



Erlinda Yunus &lt;yunus.erlinda@gmail.com&gt;

---

**Decision on IJPPM-05-2021-0273**

2 messages

**International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management**Thu, Jul 15, 2021 at  
7:33 PM

&lt;onbehalfof@manuscriptcentral.com&gt;

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

To: yunus.erlinda@gmail.com

15-Jul-2021

Dear Dr. Erlinda Yunus,

Manuscript ID IJPPM-05-2021-0273 entitled "Would Compensation be Necessary? The Importance of Service Recovery Strategy on E-Retail Delivery Problems" 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.

To help support you on your publishing journey we have partnered with Editage, a leading global science communication platform, to offer expert editorial support including language editing and translation.

If your article has been rejected or revisions have been requested, you may benefit from Editage's services. For a full list of services, visit: [authorservices.emeraldpublishing.com/](https://authorservices.emeraldpublishing.com/)  
Please note that there is no obligation to use Editage and using this service does not guarantee publication.

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](mailto:luisa.huatuco@york.ac.uk)

DEADLINE: 13-Oct-2021

Reviewer: 1

Recommendation: Major Revision

**Comments:**

Thank you for your submission, I have suggested the points for improvement.

**Additional Questions:**

1. Originality: Does the paper contain new and significant information adequate to justify publication?: The manuscript is good but there are a few issues that need to be addressed.

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 major issue of the manuscript is the literature support is quite shallow. The whole manuscript is dependent on a handful of recent citations. Here are a few suggestions for the same.

- 1) <https://doi.org/10.1108/APJML-11-2015-0167>
- 2) <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jretconser.2020.102360>
- 3) <https://doi.org/10.1080/15332861.2015.1080056>

Even if relevant studies are not available in e-tail delivery contexts the author(s) may utilize e-fulfillment based studies to support the hypotheses. You may utilize these papers too.

- 1) <https://doi.org/10.1108/APJML-05-2018-0167>
- 2) <https://doi.org/10.1504/IJEMR.2019.100706>
- 3) <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jretconser.2020.102393>

These citations will help you in bringing the literature in good shape.

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 methodology sections are good.

4. Results: Are results presented clearly and analysed appropriately? Do the conclusions adequately tie together the other elements of the paper?: The results required to be corroborated with past researches.

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 required to be shortened and it should be divided into implications 1) implications for theory and 2) implications for practitioners.

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.: The quality of communication required to be improved as there are a few language errors.

Reviewer: 2

Recommendation: Minor Revision

**Comments:**

Congratulations on the work done. I suggest some improvements in the methodology section to make the procedures and criteria used a little clearer for the readers. Additionally, I suggest evaluating the possibility of using the Causal Impact technique to analyze the data and seek to advance in terms of causality.

The methodology is, in general terms, adequate. However, the justification for the methodological choices should be explained a little better. Particularly, I suggest to evaluate the possibility of using the Causal Impact technique for a more robust evaluation of the data and the influence of the intervention on the results:

- BRODERSEN, Kay H. et al. Inferring causal impact using Bayesian structural time-series models. *Annals of Applied Statistics*, p. 1-33, 2014.
- PIRAN, F. A. S. ; LACERDA, D. P. ; CAMARGO, L. F. R. ; DRESCH, A. ; MIGUEL, P. A. C. . Product modularization and effects on efficiency: an analysis of a bus manufacturer using Data Envelopment Analysis (DEA). *International Journal of Production Economics*, v. 182, p. 1-13, 2016.

Additionally, there could be more detail on how the content analysis was conducted. Were there a priori categories, or not? Was it carried out by one or more people? How did this content analysis contribute to the interpretation of the results?

**Additional Questions:**

1. Originality: Does the paper contain new and significant information adequate to justify publication?: Yes. The paper

evaluates the service recovery problem from the context of growing online sales. This research theme is not new, however, the current context presents new characteristics that could bring distinctive conditioning factors and new possibilities in comparison to studies conducted so far. In this way, I perceive relevant contributions in the research.

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 exposed is adequate. There is no excessive use of references and those used support the arguments presented. The references used are pertinent and place the reader in the essential and current knowledge for understanding the study.

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 methodology is, in general terms, adequate. However, the justification for the methodological choices should be explained a little better. Particularly, I suggest to evaluate the possibility of using the Causal Impact technique for a more robust evaluation of the data and the influence of the intervention on the results:

- PIRAN, F. A. S. ; LACERDA, D. P. ; CAMARGO, L. F. R. ; DRESCH, A. ; MIGUEL, P. A. C. . Product modularization and effects on efficiency: an analysis of a bus manufacturer using Data Envelopment Analysis (DEA). *International Journal of Production Economics*, v. 182, p. 1-13, 2016.

- BRODERSEN, Kay H. et al. Inferring causal impact using Bayesian structural time-series models. *Annals of Applied Statistics*, p. 1-33, 2014.

Additionally, there could be more detail on how the content analysis was conducted. Were there a priori categories, or not? Was it carried out by one or more people? How did this content analysis contribute to the interpretation of the results?

4. Results: Are results presented clearly and analysed appropriately? Do the conclusions adequately tie together the other elements of the paper?: Yes. The results are very interesting and are in line with the arguments presented above. It brings important novelties and, mainly, opens reflections in scientific and applied terms.

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?: The results open up important perspectives for service firms, particularly with regard to ways of recovering negative customer experiences. It adequately addresses the paradox of service recovery in the context of electronic sales.

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.: The text is well written, clear and objective.

Reviewer: 3

Recommendation: Minor Revision

Comments:

1) Please have another look on your reference list. You accessed the DBS report in 2017 for the last time. With Katadata (2016) you are citing an Indonesian newspaper website which might not be the most reliable source. With Sabagnolu (2021), you are referring to a [statista.com](https://www.emarketer.com/chart/242908/retail-e-commerce-sales-worldwide-2019-2024-trillions-change-of-total-retail-sales) deep link that actually only summarizes data from <https://www.emarketer.com/chart/242908/retail-e-commerce-sales-worldwide-2019-2024-trillions-change-of-total-retail-sales>

2) If there should be another review round, please insert figures and tables into the text where they should also be placed after publication.

Additional Questions:

1. Originality: Does the paper contain new and significant information adequate to justify publication?: Yes, the article targets the field of online shopping and contains relevant findings about strategies influencing repurchase intentions.

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?: I counted 23 journal references, 2 books / chapters etc., 2 conference articles and 4 online references. Overall, the literature work is alright but could be expanded.

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?: Experiments seem to be a good choice for this type of RQ.

4. Results: Are results presented clearly and analysed appropriately? Do the conclusions adequately tie together the other elements of the paper?: Yes.

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?: Implications for research and for practice are properly addressed in sections 5.1 and 5.2.

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.: The quality of communication was good.

---

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

Thu, Jul 15, 2021 at 8:09 PM

Dear Dr Luisa Huaccho Huatuco,

thank you very much for the information.

I will revise the manuscript within the allocated time and submit it before October 13th.

Stay healthy and have a good day!

Best regards,  
Erlinda Yunus

[Quoted text hidden]