Yes
Is the paper too long? : Yes

RECOMMENDATION : Acceptable with major revisions
Suggestions which would improve the quality of the paper but are not essential for publication:
The article is in principle interesting, but is hard to read and understand in its current form.
Instead of listing some detailed comments, the overall general comment is, that the paper is too verbose and too long.
To illustrate the major comment, this reviewer will list below some comments for sections 1, 2, and 3.
Section 1.
What is the triple bottom line? Please explain.
Information exchange has driven change in logistics. Why is this important in the context of the paper?
The noun research is singular. The corresponding verb should also be singular.

Why are the concepts natural resources consumed, waste produced, proportion of waste being treated considered to be technical barriers, as stated in the subsequent sentence?

Why has IT been chosen to improve environmental performance? There are many factors in an organization that influence environmental performance. This must be made more clear.

Section 2.

The role of IT in improving environmental performance is not convincing.

The statement: ... by transforming their IT hardware/software including IS .... cannot be understood. It is a large step from contribution to business operation and innovation to environmental performance.

It has been stated without justification, that improving IT resources helps to improve environmental performance and that adopting IT capability is sufficient. However, there is only one case: Philipson. The other case, about data centres, is not supporting the author's argument.

This section can be dramatically shortened and structured. It would be good to introduce environmental performance as well as IT capabilities (now in section 3). Furthermore, the relationship between the two concepts should be made more clear.

Section 2 should actually be a literature review and concept choice for this paper.

Section 3 should introduce the framework used.

Section 3.

The choice for RBV has insufficiently been justified.

This section is hard to understand and follow and is way too verbose and long.

This section seems to be a collection of summaries of several studies. The paper, however, is not, or should not be, a summary of relevant studies.

The authors need to choose another way of presenting the content.

Now they present authors:

- author A said this
- author B said that
- author C said yet another thing

etc. with often overlapping content. Now, the reader should do the work of searching for this overlapping content.

The authors, however, should do the work of searching for overlapping content.

They should present the relevant content and refer to authors, like:

... content X (author A, author B). By contrast, content Y (author C), etc.

They should then end with the choices they make.

Somehow the choice are in the paper, but hard to distill.

I advise the authors to rewrite, restructure, and shorten their paper and resubmit.

Changes which must be made before publication:

All suggestions made above are necessary to be considered in rewriting the paper.

Reviewer B Comments:
==================
Originality of the work : Acceptable
Engineering relevance : Good
Scientific relevance : Honours
Completeness of the work : Good
Acknowledgement of the work of others by references : Honours
Organization of the manuscript : Good
Clarity in writing, tables, graphs and illustrations : Good
Likelihood of passing the "test of time" : Good

Is the technical treatment plausible and free of technical errors : No
Have you checked the equations and/or statistics? (if applicable) : No
Are you aware of prior publication or presentation of this work? : No
Is the manuscript free of commercialism? : Yes
Is the paper too long? : No

RECOMMENDATION : Acceptable with minor revisions
Suggestions which would improve the quality of the paper but are not essential for publication:
Suggestions for improvements are listed in Section 2 below.
Changes which must be made before publication:
This paper attempts to establish a quality profile for IT organisations on how well they can perform in specific country's industry environment. The paper is well written and has solicited extensive literature review.
Four competencies are proposed based on literature reviews in these areas: (H1) Environmental IT Competence, (H2) Human Resources Competence, (H3) Business Process Digitisation, (H4) IT Infrastructure Quality. Two of the competencies, H2 and H3 are hypothesised as "positive and significant", while H1 and H4 are just "positive". The arguments leading to these hypotheses do not show any difference indicating that competencies H2 and H3 will cause "significant" impacts. The authors need to explain why such a difference exists.
The term significant is actually not defined. Apart from no obvious indication, what constitutes a perception of "significance" is unknown. Is >50% impact (also again relative to what?) significant? A more scientific, measureable definition is required.
The research methodology indicates using "survey method". It sounds like a questionnaire is used. Why is it not explained as a questionnaire?
The "research construct" is divided in Table 2 as 19 items. It is not clear if these are translated into 19 questions, or 19 headings (in which several questions are grouped under a heading).
The questionnaire uses a 5-point Likert scale. This means maximum for each question is 5. Why is the mean of the items greater than 5? E.g. EIT1 has a mean of 5.53.
The sub-heading of 5.1 has a typo.

NOTE: Please send an email to the editor to acknowledge the reception of this email notification. The editor needs to make sure that messages reach the authors and don't delay the review process.
- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Instructions

1) To help the reviewer(s) verify that you have made the required corrections, please append a point-by-point report detailing how the changes have been made in line with each reviewer's comments at the beginning of your revised manuscript.

2) Responses to reviewers' comments and the revised manuscript must go together in the same single MS Word or PDF file, without revealing authors' identifications.

3) AUTHORS MUST INCLUDE IN THEIR REVISED MANUSCRIPT ALL THE REVISIONS, EDITING AND CORRECTIONS REQUIRED BY ALL REFEREES, OTHERWISE THEIR SUBMISSIONS WOULD NOT BE FURTHER PROCESSED AND WOULD BE REJECTED.

4) Append figures, images and tables at the end of your revised manuscript.

5) To upload your revised manuscript, please:
Login via http://www.inderscience.com/ospeers/login.php
(if you do not remember your username or password, you can recover it
via http://www.inderscience.com/forgotpw.php)
Then point your browser
to http://www.inderscience.com/ospeers/admin/author/articlestatus.php?id=241787 and scroll-down to find the input box "Author's revised version of file".
Click on 'Browse...' to select the revised document to be submitted and click 'Upload'.

6) Click on "Editor/Author Comments" to access the referee(s) comments and possible annotated files.

7) We advise you to use MS Word to edit your submission and make sure that the revisions within the document are presented as "tracked changes" so they would be more easily seen by the editor and the reviewers. It is preferable that you upload your revised manuscript using a MS Word file. If you use LaTeX, please mark your changes as text in colour and provide a PDF file of your article and the response to the reviewers.

To remove the personal information about tracked changes in MS Word:
In Word 2007: Round Office button -> Prepare -> Inspect Document -> Inspect -> Document Properties and Personal Information -> Remove All -> Close
In Word 2010 and later: File > Check for Issues -> Inspect Document -> Inspect -> Document Properties and Personal Information -> Remove All -> Close

If you have problems uploading the file with your revised manuscript please contact submissions@inderscience.com indicating the submission ID of your article.
- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

NOTES:
- In general we expect to receive your revised manuscript within three months or by the revision deadline established by the editor. Please contact the editor if you will take more than three months to resubmit your revised manuscript.
- It is the publisher's policy to give authors the opportunity to revise and improve their submitted papers to be accepted for publication, as requested by the referees. Please note that all the revisions, editing and English correction requested have to be made and accepted by the referees otherwise the paper will be rejected at any stage of the refereeing process.

Your prompt attention is much appreciated.

Prof. John Mo
Int. J. of Agile Systems and Management (IJASM)
submissions@inderscience.com

Ferry JIE <f.jie@ecu.edu.au>   Sat, Jul 6, 2019 at 5:42 PM

To: Darius Antoni <dariusantoni@gmail.com>, Darius Antoni <darius.antoni@binadarma.ac.id>

Best regards,

_____
Associate Professor Ferry Jie, CMILT, PhD

Deputy Director, Centre for Innovative Practice;

CILTA WA Committee; SCLAA WA Committee

School of Business and Law;
Discipline of Commerce;

Edith Cowan University

270 Joondalup Drive
Joondalup WA 6027, Australia

Phone: +61 8 63042595 | Email: f.jie@ecu.edu.au

Website: www.ecu.edu.au/business-and-law;

http://www.ecu.edu.au/schools/business-and-law/staff/profiles/associate-professor/associate-professor-ferry-jie

---

From: Ahmad Abareshi <ahmad.abareshi@rmit.edu.au>
Sent: Saturday, July 6, 2019 6:22:32 PM
To: Ferry JIE
Subject: RE: Refereeing Process: Editor comments IJASM-241787

Hi Ferry,

Any update on the this?

Regards

Ahmad

From: Ahmad Abareshi
Sent: Thursday, 20 June 2019 12:31 PM
To: Prof. Ferry Jie <f.jie@ecu.edu.au>
Subject: RE: Refereeing Process: Editor comments IJASM-241787

Hi Ferry,

It is very good news. Well done!!

I wonder if you have spoken to Darius to address the comments?

Regards

Ahmad

[Quoted text hidden]

Ferry JIE <f.jie@ecu.edu.au>   Sat, Jul 6, 2019 at 6:59 PM

To: Ahmad Abareshi <ahmad.abareshi@rmit.edu.au>

Cc: Darius Antoni <dariusantoni@gmail.com>, Darius Antoni <darius.antoni@binadarma.ac.id>

Thanks Ahmad

I have had a chat with Darius, he said to revise and send us by tomorrow night

Ferry

From: Ahmad Abareshi <ahmad.abareshi@rmit.edu.au>
Sent: Saturday, 6 July 2019 6:23 PM
To: Ferry JIE <f.jie@ecu.edu.au>
Subject: RE: Refereeing Process: Editor comments IJASM-241787

Hi Ferry,

Any update on the this?

Regards

Ahmad

Hi Ferry,

It is very good news. Well done!!

I wonder if you have spoken to Darius to address the comments?

Regards

Ahmad

From: Inderscience Online <noreply@indersciencemail.com>
Sent: Sunday, 16 June 2019 11:49 PM
To: Prof. Ferry Jie <f.jie@ecu.edu.au>; Dr Darius Antoni <darius.antoni@binadarma.ac.id>;
Ahmad Abareshi <ahmad.abareshi@rmit.edu.au>; John Mo <john.mo@rmit.edu.au>
Subject: Refereeing Process: Editor comments IJASM-241787

Dear Author(s),

[Quoted text hidden]

[Quoted text hidden]

Ahmad Abareshi <ahmad.abareshi@rmit.edu.au>

To: Ferry JIE <f.jie@ecu.edu.au>

Thanks both of you.

Regards
Ahmad

Get Outlook for Android

From: Ferry JIE <f.jie@ecu.edu.au>
Sent: Saturday, July 6, 2019 9:59:47 PM
To: Ahmad Abareshi
Cc: Darius Antoni; Darius Antoni

[Quoted text hidden]

[Quoted text hidden]

Refereeing Process: Editor comments IJASM-241787
7 messages

Inderscience Online <noreply@indersciencemail.com>

Thu, Aug 15, 2019 at 5:44 PM

Reply-To: Inderscience Online <noreply@indersciencemail.com>, Submissions Manager <submissions@inderscience.com>

To: "Prof. Ferry Jie" <f.jie@ecu.edu.au>, Dr Darius Antoni <darius.antoni@binadarma.ac.id>, Dr Ahmad Abareshi <ahmad.abareshi@rmit.edu.au>, "Prof. John Mo" <john.mo@rmit.edu.au>

Dear Author(s),

We have received further comments from the Panel of Reviewers for your paper "Critical Factors in Information Technology Capability for Enhancing Firm's Environmental Performance: Case of Indonesian ICT Sector"

We request you to implement in your latest author's revised version (AV) file the following new recommendations made by the reviewers:

Reviewer A Comments:
=================
The paper is in principle interesting and valuable for publication in the journal.
However, the presentation of the research needs to be improved.

The paper is still too verbose. It needs already 18 pages before the research methodology is presented. The hypotheses are not properly introduced.

The theoretical background is not very comprehensible. The line of reasoning needs to be simplified. Examples are needed, for example to illustrate the capabilities that are introduced. The theoretical background should deliver the concepts that are used in the questionnaires or interviews that are used in the quantitative part of the research. The selection of concepts is not clear.
The link between theory and research design should be made stronger.
Moreover, the hypotheses should be introduced properly.

Reviewer B Comments:
==================

Some minor changes have been made according to comments 2 and 4, but a note "Please Prof Ferry help me to address this comment." was left to comments 1 and 3. Nothing change is noticed on these two comments. Authors should amend the manuscript and respond (indicate where changes were made) accordingly.

Instructions:
----
1. To help reviewers to verify that you have made the required corrections, you must append the summary of modifications made to the paper at the beginning of your revised manuscript.

2. To upload your revised version, please login at:
http://www.inderscience.com/ospeers/login.php
(if you do not remember your Username/Password,
visit http://www.inderscience.com/forgotpw.php)

3. After login, point your browser
to http://www.inderscience.com/ospeers/admin/author/articlestatus.php?id=241787
here you should scroll-down to find the input box "Author's revised version of file:". Please click on "Browse�" to find your revised version and then click on "Upload" to include your revised version in our databases.

4. Click on "Editor/Author Comments" to see all the recommendations made by the reviewers.

Your prompt attention is much appreciated.

Prof. John Mo
Int. J. of Agile Systems and Management (IJASM)
submissions@inderscience.com

Ferry JIE <f.jie@ecu.edu.au>   Thu, Aug 15, 2019 at 6:35 PM

To: Darius Antoni <dariusantoni@gmail.com>, Darius Antoni <darius.antoni@binadarma.ac.id>, Ahmad Abareshi <ahmad.abareshi@rmit.edu.au>

Dear all,

Would you please kindly assist this? Anyone??

It is nearly there..

Thanks and best regards,

Ferry

Dear Author(s),

We have received further comments from the Panel of Reviewers for your paper "Critical Factors in Information Technology Capability for Enhancing Firmâ€™s Environmental Performance: Case of Indonesian ICT Sector"

We request you to implement in your latest author's revised version (AV) file the following new recommendations made by the reviewers:

Reviewer A Comments:
=================
The paper is in principle interesting and valuable for publication in the journal.
However, the presentation of the research needs to be improved.

The paper is still too verbose. It needs already 18 pages before the research methodology is presented. The hypotheses are not properly introduced.

The theoretical background is not very comprehensible. The line of reasoning needs to be simplified. Examples are needed, for example to illustrate the capabilities that are introduced. The theoretical background should deliver the concepts that are used in the questionnaires or interviews that are used in the quantitative part of the research. The selection of concepts is not clear.
The link between theory and research design should be made stronger.
Moreover, the hypotheses should be introduced properly.

Reviewer B Comments:
==================

Some minor changes have been made according to comments 2 and 4, but a note "Please Prof Ferry help me to address this comment." was left to comments 1 and 3. Nothing change is noticed on these two comments. Authors should amend the manuscript and respond (indicate where changes were made) accordingly.

Instructions:
----
1. To help reviewers to verify that you have made the required corrections, you must append the summary of modifications made to the paper at the beginning of your revised manuscript.

2. To upload your revised version, please login at:
http://www.inderscience.com/ospeers/login.php
(if you do not remember your Username/Password,
visit http://www.inderscience.com/forgotpw.php)

3. After login, point your browser
to http://www.inderscience.com/ospeers/admin/author/articlestatus.php?id=241787
here you should scroll-down to find the input box "Author's revised version of file:". Please click on "Browseï¿½" to find your revised version and then click on "Upload" to include your revised version in our databases.

4. Click on "Editor/Author Comments" to see all the recommendations made by the reviewers.

Your prompt attention is much appreciated.

Prof. John Mo
Int. J. of Agile Systems and Management (IJASM)
submissions@inderscience.com

Ahmad Abareshi <ahmad.abareshi@rmit.edu.au>

Fri, Aug 16, 2019 at 8:26 AM

To: Ferry JIE <f.jie@ecu.edu.au>, Darius Antoni <dariusantoni@gmail.com>, Darius Antoni <darius.antoni@binadarma.ac.id>

Hi Ferry,

That is correct. It is almost there.

Where can I find the responses to the first round of revision? I assume that a table was prepared and submitted in which the reviewers comments were addressed. I do not have log in and password to see what was submitted. If you can share it then I can have a look.

Regards

Ahmad

[Quoted text hidden]

Ahmad Abareshi <ahmad.abareshi@rmit.edu.au>   Thu, Aug 22, 2019 at 8:55 AM

To: Ferry JIE <f.jie@ecu.edu.au>, Darius Antoni <dariusantoni@gmail.com>, Darius Antoni <darius.antoni@binadarma.ac.id>

Hello Gentlemen,

Any update on this?

Regards

Ahmad

[Quoted text hidden]

Ferry JIE <f.jie@ecu.edu.au>   Thu, Aug 22, 2019 at 10:10 AM

To: Ahmad Abareshi <ahmad.abareshi@rmit.edu.au>, Darius Antoni <dariusantoni@gmail.com>, Darius Antoni <darius.antoni@binadarma.ac.id>

Hi Ahmad

Darius has agreed to help with this.

I will be in Melbourne from 28 August to 1 Sep hope I can meet you, Ahmad

Pak Darius any updates please.

Please let us know

Ferry

[Quoted text hidden]

[Quoted text hidden]

Ahmad Abareshi <ahmad.abareshi@rmit.edu.au>   Thu, Aug 22, 2019 at 10:15 AM

To: Ferry JIE <f.jie@ecu.edu.au>, Darius Antoni <dariusantoni@gmail.com>, Darius Antoni
<darius.antoni@binadarma.ac.id>

Hi Ferry,

Thanks for the update. It would be great if the final response can be shared with all of us prior to submitting
to the journal. I just want to make sure that we don't miss this chance.

Good news that you are coming to Mel. I will call you during that time.

[Quoted text hidden]

Ferry JIE <f.jie@ecu.edu.au>   Thu, Aug 22, 2019 at 10:17 AM

To: Ahmad Abareshi <ahmad.abareshi@rmit.edu.au>, Darius Antoni <dariusantoni@gmail.com>, Darius
Antoni <darius.antoni@binadarma.ac.id>

Thanks.

I will stay in Pan Pacific Hotel near Melbourne Convention Centre.

Universitas Bina Darma

Darius Antoni <darius.antoni@binadarma.ac.id>

IJASM Journal
13 messages

Darius Antoni <darius.antoni@binadarma.ac.id>　　　　　Mon, Sep 2, 2019 at 6:12 AM
To: Ferry JIE <f.jie@ecu.edu.au>

Dear Prof Ferry,

Please find a revised IJASM Journal Attached.

If any revisions are needed please let me know

Thanks

Darius Antoni

📄 **IJASM_Journal Document Paper.docx**
227K

Ferry JIE <f.jie@ecu.edu.au>　　　　　Mon, Sep 2, 2019 at 6:17 AM
To: Ahmad Abareshi <ahmad.abareshi@rmit.edu.au>
Cc: Darius Antoni <darius.antoni@binadarma.ac.id>, Darius Antoni <dariusantoni@gmail.com>

Dear Pak Darius and Ahmad

Hope you all are well. Thanks Pak Darius for sending this.

Please see attached Ahmad. Please help to check and go through this before submission to IJASM. Ahmad it was nice to meet you in Melbourne last week ☺

Hope we are able to work together again ☺

Best regards,

Ferry

Associate Professor Ferry Jie, CMILT, PhD

Deputy Director, Centre for Innovative Practice;

CILTA Chartered Member (CMILT)

CILTA WA Committee; SCLAA WA Committee

School of Business and Law

Discipline of Commerce

Edith Cowan University

270 Joondalup Drive

Joondalup WA 6027, Australia

Phone: +61 8 63042595 | Email: f.jie@ecu.edu.au

Website: www.ecu.edu.au/business-and-law ;

http://www.ecu.edu.au/schools/business-and-law/staff/profiles/associate-professor/associate-professor-ferry-jie

ECU is the top public university in Australia for Teaching Quality in Business & Management, and Legal & Paralegal studies.

The School of Business and Law develops industry-ready graduates through high quality teaching and learning experiences and engaged, applied research.

[Quoted text hidden]

IJASM_Journal Document Paper.docx
227K

Ahmad Abareshi <ahmad.abareshi@rmit.edu.au>   Tue, Sep 3, 2019 at 8:59 AM

To: Ferry JIE <f.jie@ecu.edu.au>

Cc: Darius Antoni <darius.antoni@binadarma.ac.id>, Darius Antoni <dariusantoni@gmail.com>

Nice to meet you too after long time Ferry.

Thanks Darius for sending the first draft.

I will work on them and let you know soon. By the way when is the deadline?

Regards

Ahmad

[Quoted text hidden]

To: Ferry JIE <f.jie@ecu.edu.au>

Cc: Darius Antoni <darius.antoni@binadarma.ac.id>, Darius Antoni <dariusantoni@gmail.com>

Hi gentlemen,

I revised the draft and attached with this email. Please see my comments. I used Track Change feature.

Darius,

- References are very old. In fact there is no reference from 2016 onwards. Please add recent references.

- Referencing need your attention. Sometime you used 'et al' and sometime you put all authors. Check the referencing systems in the journal and follow it. Please do not use first name in the text e.g. A. Molla …

Regards

Ahmad

[Quoted text hidden]

IJASM_Journal Document Paper v2.docx
232K

Ferry JIE <f.jie@ecu.edu.au>

Wed, Sep 4, 2019 at 8:57 AM

To: Ahmad Abareshi <ahmad.abareshi@rmit.edu.au>

Cc: Darius Antoni <darius.antoni@binadarma.ac.id>, Darius Antoni <dariusantoni@gmail.com>

Thanks Ahmad.

Pak Darius, would you please kindly assist to revise and make some changes and then send it back to us again as soon as possible?

The deadline is approaching.

Ferry

Hi gentlemen,

I revised the draft and attached with this email. Please see my comments. I used Track Change feature.

Darius,

- References are very old. In fact there is no reference from 2016 onwards. Please add recent references.

- Referencing need your attention. Sometime you used 'et al' and sometime you put all authors. Check the referencing systems in the journal and follow it. Please do not use first name in the text e.g. A. Molla …

[Quoted text hidden]

[Quoted text hidden]

Ferry JIE <f.jie@ecu.edu.au>   Sun, Sep 15, 2019 at 4:16 PM

To: Ahmad Abareshi <ahmad.abareshi@rmit.edu.au>

Cc: Dr Darius Antoni <darius.antoni@binadarma.ac.id>, Darius Antoni <dariusantoni@gmail.com>

Ahmad,

I have forwarded the latest version from Pak Darius early September, have you got it?

Ferry

From: Darius Antoni <darius.antoni@binadarma.ac.id>
Sent: Monday, 2 September 2019 7:12 AM
To: Ferry JIE <f.jie@ecu.edu.au>
Subject: IJASM Journal

Dear Prof Ferry,

[Quoted text hidden]

[Quoted text hidden]

📄 **IJASM_Journal Document Paper.docx**
227K

Ferry JIE <f.jie@ecu.edu.au>   Sun, Sep 15, 2019 at 4:17 PM

To: Ahmad Abareshi <ahmad.abareshi@rmit.edu.au>

Cc: Dr Darius Antoni <darius.antoni@binadarma.ac.id>, Darius Antoni <dariusantoni@gmail.com>

Ahmad, the email below that I have forwarded from Pak Darius …

From: Ferry JIE

Dear Pak Darius and Ahmad

[Quoted text hidden]

[Quoted text hidden]

📄 **IJASM_Journal Document Paper.docx**
227K

Ferry JIE <f.jie@ecu.edu.au>   Sun, Sep 15, 2019 at 5:02 PM

To: Ahmad Abareshi <ahmad.abareshi@rmit.edu.au>

Cc: Darius Antoni <darius.antoni@binadarma.ac.id>, Darius Antoni <dariusantoni@gmail.com>

Hi Pak Darius,

Ahmad has already given you on 4 Sep for the track changes feature and additional comments below on 4 Sep.

Now, it is your support to revise this according to what Ahmad has sent you on 4 Sep at 9.51am (see email below).

Once you have revised it then please send it back to us again by Friday 20 Sep.

I will submit it by Saturday, 21 Sep

Ferry

Hi gentlemen,

I revised the draft and attached with this email. Please see my comments. I used Track Change feature.

Darius,

- References are very old. In fact there is no reference from 2016 onwards. Please add recent references.

- Referencing need your attention. Sometime you used 'et al' and sometime you put all authors. Check the referencing systems in the journal and follow it. Please do not use first name in the text e.g. A. Molla …

[Quoted text hidden]

[Quoted text hidden]

Hi Darius,

Please also have a look at new comments given by the reviewers.

Ferry, I think it is very close. It needs your final look as well.

Regards

Ahmad

Hi Pak Darius,

Ahmad has already given you on 4 Sep for the track changes feature and additional comments below on 4 Sep.

Now, it is your support to revise this according to what Ahmad has sent you on 4 Sep at 9.51am (see email below).

Once you have revised it then please send it back to us again by Friday 20 Sep.

I will submit it by Saturday, 21 Sep

Ferry

Hi gentlemen,

I revised the draft and attached with this email. Please see my comments. I used Track Change feature.

Darius,

- References are very old. In fact there is no reference from 2016 onwards. Please add recent references.

- Referencing need your attention. Sometime you used 'et al' and sometime you put all authors. Check the referencing systems in the journal and follow it. Please do not use first name in the text e.g. A. Molla …

[Quoted text hidden]

Darius Antoni <darius.antoni@binadarma.ac.id>   Mon, Sep 16, 2019 at 8:29 AM

To: Ahmad Abareshi <ahmad.abareshi@rmit.edu.au>

Dear Ahmad,

I will revise it immediately

Regard,

Darius Antoni

[Quoted text hidden]

Darius Antoni <darius.antoni@binadarma.ac.id>   Mon, Sep 16, 2019 at 8:37 AM

To: Ahmad Abareshi <ahmad.abareshi@rmit.edu.au>

Dear Prof,

Would you like to send me which one the comments from reviewer.

I am little bit confused with them.

Thanks

On Mon, Sep 16, 2019 at 7:51 AM Ahmad Abareshi <ahmad.abareshi@rmit.edu.au> wrote:

[Quoted text hidden]

Ahmad Abareshi <ahmad.abareshi@rmit.edu.au>   Mon, Sep 16, 2019 at 8:53
                                                                                              AM

To: Darius Antoni <darius.antoni@binadarma.ac.id>

Dear Darius,

Glad to hear from you. Hope you and your family are doing well.

I am referring to the following comments. I am not sure whether you have already addressed them
or not. Sorry to confuse you.

Reviewer A Comments:

==================

The paper is in principle interesting and valuable for publication in the journal.

However, the presentation of the research needs to be improved.

**The paper is still too verbose. It needs already 18 pages before the research methodology is
presented. The hypotheses are not properly introduced.**

**The theoretical background is not very comprehensible. The line of reasoning needs to be
simplified. Examples are needed, for example to illustrate the capabilities that are**

introduced. The theoretical background should deliver the concepts that are used in the questionnaires or interviews that are used in the quantitative part of the research. The selection of concepts is not clear.

The link between theory and research design should be made stronger.

Moreover, the hypotheses should be introduced properly.

Reviewer B Comments:

==================

Some minor changes have been made according to comments 2 and 4, but a note "Please Prof Ferry help me to address this comment." was left to comments 1 and 3. Nothing change is noticed on these two comments. Authors should amend the manuscript and respond (indicate where changes were made) accordingly.

Regards

Ahmad

[Quoted text hidden]

Darius Antoni <darius.antoni@binadarma.ac.id>   Wed, Sep 18, 2019 at 9:48 AM
To: Ahmad Abareshi <ahmad.abareshi@rmit.edu.au>

Dear Ahmad,

I already try to reduce the number of our paper but it still 19 pages.

Would you like to advise me which part or section can be deleted in our journal?

Thank you,

Darius Antoni

[Quoted text hidden]

2nd Revised JIASM Journal

1 message

Darius Antoni <darius.antoni@binadarma.ac.id>   Wed, Sep 18, 2019 at 4:24 PM
To: Ferry JIE <f.jie@ecu.edu.au>, Ahmad Abareshi <ahmad.abareshi@rmit.edu.au>

Dear prof,
Please find 2nd revised Jiasm Journal attached

I attempt to revise the comments regarding:
1. Number of Journal pages (18 pages)
2. Hypothesis Development (ok)
3. Literature Review theoretical background (ok)
4. Reference 2015 above added

If there is any comments please let me know

Thank you

Darius Antoni

📄 **IJASM_Journal Document Paper3.docx**
255K

AuthorFinalVersion

5 messages

Darius Antoni <darius.antoni@binadarma.ac.id>　　　　　　Sat, Oct 19, 2019 at 11:15 PM

To: Ahmad Abareshi <ahmad.abareshi@rmit.edu.au>, Ferry JIE <f.jie@ecu.edu.au>

Dear Prof. Ahmad

Would you like to write your Biographical noted in our paper. and after than please send it back to me.

Thank you

Darius Antoni

📄 **FerryJieFinalVersion.docx**
198K

Ferry JIE <f.jie@ecu.edu.au>　　　　　　Sun, Oct 20, 2019 at 2:47 PM

To: Darius Antoni <darius.antoni@binadarma.ac.id>, Ahmad Abareshi <ahmad.abareshi@rmit.edu.au>

Hi both

Please ensure that the paper is following the IJASM format please.

Please include biography ASAP.

My short biography is below:

Ferry Jie is the Associate Professor in Supply Chain and Logistics Management in the

Commerce discipline at the School of Business and Law, and the Deputy Director, Centre of Innovative Practice. Dr Jie has maintained a high quality of research throughout his academic career including international scholarly leadership in the areas of supply chain management and logistics, including being invited to be keynote speaker and to give public lectures at symposiums and international conferences in Indonesia, Malaysia, Vietnam, China, UK and Australia. From 2010 to 2019, Dr Jie has published 62 refereed journal articles (including 12 (eight) articles in A Ranked Journal - ABDC Journal Lists) and 41 refereed conference papers. Furthermore, Dr Jie has received research grants/awards to the amount of $1,604,604.07 between 2010 and 2019.

Thanks and best regards,

Ferry

[Quoted text hidden]

Ahmad Abareshi <ahmad.abareshi@rmit.edu.au>   Sun, Oct 20, 2019 at 2:51 PM

To: Darius Antoni <darius.antoni@binadarma.ac.id>

Dear Darius,

Here is my bio:

Ahmad Abareshi is a senior lecturer at School of Business IT and Logistics at RMIT University. His research focuses on the application of IT in logistics, green IT, and supply chain. His work has been published in journals such as *Journal of Computer Information Systems, Transportation Research Part E, Transportation Research Part D, Information Technology & People* and various others.

Regards

Ahmad

Dear Prof. Ahmad

[Quoted text hidden]

Darius Antoni <darius.antoni@binadarma.ac.id>   Sun, Oct 20, 2019 at 4:10 PM

To: Ahmad Abareshi <ahmad.abareshi@rmit.edu.au>

Dear Prof. Ahmad,

thank you

the paper will be uploaded immediately

Regard,

Darius

[Quoted text hidden]

Ahmad Abareshi <ahmad.abareshi@rmit.edu.au>   Sun, Oct 20, 2019 at 7:19 PM

To: Darius Antoni <darius.antoni@binadarma.ac.id>

Thanks Darius,

All the best

No	Reviewer A Comments		
1.	What is the triple bottom line? Please explain.	The environment is one of key components of the triple bottom line framework that can help an organization for conceptualizing, managing and reporting their business to build sustainable competitive advantage	done
2.	Information exchange has driven change in logistics. Why is this important in the context of the paper?	I donot find any sentence mention that comment	
3.	The noun research is singular. The corresponding verb should also be singular.	there has been much research concentrating on how information technologies can enable firms to overcome these technical barriers in improving environmental performance	done
4.	Why are the concepts natural resources consumed, waste produced, proportion of waste being treated considered to be technical barriers, as stated in the subsequent sentence?	The technical barriers is about the extent to which an organisation has envrironmental friendly infrastructures such as power supply, ICT equipment for disposal and recycling to reduce the impact of business operations on natural environment	done
5.	Why has IT been chosen to improve environmental performance? There are many factors in an organization that influence environmental performance. This must be made more clear.	…basis to understand how IT capability leads to improvement of environmental performance and what critical IT capabilities would improve environmental performance in an organisation. This is because the IT has ability to play a crucial role in both greening its operations and services and supporting business's overall environmental sustainability objectives	done
6.	The statement: ... by transforming their IT hardware/software including IS .... cannot be understood.	organisations can improve their environmental performance by automating, transforming their business operations through IT hardware/software including the information system (IS).	done
7.	….However, there is only one case: Philipson. The other case, about data centres, is not supporting the author's argument.	Sayeed and Gill (2008) argue that optimize energy consumption including renewable energy and power management can be improved by effectively instituting data centres	
8.	Furthermore, the relationship between the two concepts should be made more clear.	I think, the paper already provide justification and description how the IT capability can help organization to improve the environmental performance in section 3	
9.	The choice for RBV has insufficiently been justified.	RBV highlights the importance of resources and capabilities that are valuable, rare, inimitable and non-substitutable for delivering services or producing goods more economically (Barney, 1991) I believe that RBV is one approach that	

		can be used to identify the IT capabilities to help organization to create sustainable value.	
10.	This section is hard to understand and follow and is way too verbose and long.		done
11	This section seems to be a collection of summaries of several studies. The paper, however, is not, or should not be, a summary of relevant studies.		done
12			
	Reviewer 2 Comments		
1.	Four competencies are proposed based on literature reviews in these areas: (H1) Environmental IT Competence, (H2) Human Resources Competence, (H3) Business Process Digitisation, (H4) IT Infrastructure Quality. Two of the competencies, H2 and H3 are hypothesised as "positive and significant", while H1 and H4 are just "positive". The arguments leading to these hypotheses do not show any difference indicating that competencies H2 and H3 will cause "significant" impacts. The authors need to explain why such a difference exists.	Please Prof Ferry help me to address this comment. For me, there is no different both of them	
2	The research methodology indicates using "survey method". It sounds like a questionnaire is used. Why is it not explained as a questionnaire?	It has been revised	Done
3	The "research construct" is divided in Table 2 as 19 items. It is not clear if these are translated into 19 questions, or 19 headings (in which several questions are grouped under a heading).	Prof please help me to address this comment because I could not understand what it means. thanks	
4	The questionnaire uses a 5-point Likert scale. This means maximum for each question is 5. Why is the mean of the items greater than 5? E.g. EIT1 has a mean of 5.53.	The questionnaire uses a 7 point likert sclae	done