

LAMPIRAN BUKTI KORESPONDENSI KARYA ILMIAH

**INTEGRATING SWOT ANALYSIS INTO FMEA TO IMPROVE CORRECTIVE ACTION DECISION
MAKING**

AGUNG SUTRISNO

10/13/22, 6:23 AM

Yahoo Mail - Paper Submission to IJPQM

Paper Submission to IJPQM

Dari: agung sutrisno (a6un6sutrisno@yahoo.com)

Kepada: iehmkwon@pknu.ac.kr

Cc: indra.gunawan@federation.edu.au

Tanggal: Senin, 10 Maret 2014 17.23 PDT

Dear Prof. Kwon and Prof. Indra,

Today, I have just submitted our collaborative paper to International Journal of Productivity and Quality Management (w3.inderscience.com).

By this e-mail, I would like to acknowledge my sincerely thanks for your kind responses during the paper's preparation moments.

It is hoped that a good news will be heard from the submission.

Sincerely yours,

Agung Sutrisno

Editor/Author Comments

Editor
12/05/14
12:57 AM

Dear Author(s),

We have received the review reports for your paper "Integrating SWOT Analysis in FMEA-Based Corrective Action Strategy Selection Methodology".

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

Reviewer A Comments:

=====

Changes which must be made before publication:

1. Introduction section reads fine, but it should include latest journal references (2010-2014) and relevant extracts from them.
2. The literature (Section 2) review throughout the paper should include 8-10 latest journal references (2010-2014) and 4-6 from IJPQM as well as relevant extracts from them.
3. Quantifying impact factor of SWOT variables model development (Section 3) looks interesting, but better explained and motivated.
4. Selecting competing actions by using the BCOR2 model reads well.
5. Illustrative example of application reads okay, but should have better explained.
6. Discussions read well.
7. Conclusions (Section 7) should be strengthened.
8. The language of the paper needs editing by a native speaker.
9. References should follow the style of IJPQM both within the text and in the end.

Reviewer B Comments:

=====

Changes which must be made before publication:

General Comments

The subject of the paper is interesting and very suitable for IJPQM. Overall, the paper has been fairly organised and it presents a novel model for integrating SWOT analysis into FMEA for selecting competing correction actions. However, it requires some changes/improvements before it can be accepted for publication. Thus, I recommend that the paper should be accepted for publication in IJPQM subject to a major revision to address the following comments:

Abstract

- The abstract of the paper includes the (1) research purpose and (2) the methodology followed. However, it is missing important elements such as (3) the findings/outcomes, and probably the (4) practical and (5) theoretical implications of the paper. Make sure that it mentions/highlights the paper's original contribution in it.

Introduction

- 1st paragraph, 6th line – Where is the evidence that RPN is becoming the mostly used basis to risk based improvements? Author(s) need to provide strong evidence to back up this statement due to it is key for the paper as there are many other approaches that companies use to objectively prioritise improvement initiatives.

- 2nd paragraph, line 1 –What studies exactly? Need to be more specific or provide a reference(s) to these studies.

- The Introduction of the paper suitably motivates the readers into the subject and helps to put the paper (and its main concepts) into perspective/context. I consider that this section could be improved by briefly reviewing (expanding) the previous research done (Liu et al., 2012; Niu et al., 2009; Arunraj and Maiti, 2010; etc.) in trying to improve quality of risk response to the occurrence of risky events. What are the models/frameworks proposed by these authors? What are their limitations? In this way, the readers will have a better perspective as to how other researchers have tried to tackle the problems exposed in this paper. But more importantly, as the author(s) will be highlighting the limitation of these researches, this will serve as a justification for the need of the model proposed, which will also help to highlight the relevance of the paper and to demonstrate that it is filling a gap in the knowledge of this area by proposing a different method to tackle the issue.

Section 2

- This section has been mainly confined to describe FMEA and SWOT analysis. It would be

convenient to discuss, for example: (1) whether their integration has been sought before; and if yes, where? what results have been obtained from it? What were the main advantages and limitations? and if not, (2) whether their characteristics make them suitable to support each other. This would provide this section with a more critical view point as opposed to simply be a descriptive section.

Section 3

- Paragraph 1, lines 1-2 – the pre-requisite of considering the quantification of impact factor of SWOT variables is not clearly discussed in Section 1 as stated in this sentence.
- The underlying assumption (i to iii) must be justified. Why exactly is the model functioning under these assumptions?
- The quantification of the impact factors for SWOT variables is clearly explained in Sections 3.1, 3.2, and 3.3 as well as the linkage of corrective actions options with SWOT variables in 3.4.

Sections 4 and 5

- These sections are well written and developed so they clearly show the development of the model presented and an illustrative example of its application. The second is very useful to better understand the nature and application scope/reach of the model proposed.

Section 6

- Section 6, paragraphs 2 and 3 - It would be convenient to not only highlight the possible limitations of the model but also provide some direction as to how these may be overcome. Author(s) do not need to solve the limitations but simply provide some direction as to how these could be addressed to improve the model.
- What about the theoretical impact of the research presented in this paper? These can also be discussed alongside the managerial implications.

- Section 6.2 is too vague and superficial. I would either recommend the author(s) to expand on it or somehow trying to integrate it, probably, as part of the Conclusions (Section 7).

Section 7

- Make sure that Section 7 clearly highlights the unique contributions of the research, limitations of the research (different to those of the model presented), and future research directions.

References

- Make sure that the references included in the referencing section do not have missing details such as volume, issue and page numbers and that the paper does not contain any grammar, spelling or typo mistakes. Please carefully check the whole paper for these very important aspects. Also, make sure that every single reference included in the text has also been added to the referencing section.

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 summary of the modifications made at the beginning of your revised manuscript.

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

3) To upload your revised version, 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=78117> 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'.

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

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

IMPORTANT: If we do not receive your revised manuscript within 3 months your manuscript will be considered as a new submission and will be sent to a new round of reviews.

Your prompt attention is much appreciated.

Your comments:

10/13/22, 6:02 AM

Yahoo Mail - Acceptance of the Proof (Paper ID : IJPQM - 78111)

Acceptance of the Proof (Paper ID : IJPQM - 78111)

Dari: agung sutrisno (a6un6sutrisno@yahoo.com)

Kepada: inderscienceproofs@athenaeservices.com

Tanggal: Rabu, 20 Agustus 2014 07.12 PDT

Dear Ms Jeng Nepomuceno-Silo,

Thank You very much for sending me the amended proof of our paper (Paper ID : IJPQM - 78117).
Upon viewed the amended proof, we are satisfied with the proof and You can expedite the pape's publication process.

Thank You very much and Have a nice Day.

Sincerely Yours,

Agung Sutrisno
Corresponding Author