

## Cover Letter for Submission

To:  
**Prof. Dr. Marc A. Rosen**  
Editor in Chief  
*Sustainability*

*Jakarta, October 5<sup>th</sup>, 2022*

Dear Prof Rosen,  
Greeting from Jakarta, Indonesia.


I would like to submit our paper entitled “*Risk Perception in the Post COVID-19 Pandemic: Analyzing Travel Behavior on Staying at Tourist Accommodation in the New Normal Era*” to your journal, Sustainability. This paper is an original article regarding travel risk perception among tourists in the ease of the COVID-19 pandemic.

Through this cover letter, I declare that this paper has not yet been published nor proceed to any other journal publications. I also declare that there is no potential conflict of interest in publishing this article and there is no copyright material in the content submitted.

We also informed you that this paper is a part of the research project funded by the Indonesia Endowment Fund for Education (LDPD RI). All funding information has been stated in the paper.

I'm looking forward to hearing from you. Thank you.

*Sincerely yours,*



Noveri Maulana

[Sustainability] Manuscript ID: sustainability-1914491 - Assistant Editor Assigned > Inbox x



Primavera Xin <primavera.xin@mdpi.com>

Tue, Aug 30, 2022, 9:52 AM ☆ 😊 ↶ ⋮

to me, Primavera, Noveri, Rifelly, Hariyadi, Priyono, Sustainability ▾

Dear Mr. Maulana,

Your paper has been assigned to Primavera Xin, who will be your main point of contact as your paper is processed further.

Journal: [Sustainability](#)

Manuscript ID: sustainability-1914491

Title: Risk Perception in the Post COVID-19 Pandemic: Analyzing Travel

Behavior on Staying at Tourist Accommodation in the New Normal Era

Authors: Noveri Maulana \*, Rifelly Dewi Astuti, Hariyadi Sukamdani, Priyono

Tjptoherjanto

Received: 29 August 2022

E-mails: [noveri.maulana91@ui.ac.id](mailto:noveri.maulana91@ui.ac.id), [rifelly.dewi22@ui.ac.id](mailto:rifelly.dewi22@ui.ac.id),

[hsukamdani@gmail.com](mailto:hsukamdani@gmail.com), [priyono.tjptoherjanto@ui.ac.id](mailto:priyono.tjptoherjanto@ui.ac.id)

You can find it here:

[https://susy.mdpi.com/user/manuscripts/review\\_info/aa9d0c40639fc86ed100bdffc8f4aea](https://susy.mdpi.com/user/manuscripts/review_info/aa9d0c40639fc86ed100bdffc8f4aea)

Best regards,

Ms. Vera Xin MSc in Psychology

E-Mail: [primavera.xin@mdpi.com](mailto:primavera.xin@mdpi.com)

[Sustainability] Manuscript ID: sustainability-1914491 - Major Revisions > Inbox x



Sustainability Editorial Office <sustainability@mdpi.com>

Mon, Sep 26, 2022, 7:53 AM ☆ 😊 ↶ ⋮

to me, Noveri, Rifelly, Hariyadi, Priyono, Sustainability ▾

Dear Mr. Maulana,

Thank you again for your manuscript submission:

Manuscript ID: sustainability-1914491

Type of manuscript: Article

Title: Risk Perception in the Post COVID-19 Pandemic: Analyzing Travel

Behavior on Staying at Tourist Accommodation in the New Normal Era

Authors: Noveri Maulana \*, Rifelly Dewi Astuti, Hariyadi Sukamdani, Priyono

Tjptoherjanto

Received: 29 August 2022

E-mails: [noveri.maulana91@ui.ac.id](mailto:noveri.maulana91@ui.ac.id), [rifelly.dewi22@ui.ac.id](mailto:rifelly.dewi22@ui.ac.id),

[hsukamdani@gmail.com](mailto:hsukamdani@gmail.com), [priyono.tjptoherjanto@ui.ac.id](mailto:priyono.tjptoherjanto@ui.ac.id)

Submitted to section: Economic and Business Aspects of Sustainability,

[https://www.mdpi.com/journal/sustainability/sections/management\\_aspects\\_of\\_sustainability](https://www.mdpi.com/journal/sustainability/sections/management_aspects_of_sustainability)

Your manuscript has now been reviewed by experts in the field. Please find your manuscript with the referee reports at this link:

<https://susy.mdpi.com/user/manuscripts/resubmit/aa9d0c40639fc86ed100bdffc8f4aea>

Please revise the manuscript according to the referees' comments and upload the revised file within 10 days.

Please use the version of your manuscript found at the above link for your revisions.

- (I) Please check that all references are relevant to the contents of the manuscript.
- (II) Any revisions to the manuscript should be marked up using the "Track Changes" function if you are using MS Word/LaTeX, such that any changes can be easily viewed by the editors and reviewers.
- (III) Please provide a cover letter to explain, point by point, the details of the revisions to the manuscript and your responses to the referees' comments.
- (IV) If you found it impossible to address certain comments in the review reports, please include an explanation in your rebuttal.
- (V) The revised version will be sent to the editors and reviewers.

If one of the referees has suggested that your manuscript should undergo extensive English revisions, please address this issue during revision. We propose that you use one of the editing services listed at <https://www.mdpi.com/authors/english> or have your manuscript checked by a colleague fluent in English writing.

Do not hesitate to contact us if you have any questions regarding the revision of your manuscript. We look forward to hearing from you soon.

Kind regards,

Ms. Vera Xin MSc in Psychology

E-Mail: [primavera.xin@mdpi.com](mailto:primavera.xin@mdpi.com)

# REVIEW ROUND-1

## Reviewer 1:

Review Report Form					
Quality of English Language	<input type="checkbox"/>	English very difficult to understand/incomprehensible			
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Extensive editing of English language and style required			
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Moderate English changes required			
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	English language and style are fine/minor spell check required			
	<input type="checkbox"/>	I am not qualified to assess the quality of English in this paper			
		Yes	Can be improved	Must be improved	Not applicable
Is the content succinctly described and contextualized with respect to previous and present theoretical background and empirical research (if applicable) on the topic?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Are all the cited references relevant to the research?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Are the research design, questions, hypotheses and methods clearly stated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Are the arguments and discussion of findings coherent, balanced and compelling?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
For empirical research, are the results clearly presented?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Is the article adequately referenced?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Are the conclusions thoroughly supported by the results presented in the article or referenced in secondary literature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

### Comments and Suggestions for Authors

This paper is entitled "Risk Perception in the Post COVID-19 Pandemic: Analyzing Travel Behavior on Staying at Tourist Accommodation in the New Normal Era". Through exploratory factor analysis, the study has explored various factors of risk perception toward staying at tourist accommodation among domestic and foreign tourists during the ease of travel restriction in Indonesia after the third wave of COVID-19 cases in 2022. In this case, the idea and results of the paper are interesting but the following comments can be utilized to improve this paper in future.

Abstract: Authors must provide some information as brief about the results of the current research.

Page1line37, 38: it is better to use one time citation as [1,2]

Page2line45-48: this paragraph must be moved to the section 1.1.

Page2line45-48: the authors used alphabetic citation at the first part of the paragraph (Dolnicar (2000)) and numerical in line 47. This is not correct. They must consider it throughout the manuscript.

Page2line56-61: two times citation [5] utilized. It must be used one time.

Page2line74-80: two times citation [8] utilized. It must be used one time. This must consider throughout the manuscript.

Page2line81-90: consider citation as described above. Numerical and alphabetical use is not correct.

General: Since the authors did not provide section of literature review, they must arrange comprehensive information from recent research based on the objective of the research. Therefore, the introduction research must be improved.

General: Authors have mentioned several research in the section of "Materials and Methods". This is not correct. It must be moved to the literature review or introduction.

Table 1 and Table 2: it must be arranged in one page. If it is not possible, it must be divided into two tables with separate number and caption.

Page5line170: "Hence, the risk 170 items developed in this study need to be adjusted to this current study context." This sentence must be rearranged. The meaning of that is not clear.

Page6line172-174: "Eleven travelers participated in two separate FGDs to validate those risk items from the literature review. Then, the final result of these analysis methods has been summarized as 23 risk items as shown in Table 2": Why 23 risk items?! It must be describe clearly.

## Response to Reviewer 1

Paper entitled: "Risk Perception in the Post COVID-19 Pandemic: Analyzing Travel Behavior on Staying at Tourist Accommodation in the New Normal Era"

Dear Reviewer 1,

All review notes have been discussed and carefully evaluated among the authors to improve the quality of our manuscript. We appreciate the insightful comments and advice that Reviewer 1 has given to the paper. Hence, allow us to respond to each comment in the following notes:

1. The comment regarding the inconsistency of the citation style (whether it is a numeric or alphabetic citation) has been corrected to all numeric citations regarding the journal's policy. The misconduct of citations, such as in lines 37-38, 45-48, 56-51, 74-80, 81-90, and soon in the previously submitted manuscript, have been corrected.
2. The comments regarding the literature review, such as "Authors have mentioned several research in the section of "Materials and Methods." This is not correct. It must be moved to the literature review or introduction." Those comments have been considered in our paper. Hence, the paragraph related to literature in the "Material and Methods" section has been rearranged to section one, "introduction," It is also improved by providing a more comprehensive review such as the sub-section *1.1. Risk Perception, Tourist Behavior, and Tourism Sustainability in the Post-pandemic Era* (page 2-2); section *1.2. Risk Perception Studies during COVID-19* (pages 3-4); and section *1.3. Item and Measurement Scales* (page 5).
3. The comment on the arrangement of the table has been corrected. All tables are in the one-page presentation.
4. Regarding the explanation of "why 23 of risk items?" the authors have described the FGD process in the additional section 3.1 Focus Group Discussion, which explains the coding and categorization process.
5. Reviewer 1 also commented regarding Sampling methods and sample size in the pilot and main tests. The authors have improved the explanation regarding sampling in section 2.2 of this manuscript. Purposive sampling was used for recruiting FGD participants. Meanwhile, simple random sampling was used for the field survey. The Online Sampling calculator by the Australian Statistic bureau is used in the study.
6. Exploratory Factor Analysis, which is very limited in our previous manuscript, has been improved in this revision. The last comment of Reviewer 1 is "the procedure of analysis for "Eigen-values, Vari-ance, Commu-nalities, Factor Loading, and Cronbach Alpha" must be described clearly." The authors have improved the explanation of the procedures in section 3.4.

Perhaps our improved manuscript has met the standard of Reviewer 1 and follows the journal policy toward publication.

Sincerely,

The Authors.

## REVIEWER 2:

### Review Report Form

- Quality of English ( ) English very difficult to understand/incomprehensible  
 Language ( ) Extensive editing of English language and style required  
 ( ) Moderate English changes required  
 ( ) English language and style are fine/minor spell check required  
 (x) I am not qualified to assess the quality of English in this paper

	Yes	Can be improved	Must be improved	Not applicable
Is the content succinctly described and contextualized with respect to previous and present theoretical background and empirical research (if applicable) on the topic?	(x)	( )	( )	( )
Are all the cited references relevant to the research?	(x)	( )	( )	( )
Are the research design, questions, hypotheses and methods clearly stated?	( )	(x)	( )	( )
Are the arguments and discussion of findings coherent, balanced and compelling?	( )	( )	(x)	( )
For empirical research, are the results clearly presented?	( )	( )	(x)	( )
Is the article adequately referenced?	(x)	( )	( )	( )
Are the conclusions thoroughly supported by the results presented in the article or referenced in secondary literature?	( )	(x)	( )	( )

**Comments and Suggestions for Authors**

The study is very interesting, readable and, in my opinion, interesting. The coronavirus pandemic has resulted in a new order of operations in all walks of life, leaving a significant mark on all sectors of the economy. The article is well edited and logically structured. What I would suggest to the authors is a substantial revision of the literature review. A number of articles have appeared in other journals of the publisher, e.g. Risks, on the subject. It might be worthwhile to broaden the horizon even more by looking at other sectors. Some articles published by the publisher (just from the quick search):

The Effect of Business Legal Form on the Perception of COVID-19-Related Disruptions by Households Running a Business

Investor Segments by Perceived Project Risk and Their Characteristics Based on Primary Research Results

Impact of COVID-19 Risk Perception on Residents' Behavioural Intention towards Forest Therapy Tourism

Can International Students' Risk Perception and Place Image Create an Advantage in Safeguarding Place Loyalty in Post-COVID-19 Tourism?

So, I would definitely recommend expanding the number and scope of literature sources. Is it necessary to present the full sample composition in the methodological section? Perhaps some additional measurements, tests could be added to the results section of the study? I feel that the factor analysis alone is very inadequate, so I recommend the authors to carry out additional methods and, depending on this, to extend the conclusions.

Submission Date 29 August 2022

Date of this review 05 Oct 2022 08:34:00

## **Response to Reviewer 2**

Paper entitled: “Risk Perception in the Post COVID-19 Pandemic: Analyzing Travel Behavior on Staying at Tourist Accommodation in the New Normal Era”

Dear Reviewer 2,

All review notes have been discussed and carefully evaluated among the authors to improve the quality of our manuscript. We appreciate the insightful comments and advice that Reviewer 2 has given to the paper. Hence, allow us to respond to each comment in the following notes:

1. The comment regarding the lack of literature review from Reviewer 2 has been improved in this revised manuscript. Thanks to several papers' recommendations, we have carefully analyzed and referred the analysis to more publications. In short, we have improved our kinds of literature from 30 papers (in the previous submission) to 50 papers in this revised manuscript. Perhaps the additional reference has improved our arguments and explanation in the literature review section and the discussion section.
2. Regarding the suggestion toward additional tests in this study, we really appreciate the suggestion from Reviewer 2 in this matter. However, those studies are presented in a different publications. Since the study's primary purpose is to conclude the risk perception factors, we summarized the analysis suitably enough for this study. Hence, we extend the analysis in the forthcoming paper to segment the tourist based on our proposed multi-dimensional risk perception and test the differences in risk perception among the tourist in each resulting segment. Perhaps, this argument could be accepted to respond to the comment of Reviewer 2.

Once again, we appreciate the comment and input toward our manuscript. Perhaps our improved manuscript has met the standard of Reviewer 2 and follows the journal policy toward publication.

Sincerely,

The Authors.

## REVIEWER 3:

### Review Report Form

- Quality of English ( ) English very difficult to understand/incomprehensible  
Language ( ) Extensive editing of English language and style required  
( ) Moderate English changes required  
(x) English language and style are fine/minor spell check required  
( ) I am not qualified to assess the quality of English in this paper

	Yes	Can be improved	Must be improved	Not applicable
Is the content succinctly described and contextualized with respect to previous and present theoretical background and empirical research (if applicable) on the topic?	( )	( )	(x)	( )
Are all the cited references relevant to the research?	( )	( )	(x)	( )
Are the research design, questions, hypotheses and methods clearly stated?	( )	( )	(x)	( )
Are the arguments and discussion of findings coherent, balanced and compelling?	( )	( )	(x)	( )
For empirical research, are the results clearly presented?	( )	( )	(x)	( )
Is the article adequately referenced?	( )	( )	(x)	( )
Are the conclusions thoroughly supported by the results presented in the article or referenced in secondary literature?	( )	( )	(x)	( )

Comments and Suggestions for Authors

The article is interesting from the point of view of the risk theory and the impact of Covid-19 on tourism. For these reasons, it is worth publishing it. Research is well prepared and conducted. Nevertheless, its content needs to be supplemented: 1. Based on the literature review, the authors should indicate a scientific research gap. On the basis of literature, it is also necessary to clearly formulate the research goal and problem. This article is missing because the literature review itself is very shallow. It should be a separate section. Part of the description from Materials and methods can be transferred to it. 2. The results and discussion should not be described together. The discussion should include a polemic with the current literature studies (after their completion). It should also emphasize the originality of research and the authors' contribution to discipline. This section should also include industry recommendations and theoretical implications. Someone needs the content and results. 3. The results should include a research summary (generalization) and research limitations. The conclusion should also refer to sustainability, which is the journal's main area of interest.

Submission Date 29 August 2022

Date of this review 18 Sep 2022 18:11:58

## Response to Reviewer 3

Paper entitled: "Risk Perception in the Post COVID-19 Pandemic: Analyzing Travel Behavior on Staying at Tourist Accommodation in the New Normal Era"

Dear Reviewer 3,

All review notes have been discussed and carefully evaluated among the authors to improve the quality of our manuscript. We appreciate the insightful comments and advice that Reviewer 3 has given to the paper. Hence, allow us to respond to each comment in the following notes:

1. The comment regarding the lack of literature review from Reviewer 3 has been improved in this revised manuscript. We have explained the research gap and novelty in the introduction section, especially in subsection *1.1. Risk Perception, Tourist Behavior, and Tourism Sustainability in the Post-pandemic Era* and subsection *1.2. Risk Perception Studies during COVID-19*. We have carefully analyzed and referred the analysis to more publications. Perhaps the additional reference has improved our arguments and explanation in the literature review and the discussion section. In short, we have improved our kinds of literature from 30 papers (in the previous submission) to 50 papers in this revised manuscript.
2. Reviewer 3 comments: "The results and discussion should not be described together." Thanks to the advice, we have described the Results and Discussion section separately in this revised manuscript.
3. The last comment from Reviewer 3: "The results should include a research summary (generalization) and research limitations. The conclusion should also refer to sustainability, which is the journal's main area of interest." We have deepened our summary and related the conclusion to the sustainability issues.

Once again, we appreciate the comment and input toward our manuscript. Perhaps our improved manuscript has met the standard of Reviewer 3 and follows the journal policy toward publication.

Sincerely,

The Authors.



## REVIEW ROUND-2

[Sustainability] Manuscript ID: [sustainability-1914491](#) - Major Revisions » Inbox x



**Sustainability Editorial Office** <sustainability@mdpi.com>  
to me, Noveri, Rifelly, Hariyadi, Prijono, Sustainability ▾

Wed, Oct 12, 2022, 7:36 PM ☆ ☺ ↶ ⋮

Dear Mr. Maulana,

Thank you again for your manuscript submission:

Manuscript ID: [sustainability-1914491](#)

Type of manuscript: Article

Title: Risk Perception in the Post COVID-19 Pandemic: Analyzing Travel

Behavior on Staying at Tourist Accommodation in the New Normal Era

Authors: Noveri Maulana \*, Rifelly Dewi Astuti, Hariyadi Sukamdani, Prijono

Tjiptoherijanto

Received: 29 August 2022

E-mails: [noveri.maulana91@ui.ac.id](mailto:noveri.maulana91@ui.ac.id), [rifelly.dewi22@ui.ac.id](mailto:rifelly.dewi22@ui.ac.id),

[hsukamdani@gmail.com](mailto:hsukamdani@gmail.com), [prijono.tjiptoherijanto@ui.ac.id](mailto:prijono.tjiptoherijanto@ui.ac.id)

Submitted to section: Economic and Business Aspects of [Sustainability](#),

[https://www.mdpi.com/journal/sustainability/sections/management\\_aspects\\_of\\_sustainability](https://www.mdpi.com/journal/sustainability/sections/management_aspects_of_sustainability)

Your manuscript has now been reviewed by experts in the field. Please find your manuscript with the referee reports at this link:

<https://susy.mdpi.com/user/manuscripts/resubmit/aa9d0c40639fc86ed100bdffc8f4aea>

Please revise the manuscript according to the referees' comments and upload the revised file within 10 days.

## REVIEWER 1 Round 2:

### Review Report Form

- Quality of English Language
- English very difficult to understand/incomprehensible
  - Extensive editing of English language and style required
  - Moderate English changes required
  - English language and style are fine/minor spell check required
  - I am not qualified to assess the quality of English in this paper

	Yes	Can be improved	Must be improved	Not applicable
Is the content succinctly described and contextualized with respect to previous and present theoretical background and empirical research (if applicable) on the topic?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Are all the cited references relevant to the research?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Are the research design, questions, hypotheses and methods clearly stated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Are the arguments and discussion of findings coherent, balanced and compelling?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
For empirical research, are the results clearly presented?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Is the article adequately referenced?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Are the conclusions thoroughly supported by the results presented in the article or referenced in secondary literature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

#### Comments and Suggestions for Authors

Authors did not response to the following important comment.

"Page6line180-182: The questionnaire was delivered to 50 respondents through an online survey link and each respondent could participate in the survey through their laptop or gadgets.: why 50 respondents was utilized?! The calculation and formula for the pilot study must be described."

Authors reported "simple random sampling was used for the field survey. The Online Sampling calculator by the Australian Statistic bureau is used in the study.": first random sampling is not acceptable. It must be followed from specific method. Second, Australian Statistic must be described in details and procedure. All statistic and formula must be described.

The author did not answer this question or did not address appropriate to understand for the reviewer.

"Page6line182-184: "The result shows that 182 the research items have good reliability in their consistency among the respondents, hence 183 the questionnaire is ready to be distributed to target respondents for the main study."?! How can be understood the pilot is reliable for the analysis."

I could not find the anwer for this "Line 190: "the purposive sampling method is 190 applied to the study.": why?!"

What is the answer for this comment?!?!

"Line 191 and 192: "According to Hair et al (2014), the minimum required total samples 191 for the study is 385 respondents to achieve good reliability in the result and analysis.": in such research, authors must analyse and calculate the number of sample size based on the existing scientific formula. The research conducted by Hair et al (2014) has its specific and cannot utilized for this. In this regards, Autors MUST provide standard formula and procedure for the calculation of sample size and piloting size."

Submission Date 29 August 2022

Date of this review 09 Oct 2022 21:18:00

## Respond to Reviewer 1 (Round 2)

Thank you for the response and suggestion from Reviewer 1. Below are our comments regarding the review:

1. Page6line180-182: The questionnaire was delivered to 50 respondents through an online survey link, and each respondent could participate in the survey through their laptop or gadgets.: why was 50 respondents utilized?! The calculation and formula for the pilot study must be described.  
*(answer: The formula for the pilot study has been detailed in the section "3.2. Pilot Testing". The authors follow the study of Viechtbauer et al (2015) regarding the sample for the Pilot study. The formula has been described in the manuscript, and the reliability dan validity testing has been explored in the pilot study. A detailed process of the pilot study can be found in lines 254 – 286.)*
2. "first random sampling is not acceptable. It must be followed from specific method. Second, Australian Statistic must be described in details and procedure. All Statistic and formula must be described as"  
*(Answer: We have described the sampling formula in the study by implementing the Taro Yamane formula. This formula helps the authors define the study's sample size according to the study's purpose. The description of the sampling procedure can be found on lines 202 – 216)*
3. "How can be understood the pilot is reliable for the analysis."  
*(Answer: The reliability and validity of pilot testing are described in lines 278 – 286. Cronbach's Alpha value shows 0.9 exceed the threshold value. Also, the factor loading of each item shows a value above 0.5, indicating that all items in the questionnaire are valid and reliable.)*
4. The purposive sampling method is 190 applied to the study.": why?!" What is the answer to this comment?!?  
*(Answer: Since the study aims to explore the factors regarding risk perception in the post-pandemic context, the author is implementing purposive sampling in defining target respondents according to the exploratory study design. The authors' judgment in exploring the respondent point of view is defined by indicating the eligibility of respondents who visit and stay at an accommodation in a tourist destination in Indonesia during March – July 2022. Hence, based on these criteria, the author conducted primary data collection in five popular tourist destinations in Indonesia: Bali, Jakarta, Lombok, Yogyakarta, and Bogor. This non-probability sampling method could enhance the study's result regarding the research purpose. The detail of the sampling method is described in lines 190 – 201.)*
5. The research conducted by Hair et al (2014) has its specific and cannot utilized for this. In this regards, Autors MUST provide standard formula and procedure for the calculation of sample size and piloting size.  
*(Answer: The authors have described the standard formula for sampling size and the pilot study as suggested by reviewer 1. The sampling formula can be found in line 211, and the formula for pilot testing can be found in line 261.)*

## REVIEWER 2, Round 2:

### Review Report Form

- Quality of English  English very difficult to understand/incomprehensible  
Language  Extensive editing of English language and style required  
 Moderate English changes required  
 English language and style are fine/minor spell check required  
 I am not qualified to assess the quality of English in this paper

	Yes	Can be improved	Must be improved	Not applicable
Is the content succinctly described and contextualized with respect to previous and present theoretical background and empirical research (if applicable) on the topic?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Are all the cited references relevant to the research?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Are the research design, questions, hypotheses and methods clearly stated?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Are the arguments and discussion of findings coherent, balanced and compelling?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
For empirical research, are the results clearly presented?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Is the article adequately referenced?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Are the conclusions thoroughly supported by the results presented in the article or referenced in secondary literature?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments and Suggestions for Authors The study has been much improved from the original paper. I see that the corrections have all served to improve the article. I have no further suggestions for improvement.

Submission Date 29 August 2022

Date of this review 19 Oct 2022 12:52:39

### Authors' Responses to Reviewer's Comments (Reviewer 2)

Author's Notes Dear Reviewer 2,

Thank you very much for your kind review and suggestion. Our manuscript has been improved based on your insightful comments.

Warm regards,

The Authors

## REVIEWER 3, Round 2:

### Review Report Form

- Quality of English     English very difficult to understand/incomprehensible  
Language             Extensive editing of English language and style required  
                           Moderate English changes required  
                           English language and style are fine/minor spell check required  
                           I am not qualified to assess the quality of English in this paper

	Yes	Can be improved	Must be improved	Not applicable
Is the content succinctly described and contextualized with respect to previous and present theoretical background and empirical research (if applicable) on the topic?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Are all the cited references relevant to the research?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Are the research design, questions, hypotheses and methods clearly stated?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Are the arguments and discussion of findings coherent, balanced and compelling?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
For empirical research, are the results clearly presented?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Is the article adequately referenced?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Are the conclusions thoroughly supported by the results presented in the article or referenced in secondary literature?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments and Suggestions for Authors    The authors improved the article. It could be published.

Submission Date    29 August 2022

Date of this review    06 Oct 2022 11:42:35

### Authors' Responses to Reviewer's Comments (Reviewer 3)

Author's Notes    Dear Reviewer 3,  
  
Thank you very much for your kind review and suggestion. Our manuscript has been improved based on your insightful comments.  
  
Warm regards,  
  
The Authors

# REVIEW ROUND-3

## REVIEWER 1, Round 3:

### Review Report Form

- Quality of English ( ) English very difficult to understand/incomprehensible  
Language ( ) Extensive editing of English language and style required  
( ) Moderate English changes required  
(x) English language and style are fine/minor spell check required  
( ) I am not qualified to assess the quality of English in this paper

	Yes	Can be improved	Must be improved	Not applicable
Is the content succinctly described and contextualized with respect to previous and present theoretical background and empirical research (if applicable) on the topic?	( )	(x)	( )	( )
Are all the cited references relevant to the research?	( )	(x)	( )	( )
Are the research design, questions, hypotheses and methods clearly stated?	( )	(x)	( )	( )
Are the arguments and discussion of findings coherent, balanced and compelling?	( )	(x)	( )	( )
For empirical research, are the results clearly presented?	( )	(x)	( )	( )
Is the article adequately referenced?	( )	(x)	( )	( )
Are the conclusions thoroughly supported by the results presented in the article or referenced in secondary literature?	( )	(x)	( )	( )
Comments and Suggestions for Authors	new responses are acceptable.			
Submission Date	29 August 2022			
Date of this review	24 Oct 2022 20:47:56			

# PROOFREADING For Final Version

Article

## Risk Perception in the Post COVID-19 Pandemic Era: An Analysis of Tourist Accommodation and Travel Behavior in the New Normal Era

Noveri Maulana <sup>1,\*,</sup> Rifelly Dewi Astuti <sup>2,</sup> Hariyadi, B., Sukamdani <sup>3,3</sup> and Priyono Tjiptoherijanto <sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Sekolah Tinggi Manajemen PPM (PPM School of Management), Jakarta 10340, Indonesia

<sup>2</sup> Faculty of Economic and Business, University of Indonesia, Jakarta 12930, Indonesia; rifelly.dewi22@ui.ac.id (R.D.A.); hsukamdani@gmail.com (H.B.S.S.); priyono.tjiptoherijanto@ui.ac.id (P.T.)

<sup>3</sup> Indonesian Hotel and Restaurant Association (IHRA/PHRI), Jakarta 10220, Indonesia

\* Correspondence: [noveri.maulana91@ui.ac.id](mailto:noveri.maulana91@ui.ac.id) or [nvr@ppm-manajemen.ac.id](mailto:nvr@ppm-manajemen.ac.id)

**Abstract:** After two years of the COVID-19 pandemic, research on travel risk perception has been dominated by the study of health risks as a significant factor that influences tourists' purchase behavior toward tourism and hospitality products, such as accommodation selection. However, research on other travel-risk-related factors remains limited. This study aimed to fill this gap in the literature. Through exploratory factor analysis, the study explored various risk perception factors toward staying in tourist accommodation among tourists during the easing of travel restrictions in Indonesia. Through a survey of 411 foreign and domestic tourists, the study identified 22 risk items and categorized the items into the following 5 dimensions of risk perception: potential loss risk (six items, 39.9% variance), psychological risk (five items, 9.1% variance), health risk (four items, 5.7% variance), social risk (three items, 5.3% variance), and financial risk (four items, 4.7% variance). This study is one of the few studies on risk perception that proposes a multi-dimensional approach rather than a single-dimension approach to risk perception in the hospitality context. These findings may enhance the literature on travel risk perception amidst the crisis and contribute to tourism recovery strategies in the post-pandemic era.

**Keywords:** factor analysis; risk perception; perceived risk; tourist behavior; post-pandemic; tourism recovery; new normal

**Citation:** Maulana, N.; Astuti, R.D.; Sukamdani, H.B.; Tjiptoherijanto, P. Risk Perception in the Post COVID-19 Pandemic Era: An Analysis of Tourist Accommodation and Travel Behavior in the New Normal Era. *Sustainability* **2022**, *14*, x. <https://doi.org/10.3390/sxxxx>

Academic Editor: E. Owen D. Waygood

Received: 29 August 2022  
Accepted: 26 October 2022  
Published: date

**Publisher's Note:** MDPI stays neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.



Copyright: © 2022 by the authors. Submitted for possible open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

### 1. Introduction

Since tourist decision-making is complex, and because purchase decision-making is a multi-factorial process, in the study of purchase behavior in the tourism context, various determinants can be applied as antecedents. One of the determinants in defining tourist behavior is risk perception. Risk perception, also known as 'perceived risk,' indicates the amount of uncertainty of the negative impact that a specific situation may have on an individual. Tourist perceived risk of a risky destination can also be assessed in terms of the COVID-19 outbreak. Since most of the studies on the perceived risk of tourism are focused on crime, terrorism, and natural disasters, the perceived risk of tourism in the context of disease and pandemic is still limited [1–3]. Hence, the need for studies on the perceived risk of tourism in the context of COVID-19 remains. Countries in Asia, for example, are perceived as risky destinations by Western tourists due to an ongoing perception of risk regarding the COVID-19 outbreak in China and surrounding Asian countries [4]. Thus, given the worldwide spread of COVID-19, the perceived risk of COVID-19 likely impacts the visit intention of tourists towards almost every country in the world, including Indonesia, one of the most popular tourist destinations in Southeast Asia.

Commented [M1]: Dear Authors,

- (1) Please proofread the article format according to the comments left and pay attention to the highlighted parts.
- (2) Please do not delete the comments during your proofreading, since we need to check point by point after receiving your proofed version.
- (3) Please just modify or confirm or give feedback with track change Function.
- (4) English editing and layout have been complete, please do not revert the changes.

Commented [nm2R1]: Thank you, well noted.

Deleted: zing

Commented [OdK3]: Please verify this change.

Commented [nm4R3]: Risk Perception in the Post COVID-19 Pandemic Era: An Analysis of Tourist Accommodation and Travel Behavior in the New Normal Era

Deleted:

Deleted: B. S

Commented [M5]: Please carefully check the accuracy of names and affiliations. Authorship (... [1])

Commented [nm6R5]: Second author's name (... [2])

Commented [M7]: 1. The name of this author (... [3])

Commented [nm8R7]: Please corrected our (... [4])

Commented [M13]: We added the cities and (... [8])

Commented [nm14R13]: confirmed

Commented [M15]: Please confirm if need to (... [9])

Commented [nm16R15]: Yes, please keep both.

Commented [M9]: Please check all author name (... [5])

Commented [nm10R9]: Please correct our sentence (... [6])

Deleted:

Deleted: Hariyadi, B.S.S

Commented [OdK11]: Please verify this change.

Commented [nm12R11]: Confirmed, but in the (... [7])

# ACCEPTANCE EMAIL NOTIFICATION

← [Icons] 25 of many >

[Sustainability] Manuscript ID: **sustainability-1914491** - Accepted for Publication > Inbox x

**S** **Sustainability Editorial Office** <sustainability@mdpi.com> Wed, Oct 26, 2022, 7:11AM ☆ 😊 ↶ ⋮  
to me, Noveri, Rifelly, Hariyadi, Prijono, Sustainability, Primavera ▾

Dear Mr. Maulana,

Congratulations on the acceptance of your manuscript, and thank you for submitting your work to **Sustainability**:

Manuscript ID: **sustainability-1914491**  
Type of manuscript: Article  
Title: Risk Perception in the Post COVID-19 Pandemic: Analyzing Travel Behavior on Staying at Tourist Accommodation in the New Normal Era  
Authors: Noveri Maulana \*, Rifelly Dewi Astuti, Hariyadi Sukamdani, Prijono Tjiptoherjanto  
Received: 29 August 2022  
E-mails: [noveri.maulana91@ui.ac.id](mailto:noveri.maulana91@ui.ac.id), [rifelly.dewi22@ui.ac.id](mailto:rifelly.dewi22@ui.ac.id),  
[hsukamdani@gmail.com](mailto:hsukamdani@gmail.com), [prijono.tjiptoherjanto@ui.ac.id](mailto:prijono.tjiptoherjanto@ui.ac.id)  
Submitted to section: Economic and Business Aspects of **Sustainability**,  
[https://www.mdpi.com/journal/sustainability/sections/management\\_aspects\\_of\\_sustainability](https://www.mdpi.com/journal/sustainability/sections/management_aspects_of_sustainability)  
[https://susy.mdpi.com/user/manuscripts/review\\_info/aa9d0c40639fc86ed100bdfc8f4aea](https://susy.mdpi.com/user/manuscripts/review_info/aa9d0c40639fc86ed100bdfc8f4aea)

We will now edit and finalize your paper, which will then be returned to you for your approval. Within the next couple of days, an invoice concerning the article processing charge (APC) for publication in this open access journal will be sent by email from the Editorial Office in Basel, Switzerland.