



Erlinda Yunus <yunus.erlinda@gmail.com>

International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management - Decision on Manuscript ID IJPPM-12-2019-0590

2 messages

International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management

Fri, Feb 14, 2020 at

<onbehalfof@manuscriptcentral.com>

4:50 PM

Reply-To: luisa.huatuco@york.ac.uk

To: erl@ppm-manajemen.ac.id, yunus.erlinda@gmail.com

14-Feb-2020

Dear Dr. Yunus,

Manuscript ID IJPPM-12-2019-0590 entitled "The Mark of Industry 4.0: How Managers Respond to Key Revolutionary Changes" which you submitted to the International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management, has been reviewed. The comments of the reviewer(s) are included at the bottom of this letter.

The reviewer(s) have recommended publication, but also suggest some revisions to your manuscript. Therefore, I invite you to respond to the reviewer(s)' comments and revise your manuscript.

To revise your manuscript, log into <https://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/ijppm> and enter your Author Centre, where you will find your manuscript title listed under "Manuscripts with Decisions." Under "Actions," click on "Create a Revision." Your manuscript number has been appended to denote a revision.

You will be unable to make your revisions on the originally submitted version of the manuscript. Instead, revise your manuscript using a word processing program and save it on your computer. Please also highlight the changes to your manuscript within the document by using the track changes mode in MS Word or by using bold or coloured text. Once the revised manuscript is prepared, you can upload it and submit it through your Author Centre.

When submitting your revised manuscript, you will be able to respond to the comments made by the reviewer(s) in the space provided. You can use this space to document any changes you make to the original manuscript. In order to expedite the processing of the revised manuscript, please be as specific as possible in your response to the reviewer(s).

IMPORTANT: Your original files are available to you when you upload your revised manuscript. Please delete any redundant files before completing the submission.

Because we are trying to facilitate timely publication of manuscripts submitted to the International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management, your revised manuscript should be uploaded as soon as possible. If it is not possible for you to submit your revision in a reasonable amount of time, we may have to consider your paper as a new submission.

Once again, thank you for submitting your manuscript to the International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management and I look forward to receiving your revision.

Yours sincerely,

Dr. Luisa Huaccho Huatuco

Co-Editor, International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management

luisa.huatuco@york.ac.uk

DEADLINE: 14-May-2020

Reviewer(s)' Comments to Author:

Reviewer: 1

Recommendation: Major Revision

Comments:

Dear authors, thank you for your submission to International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management. While I believe that you have interesting data, you must better show the relation to extant work and the generalizability of your findings from Indonesia to existing studies, among some further issues. I hope that my comments prove helpful to revise the manuscript.

Additional Questions:

1. Originality: Does the paper contain new and significant information adequate to justify publication?: Potentially yes, but the contribution to extant literature (which is missing) and the generalizability/limitations must be shown.
2. Relationship to Literature: Does the paper demonstrate an adequate understanding of the relevant literature in the field and cite an appropriate range of literature sources? Is any significant work ignored?: The literature cited is a) not too much, b) rather outdated for a contemporary topic like Industry 4.0 (a lot is from 2016 and before), c) a lot refers to non-scientific references, such as McKinsey, or Agca et al. and d) rather low-level journals/conference proceedings. These must be complemented with recent, high quality journal papers, such as:

Birkel, H. S., Veile, J. W., Müller, J. M., Hartmann, E., & Voigt, K. I. (2019). Development of a risk framework for Industry 4.0 in the context of sustainability for established manufacturers. *Sustainability*, 11(2), 384.

Moktadir, M. A., Ali, S. M., Kusi-Sarpong, S., & Shaikh, M. A. A. (2018). Assessing challenges for implementing Industry 4.0: Implications for process safety and environmental protection. *Process Safety and Environmental Protection*, 117, 730-741.

Müller, J. M., Kiel, D., & Voigt, K. I. (2018). What drives the implementation of Industry 4.0? The role of opportunities and challenges in the context of sustainability. *Sustainability*, 10(1), 247.

Schneider, P. (2018). Managerial challenges of Industry 4.0: an empirically backed research agenda for a nascent field. *Review of Managerial Science*, 12(3), 803-848.

These references, among others, must be discussed and how this paper contributes to their findings (see also below).

3. Methodology: Is the paper's argument built on an appropriate base of theory, concepts, or other ideas? Has the research or equivalent intellectual work on which the paper is based been well designed? Are the methods employed appropriate?: Yes, but I am not too sure if the authors really develop "grounded theory", or rather a framework at the end. This should be, at least, mentioned in the conclusion. Further, what are the specific characteristics of Indonesia, how are the results generalizable, what are possible limitations from having only one country in the sample?

4. Results: Are results presented clearly and analysed appropriately? Do the conclusions adequately tie together the other elements of the paper?: The results are rather short compared to the richness of interview data. More insights could be given, both on a case-specific level, and how the framework was generated, would improve the paper.

5. Implications for research, practice and/or society: Does the paper identify clearly any implications for research, practice and/or society? Does the paper bridge the gap between theory and practice? How can the research be used in practice (economic and commercial impact), in teaching, to influence public policy, in research (contributing to the body of knowledge)? What is the impact upon society (influencing public attitudes, affecting quality of life)? Are these implications consistent with the findings and conclusions of the paper?: Discussion and conclusion are rather short. First, more references and what this paper contributes compared to them must be included. Second, the limitations and generalizability of the paper must be shown. Third, what are limitations and suggestions for future research? Fourth, the conclusion currently only is a sum-up, not a critical evaluation.

6. Quality of Communication: Does the paper clearly express its case, measured against the technical language of the field and the expected knowledge of the journal's readership? Has attention been paid to the clarity of expression and readability, such as sentence structure, jargon use, acronyms, etc.: Yes, but the critical reflection is missing. Especially for the discussion and conclusion, a more nuanced style of writing would help the reader.

Reviewer: 2

Recommendation: Minor Revision

Comments:

The study does not contain new and relevant information for the area of knowledge related to the application of the Industry 4.0 concept. However, there is a specific analysis of the manufacturing industry in Indonesia, which may represent a contribution to how emerging countries can implement these concepts.

Text writing needs to go through the native English speaker review.

Additional Questions:

1. Originality: Does the paper contain new and significant information adequate to justify publication?: The study does not contain new and relevant information for the area of knowledge related to the concept of Industry 4.0. However, there is a specific analysis of the manufacturing industry in Indonesia, which may represent a contribution to how emerging countries can implement these concepts.

2. Relationship to Literature: Does the paper demonstrate an adequate understanding of the relevant literature in the field and cite an appropriate range of literature sources? Is any significant work ignored?: The study lists the literature on the subject in an acceptable way, including comparing some of its results with those presented by other authors who analyze its application in other countries. In the scientific literature there are few works that propose frameworks or methodologies to implement the concepts of industry 4.0, however, I consider that a work that can be cited by the

authors is that written by Cordeiro et al. (2019) entitled "Theoretical proposal of steps for the implementation of the industry 4.0 concept" (DOI: 10.14488 / BJOPM.2019.v16.n2.a1) to complement the literature review

3. Methodology: Is the paper's argument built on an appropriate base of theory, concepts, or other ideas? Has the research or equivalent intellectual work on which the paper is based been well designed? Are the methods employed appropriate?: The study uses data-based theory to develop its proposed framework. Although it uses a small number of respondents, it is within what is specified by the literature. What the authors should clarify is whether the interviewed people belong to different companies. For example, five pharmaceutical industries with code 2834 are identified in Table 1, but the authors do not explain what that code refers to or whether it is the same company.

4. Results: Are results presented clearly and analysed appropriately? Do the conclusions adequately tie together the other elements of the paper?: Regarding the data analyzed and the methodology presented, the results are consistent.

5. Implications for research, practice and/or society: Does the paper identify clearly any implications for research, practice and/or society? Does the paper bridge the gap between theory and practice? How can the research be used in practice (economic and commercial impact), in teaching, to influence public policy, in research (contributing to the body of knowledge)? What is the impact upon society (influencing public attitudes, affecting quality of life)? Are these implications consistent with the findings and conclusions of the paper?: Does the paper identify clearly any implications for research, practice and/or society?

R/ The work proposes a theoretical structure so that it can be proven in practice.

Does the paper bridge the gap between theory and practice?

R/ Not properly, because the framework alone does not guarantee that the results will be obtained, but it is a guide to start a process of adaptation of the concepts of I4.0.

How can the research be used in practice (economic and commercial impact), in teaching, to influence public policy, in research (contributing to the body of knowledge)?

R/ Through the realization of case studies in real environment.

What is the impact upon society (influencing public attitudes, affecting quality of life)?

R/ The immediate impact may be in the Indonesian industry. However, this will only be possible to evaluate through more extensive case studies.

Are these implications consistent with the findings and conclusions of the paper?

R/ Yes, the results are consistent.

6. Quality of Communication: Does the paper clearly express its case, measured against the technical language of the field and the expected knowledge of the journal's readership? Has attention been paid to the clarity of expression and readability, such as sentence structure, jargon use, acronyms, etc.: Text writing needs to go through the native English speaker review.



* **How-to-submit-a-revision.doc**

33K

Erlinda Yunus <yunus.erlinda@gmail.com>
To: luisa.huatuco@york.ac.uk

Fri, Feb 14, 2020 at 5:57 PM

Dear Prof. Huatuco,

Thank you for your email. We have accepted the feedback from the reviewers and will revise the manuscript accordingly by the deadline.

Best regards,
Erlinda Yunus

[Quoted text hidden]