

From:

agunasekaran@csub.edu

To:

yugowati@ppns.ac.id, yugowatip@ppns.ac.id

CC:**Subject:**

Benchmarking: an International Journal - Decision on Manuscript ID BIJ-05-2020-0232

Body:

11-Dec-2020

Dear Dr. Praharsi:

Manuscript ID BIJ-05-2020-0232 entitled "Supply Chain Performance at Traditional Shipyard in Indonesia" which you submitted to the Benchmarking: an International Journal, 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/bij> 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 Benchmarking: an International Journal, 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.

Please note that Emerald requires you to clear permission to re-use any material not created by you. If there are permissions outstanding, please upload these when you submit your revision. Emerald is unable to publish your paper with permissions outstanding.

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/
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 Benchmarking: an International Journal and I look forward to receiving your revision.

Sincerely,

Prof. Angappa Gunasekaran
Editor, Benchmarking: an International Journal
agunasekaran@csub.edu

Associate Editor and Reviewer(s)' Comments to Author:

Associate Editor
Comments to Author: :

(There are no comments.)

Reviewer: 1

Recommendation: Major Revision

Comments:

(There are no comments.)

Additional Questions:

1. Originality: Does the paper contain new and significant information adequate to justify publication?: Yes there is some originality on this article **but the research significance needed to be justified. For instance why traditional shipyard lack of supply chain performance metrics assessments.**

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?: **Literature review is not convincing either.** Supply chain performance measurement theme are very matured and therefore sufficient discussion along the length and depth are **required to identify the gaps.** Likewise review on SCOR model. **Section based on reliability, flexibility and responsiveness need revamping. A complete reorganization is required in literature review section.**

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?: Methodology seems to be improperly discussed in the paper. The author grounded the work on SCOR model, **however i do not see any of the SCOR based numbering for Plan, Source, Make, Deliver, return and Enable aspects. Likewise the level of analysis for lever 2 and level 3 are not properly revealed and Justified.** There is a clear lack of methodological rigor in the paper.

4. Results: Are results presented clearly and analysed appropriately? Do the conclusions adequately tie together the other elements of the paper?: **Results are convincing., however i suggest the author to benchmark the findings with any best in class providers.**

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?: Need to be justified properly. Likewise **the contribution to the SCOR and supply chain performance body of knowledge are needed to be discussed.**

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.: Acceptable.

Reviewer: 2

Recommendation: Reject

Comments:

(There are no comments.)

Additional Questions:

1. Originality: **Does the paper contain new and significant information adequate to justify publication?: The paper is not proposing any new addition to the existing literature.** The paper discusses a case relating to the supply chain performance of a shipyard. **So, the replicability of the results is limited.** Although the authors applied SCOR metrics, **they failed to highlight the novelty of the work.**

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 references seem to be limited. The cited references are more general and authors try to relate these references to the topic of discussion.

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 manuscript can improve the analysis by including different levels of SCOR metrics. So that, the authors can identifies the root problem and able to suggest the improvements.**

4. Results: Are results presented clearly and analysed appropriately? Do the conclusions adequately tie together the other elements of the paper?: **Result has presented poorly. The analysis is limited to a comparison with a benchmarking SCORE matrix. The authors failed to identify the root problem.** A thorough discussion of the result is recommended.

The statement given in page number 11 (line 11 -16) is as follows: "Moreover, the relationship between the owner of the shipyard and the customer is close enough, so that contracts are only made based on the principle of trust in each other. Besides, the limitation of dockyard and manufacturing devices, and slow regeneration of human capital are other barriers to fulfill the customer order". **More justification needed for this statement.**

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?: **Recommend to include implications for theory and implications for practice.**

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.: **Novelty and contribution of the manuscript is questionable.** Also, the paper is poorly written. **Typo and grammatical errors found in the manuscript.** Some instances are given here: Page 5 lines 43-52 (recommended to rephrase the statement); page 6 lines 13-14 (rephrase the sentence); Page8 line 29 (typo error); Page no. 9 line 5 (rephrase the sentence); Page 10 lines 22, 26 (typo error); Page 10 lines 44-48 (rephrase the sentence)

DEADLINE: 11-Mar-2021

To go straight to your paper click this link: *** PLEASE NOTE: This is a two-step process. After clicking on the link, you will be directed to a webpage to confirm. ***

https://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/bij?URL_MASK=dd2c01720f504e6aa21fa942bf72c6ae

Date Sent:
11-Dec-2020

Responses to the Editor and Reviewers' Comments

We appreciate the excellent services from the Editor and the reviewers of Benchmarking: An International Journal. We have revised the manuscript according to the suggestions made by the editor and reviewers. All the revised sentences are coloured blue. We hope this revised version can satisfy all the respected anonymous reviewers. The point by point reply to the comments are listed below:

Associate Editor and Reviewer(s)' Comments to Author:

Associate Editor
Comments to Author: :
(There are no comments.)

Reviewer: 1

Recommendation: Major Revision

Comments:
(There are no comments.)

Additional Questions:

1. Originality: Does the paper contain new and significant information adequate to justify publication?: Yes there is some originality on this article but the research significance needed to be justified. For instance why traditional shipyard lack of supply chain performance metrics assessments.

Our Response: Thank you for your constructive comments. We have already added new section, which is Section 2.4, for further explain about the novelty of the new method we proposed in this study. We basically added 2 different SCOR metrics to be suitably used in the traditional shipbuilding industry, they are SPI (Schedule Performance Index) and CPI (Cost Performance Index). The traditional shipyard lack of supply chain performance metrics assessments because this project is based on engineering to order. Meanwhile, most of the SCOR literatures are not based on engineering to order. In this study, we have summarized SCOR literatures for engineering to order and shipbuilding industry in Table III for the last ten years.

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?: Literature review is not convincing either. Supply chain performance measurement theme are very matured and therefore sufficient discussion along the length and depth are required to identify the gaps. Likewise review on SCOR model. Section based on reliability, flexibility and responsiveness need revamping. A complete reorganization is required in literature review section.

Our Response: Thank you for your concern. We have revised this case by adding more relevant papers in Section 2.3, highlighted in blue. We also have narrowed the scope of reference paper into Engineering-to-Order (ETO) project, since this type of project is most likely in line with the shipbuilding project.

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?: Methodology seems to be improperly discussed in the paper. The author grounded the work on SCOR model, however i do not see any of the SCOR based numbering for Plan, Source, Make, Deliver, return and Enable aspects. Likewise the level of analysis for lever 2 and level 3 are not properly revealed and Justified. There is a clear lack of methodological rigor in the paper.

Our Response: Many thanks for your valuable comments. Changes have been made accordingly. Please see the manuscript changes highlighted in blue. SCOR process level 2 are explained in section 4.1.3. Those process are obtained from brainstorming with some experts in traditional shipbuilding industry. However, the return aspect didn't include in this paper because ship production categorize as Engineer-To-Order which is the product based on customer requirement starting from the design stage, and customer couldn't return the ship that already produced. Meanwhile, SCOR level 3 are explained in section 4.1.4. In level 3, we only explained "Make Engineering-To-Order", because based on the biggest opportunity calculation the problem was the high production cost, so we try to breakdown the process in 'make' to analyze the process deeper.

4. Results: Are results presented clearly and analysed appropriately? Do the conclusions adequately tie together the other elements of the paper?: Results are convincing., however i suggest the author to benchmark the findings with any best in class providers

Our response: Thank you for the constructive comments. We used benchmarking data/supply chain SCORcard from the literature of Bolstorff and Rosenbaum (Supply chain excellence: a handbook for dramatic improvement using the SCOR model, 2003); Harrison, A and van Hoek, R (Logistics management and strategy: competing through the supply chain, 2002) and Institute of logistics and warehousing, Aina, Technological Centre (SCOR: supply-chain reference model).

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?: Need to be justified properly. Likewise the contribution to the SCOR and supply chain performance body of knowledge are needed to be discussed.

Our Response: Thank you for the constructive comments. We have already added a new section to concisely explain about theoretical implications to the SCOR and supply chain performance body of knowledge in Section 5.

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.: Acceptable.

Our response: Thank you for your valuable comment

Reviewer: 2

Recommendation: Reject

Comments:
(There are no comments.)

Additional Questions:

1. Originality: Does the paper contain new and significant information adequate to justify publication?: The paper is not proposing any new addition to the existing literature. The paper discusses a case relating to the supply chain performance of a shipyard. So, the replicability of the results is limited. Although the authors applied SCOR metrics, they failed to highlight the novelty of the work.

Our response: Thank you for your constructive comments. We have already added a new section, which is Section 2.4, for further explain about the novelty of the new method we proposed in this study. We basically added 2 different SCOR metrics to be suitably used in

the traditional shipbuilding industry, they are SPI (Schedule Performance Index) and CPI (Cost Performance Index). We also discussed some of metrics in SCOR that cannot be used for the performance measurement of traditional shipyard in Section 4.1.2. Finally, our proposed metrics can be used to measure the performance in other traditional shipyard as well.

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 references seem to be limited. The cited references are more general and authors try to relate these references to the topic of discussion.

Our Response: Thank you for your valuable comments. We have revised this case by adding more relevant papers in Section 2.3, highlighted in blue. We also have narrowed the scope of reference paper into Engineering-to-Order (ETO) project, since this type of project is most likely in line with the shipbuilding project. As for the supply chain performance measurement, we have added two different tables regarding: 1) the measurement of supply chain performance (SCP) in Table II and 2) the supply chain operations reference (SCOR) model implementation in ETO project in Table III. If we only input the paper which has “shipbuilding” as the research’s object, there will be not much paper to be referred, particularly the traditional shipbuilding industry.

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 manuscript can improve the analysis by including different levels of SCOR metrics. So that, the authors can identifies the root problem and able to suggest the improvements.

Our response: : Many thanks for your constructive comments. We have revised it accordingly. Please see the manuscript changes highlighted in blue. Different levels of SCOR metrics have been analysed more deeply in Section 4.1.2 (level 1), 4.1.3 (level 2), 4.1.4 (level 3). Based on analysis, the biggest gap and opportunities are Cost of Goods (in Table V), which showed that the shipyard spent more production costs. We have added root cause analysis using fishbone in Section 4.1.4 consist of 6 categories, these are man, machine, material, method, measurement and environment. Furthermore, we also suggest some improvements of dominant problems in Section 4.1.4 (in Table X).

4. Results: Are results presented clearly and analysed appropriately? Do the conclusions adequately tie together the other elements of the paper?: Result has presented poorly. The analysis is limited to a comparison with a benchmarking SCORE matrix. The authors failed to identify the root problem. A thorough discussion of the result is recommended. The statement given in page number 11 (line 11 -16) is as follows: “Moreover, the relationship between the owner of the shipyard and the customer is close enough, so that contracts are only made based on the principle of trust in each other. Besides, the limitation of dockyard and manufacturing devices, and slow regeneration of human capital are other barriers to fulfill the customer order”. More justification needed for this statement.

Our response: : Many thanks for your valuable comments. We have revised it accordingly. Please see the manuscript changes highlighted in blue. SCOR metrics has been analysed more deeply in Section 4.1.2; 4.1.3; 4.14. Based on analysis, the biggest gap and opportunities performance is Cost of goods sales (in Table V). We have added fishbone to analyse root cause in Figure in 6 consist of 6 categories, these are man, machine, material, method, measurement and environment. Further discussion related root cause has been added in Section 4.1.4.

Furthermore, we have discussed about the statement “**Moreover, the relationship between the owner of the shipyard and the customer is close enough, so that contracts are only made based on the principle of trust in each other**” and we decided to move that statement into delivery

performance metric because that reason more in line with delivery performance metric in page 21. The justification already made for the statement "**besides, the limitation of dockyard and manufacturing devices, and slow regeneration of human capital are other barriers to fulfil the customer order**" In page 21.

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?: Recommend to include implications for theory and implications for practice.

Our Response: [Thank you for the constructive comments. We have already added new section to concisely explain about the practical and theoretical implications in Section 5.](#)

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.: Novelty and contribution of the manuscript is questionable. Also, the paper is poorly written. Typo and grammatical errors found in the manuscript. Some instances are given here: Page 5 lines 43-52 (recommended to rephrase the statement); page 6 lines 13-14 (rephrase the sentence); Page8 line 29 (typo error); Page no. 9 line 5 (rephrase the sentence); Page 10 lines 22, 26 (typo error); Page 10 lines 44-48 (rephrase the sentence)

Our response: [Thank you for the constructive comments. The novelty and contribution have been clearly stated on the comment' response in number one. In addition, the grammatical error have been corrected.](#)

DEADLINE: 11-Mar-2021

To go straight to your paper click this link: *** PLEASE NOTE: This is a two-step process. After clicking on the link, you will be directed to a webpage to confirm. ***

https://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/bij?URL_MASK=dd2c01720f504e6aa21fa942bf72c6ae

Date Sent:

11-Dec-2020

From: agunasekaran@csb.edu
To: weehm@cycu.edu.tw
CC:
Subject: Benchmarking: an International Journal - Decision on Manuscript ID BIJ-05-2020-0232.R1
Body: 03-Apr-2021

Dear Prof. Wee:

Manuscript ID BIJ-05-2020-0232.R1 entitled "Supply Chain Performance at Traditional Shipyard in Indonesia" which you submitted to the Benchmarking: an International Journal, 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 minor 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/bij> 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 Benchmarking: an International Journal, 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.

Please note that Emerald requires you to clear permission to re-use any material not created by you. If there are permissions outstanding, please upload these when you submit your revision. Emerald is unable to publish your paper with permissions outstanding.

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/

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 Benchmarking: an International Journal and I look forward to receiving your revision.

Sincerely,
Prof. Angappa Gunasekaran
Editor, Benchmarking: an International Journal
agunasekaran@csub.edu

Associate Editor and Reviewer(s)' Comments to Author:

Associate Editor
Comments to Author:
AE

I have received one report. After careful review, I believe this is an excellent read from the practitioners perspective. **However, I suggest authors to review some recent works published in the BIJ on SCM performance measures. Currently literature review is old and doesn't help readers to understand how emerging technologies have influences SCM measures.**

Reviewer: 1

Recommendation: Minor Revision

Comments:

Dear Authors.

Thank you for the revision.

I have completed my evaluation of the manuscript ID BIJ-05-2020-0232.R1, titled: Supply Chain Performance at Traditional Shipyard in Indonesia. After reviewing both versions of the manuscript along with the response sheet, I have made my comments as detailed. Overall, the authors have done a good job in revising the manuscript appropriately. However, I wish the authors could still revise the abstract according to my suggestion to appear better for readers. I recommend accepting the manuscript following a minor revision. Thank you.

Additional Questions:

1. Originality: Does the paper contain new and significant information adequate to justify publication?: Yes the revised paper looks good in terms of clarity and originality. Authors have addressed critical comments that are raised during the previous round of review. My only concern remains on the abstract. **The abstract should be improved in terms of clearly pointing the research design and the process employed. Likewise, in the abstract the major findings should be clearly shown for readers. I am not convinced the current design of abstract.**

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?: Yes the revised paper demonstrated sufficient discussion on previous literature on ship building process and the SCOR indicators. Length and depth of supply chain performance literature has been studied to justify the demonstration. Missing articles have been cited in this revised submission.

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 revised paper very much better in terms of methodology. Authors have improved the SCOR model level 1-3 by means of adding new figures and discussions. They are rightly designed.

4. Results: Are results presented clearly and analysed appropriately? Do the conclusions adequately tie together the other elements of the paper?: Yes results are adequately discussed in this revised version. I have no further comments for the authors.

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?: Yes the revised version seems to be consistent with the findings and conclusions. Should be fine.

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.: Quality of communication has been improved. Errors and Jargons have been rectified. This version is acceptable after improving the abstract as indicated above.

DEADLINE: 17-Apr-2021

To go straight to your paper click this link: *** PLEASE NOTE: This is a two-step process. After clicking on the link, you will be directed to a webpage to confirm. ***

https://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/bij?URL_MASK=4c75b3034535438780653b721366e5b7

Date Sent: 03-Apr-2021

Our responses to the Associate Editor and Reviewer(s)' Comments:

Comments from Associate Editor:

I have received one report. After careful review, I believe this is an excellent read from the practitioners' perspective. However, I suggest authors to review some recent works published in the BIJ on SCM performance measures. Currently literature review is old and doesn't help readers to understand how emerging technologies have influences SCM measures.

Our Response: We appreciate the AE you for the encouraging comments. We have added several recent and relevant articles from the *Benchmarking: An International Journals* for year 2010-2021.

Comments from Reviewer#1

Recommendation: Minor Revision

Comments:

Dear Authors.

Thank you for the revision.

I have completed my evaluation of the manuscript ID BIJ-05-2020-0232.R1, titled: Supply Chain Performance at Traditional Shipyard in Indonesia. After reviewing both versions of the manuscript along with the response sheet, I have made my comments as detailed. Overall, the authors have done a good job in revising the manuscript appropriately. However, I wish the authors could still revise the abstract according to my suggestion to appear better for readers. I recommend accepting the manuscript following a minor revision. Thank you.

Additional Questions:

1. Originality: Does the paper contain new and significant information adequate to justify publication?: Yes the revised paper looks good in terms of clarity and originality. Authors have addressed critical comments that are raised during the previous round of review. My only concern remains on the abstract. The abstract should be improved in terms of clearly pointing the research design and the process employed. Likewise, in the abstract the major findings should be clearly shown for readers. I am not convinced the current design of abstract.

Our Response: Thank you for the positive comments. We have revised our abstract to describe the research design, the process and the major findings of the paper.

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?: Yes the revised paper demonstrated sufficient discussion on previous literature on ship building

process and the SCOR indicators. Length and depth of supply chain performance literature has been studied to justify the demonstration. Missing articles have been cited in this revised submission.

Our Response: Thank you for the encouraging comments.

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 revised paper very much better in terms of methodology. Authors have improved the SCOR model level 1-3 by means of adding new figures and discussions. They are rightly designed.

Our response: Thank you for your positive comments.

4. Results: Are results presented clearly and analysed appropriately? Do the conclusions adequately tie together the other elements of the paper?: Yes results are adequately discussed in this revised version. I have no further comments for the authors.

Our response: Thank you for your valuable comments.

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?: Yes the revised version seems to be consistent with the findings and conclusions. Should be fine.

Our response: Thank you for your positive comments.

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.: Quality of communication has been improved. Errors and Jargons have been rectified. This version is acceptable after improving the abstract as indicated above.

Our response: Thank you for your constructive comments. Our abstract has been revised according to the reviewer's suggestions.

Copyright Transfer Agreement

The transfer of copyright for the Work from author to publisher must be clearly stated to enable the publisher to assure maximum dissemination of the work. Therefore, the following agreement (hereafter known as the "Agreement"), executed and signed by the author, is required with each manuscript submission.

Emerald Publishing Ltd, subsequently referred to as "Emerald", recommends that you keep a copy of this completed form for reference purposes. Emerald is unable to publish your work until a completed and signed copyright transfer agreement has been received.

Journal Title
(hereafter known as the "Journal"):

Benchmarking: an International Journal

Article Title
(hereafter known as the "Work"):

Supply chain performance for a traditional shipbuilding industry in Indonesia

Title	Dr.	
Name	Yugowati	Praharsi
Job Title	LECTURER	
Organisation	Shipbuilding Institute of Polytechnic Surabaya	Business Management
Address	Jl. Teknik Kimia, Kampus ITS, Sukolilo, Surabaya 60111	
Address		
County/State	Surabaya	
Country	Indonesia	60111
Telephone		Fax
Email	yugowati@ppns.ac.id	

All author names Praharsi, Yugowati; Jami'in, Mohammad Abu; Suhardjito, Gaguk; Reong, Samuel; wee, hui ming

All author email addresses yugowati@ppns.ac.id, jammysby@gmail.com, gaguksh@gmail.com, g10874501@cycu.edu.tw, weehm@cycu.edu.tw

In consideration of **Emerald** agreeing to consider the above-named previously unpublished original Work for publication (both parties agree that such consideration shall be deemed sufficient), I/We, by signing this form hereby assign worldwide copyright of the Work in all forms and media (whether now known, or hereafter developed), in all languages for the full term of copyright and all extensions and renewals thereof.

I/We understand that **Emerald** will act on my/our behalf to publish, reproduce, distribute and transmit the

Work and will authorise other reputable third parties (such as document delivery services) to do the same, ensuring access to and maximum dissemination of the Work.

Licence to Author: **Emerald** grants to Author a non-exclusive licence to use and reproduce in printed form all or part of the Work (after first publication by the Journal): as photocopies for an Author's use for classroom teaching to be distributed to students free of charge, and in any literary work written or edited by the Author. This licence is granted providing that all such copies include full attribution to the Journal and the appropriate copyright line. For further information about additional Author rights, please see [Emerald's Author Charter](#).

Authors submitting articles to **Emerald** warrant the following:

- I/We have the full power and authority to enter into and execute this Agreement and to convey the rights granted herein.
- The Work is an original work which I/We have created independently. It has not been published before in its current or a substantially similar form. Please refer to [Emerald's Originality Guidelines](#)
- The Work is not currently being considered for publication by any other journal or publication and will not be submitted for such review while under review by the Journal.
- Subject to the use of any third party rights where consents have been obtained in accordance with the paragraph below, I/We own all intellectual property rights vesting in the Work.
- If third party material has been used in the Work, I/We have obtained the necessary permission from the copyright holder/s to reproduce in the Work, in all media in all countries, and transmit via all reputable third parties, any such materials including tables, figures and photographs not owned by me/us (Please upload any permissions documents.).
- The Work does not contain any unlawful statements, does not infringe any existing copyright or violate any proprietary rights, rights of privacy or publicity, or any other rights of any third party. "Proof of consent" has been obtained for studies of named organisations and people (Please upload any evidence).
- All authors have received a final version of the Work, take responsibility for the content, agree to its publication and the order of authors listed on the paper.
- Anyone who has made a significant contribution to the research and the Work has been listed as an author. Minor contributors have been noted in the Acknowledgements section.
- I/We have declared any potential conflict of interest in the research. Any support from a third party has been noted in the Acknowledgements.
- I/We have read and adhered to the Journal author guidelines.
- I/We will not permit others to electronically gather or harvest and save to a separate server my/our Work.

I/We assert my/our moral rights to be identified as the author/s of the Work, in accordance with sections 77 and 78 of the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988. I/We acknowledge that **Emerald** will ensure fair and faithful representation of my/our Work in all media and will take the necessary steps to protect the Work from unlawful copying.

I/We indemnify and shall keep **Emerald** Group Publishing indemnified against any loss, expense, injury or damage (including any legal costs and disbursements paid by them to compromise or settle any claim) howsoever caused incurred by **Emerald** directly or indirectly as a result of a breach of the above warranties.

✓ req By clicking here you agree to the terms and conditions detailed above

req

Dat 10-May-2021

e