[SO] Submission Acknowledgement: 12489

3 messages

Tamás KOLTAI <social@pp.bme.hu>   Fri, May 11, 2018 at 8:30 PM
To: Miguel Angel Padilla Esquivias <miguel@feb.unair.ac.id>

Dear Miguel Angel Padilla Esquivias:

Thank you for submitting the manuscript, "Indonesia Industrial Productivity Growth: Evidence of Reindustrialization or deindustrialization?" to Periodica Polytechnica Social and Management Sciences. With the online journal management system that we are using, you will be able to track its progress through the editorial process by logging in to the journal web site:

Manuscript URL: https://pp.bme.hu/so/authorDashboard/submission/12489
Username: mesquivias

If you have any questions, please contact me. Thank you for considering this journal as a venue for your work.

Tamás KOLTAI

_____

Periodica Polytechnica Social and Management Sciences
https://pp.bme.hu/so

Miguel Angel <miguel@feb.unair.ac.id>   Fri, May 11, 2018 at 10:31 PM
To: Lilik Sugiharti <lilik.soegiyono@gmail.com>

Submission ke Journal Periodica Polytechnica Social and Management Sciences
https://pp.bme.hu/so
[Quoted text hidden]

Lilik Sugiharti <lilik.soegiyono@gmail.com>   Sun, May 13, 2018 at 4:55 PM
To: Miguel Angel <miguel@feb.unair.ac.id>

Thank you so much Miguel...😃
[Quoted text hidden]
--
Lilik Sugiharti
Department of Economics
Faculty of Economics and Business, Universitas Airlangga
Airlangga 4-6 Surabaya, Indonesia-60286

[SO] Editor Decision: 12489

5 messages

Mr. András Nemeslaki <nemeslaki.andras@gmail.com>   Sat, Apr 27, 2019 at 1:59 AM
To: Miguel Angel Padilla Esquivias <miguel@feb.unair.ac.id>, Lilik Sugiharti <lilik-s@feb.unair.ac.id>, Martha Ranggi Primanthi <martharanggi.primanthi@gmail.com>, Djoko Mursinto <djoko-m@feb.unair.ac.id>

Dear Miguel Angel Padilla Esquivias, Lilik Sugiharti, Martha Ranggi Primanthi, Djoko Mursinto,

We have reached a decision regarding your submission to Periodica Polytechnica Social and Management Sciences, "Indonesia Industrial Productivity Growth: Evidence of Reindustrialization or deindustrialization?".

Our decision is to: **Revisions are required**

This means that we ask you to carefully consider the reviewers' remarks, modify the paper accordingly, and then upload a revision.

Please go to the **Review page** of your paper. Scrolling down you can find the **Revisions** section where you are supposed to press the **Upload File**.

Please upload
1) the revised version of the paper;
2) the revised version of the paper with the changes tracked;
3) a document that answers point-by-point to the reviewers' comments.

Please do not use the Discussion section to upload your files.

If you are willing to do the required revision, please do it within 4 weeks. Should you not be able to finish the revision in this time, please email us as soon as possible, otherwise we assume that you have withdrawn your paper.

Best regards

Mr. András Nemeslaki
Technical University of Budapest
Phone +36-30-600-7314
nemeslaki.andras@gmail.com

Andras Nemeslaki

Reviewer A:

In which category would you place the paper? Please tick relevant boxes.

a) Reporting advances in

- Application

b) Presenting a

- General survey

c) Presenting information in the form of

- Other

Does the title accurately describe the content of the paper?

The article is rather attention-catching than professionally well-defined but it duly refers to the productivity analysis in the industry sector the paper indeed delivers. It does not reveal, however, the micro or sectoral approach of the paper and the method used.

How relevant is the paper to practical problems?

It is relevant from the point of you of the structural change of emerging economies and helps understand how productive factors contibute to production in different industries and company segments and what role technology plays in the various industrial branches.

What is its potential usefulness in practice?

The method the paper applies is a TFP decomposition (stochastic frontier analisys) based on a Hicks-neutral production function. It can be adopted for the analyisis of national economies, industries and industry branches. The authors of the paper further break down the data into different firm size categories, and according to labour and capital intensity, location and technology intensity which means that the method can be used for a multifaceted examination. In addition, the paper concludes with policy advice to government decision-makers.

Is this a new and original contribution?

As the paper suggests there have been research efforts in the field of TFP growth in manufacturing in South East Asien countries and Indonesia, these examinations, however, date back to the beginning of the 90's or the beginning of the 2000's (e.g. Viel (2006), Surjngsih-Permono (2014), Margono et al. (2011), Saliola and Seker (2011)) or do not segment the data into labour and capital intensity, etc. but only differenitate according to ownership, location and size (like Margono and Sharma (2006)). With the analysis of the paper covering the period between 2007 and 2013 and using a wide range of segmentation criteria the novelty of the paper seems to be underpinned.

It is clearly presented?

The authors do not refer to the novelty of the paper directly but give an overview of research precedents.

Are there any errors of fact or logic?

The paper gives a detailed description ont he methodology used (production functon and it components and decomposition), however there is no explanation about the statistical method used (OLS or Maximum Likelihood etc.). It is not clear either how the stochasticiity is to be interpreted and how technical efficiency is measured as stochastic variable. The analysis has two parts: in the first part the contribution of inputs is explained and in the second the TFP decomposition. Why does it need to be discovered by the reader? The authors should point to this separation themselves.
Some detailed remarks:
In equation 9 the input growth variables (

Should the text be concensed or expanded? If YES please suggest alterations.

Apart from the above shortcomings the paper has an adequate length in my judgement.

Are the examples, illustrations and tables all necessary and acceptable?

In line with the paper's character, it does not contain diagrams of graphs but tables summarising regression results. The tables are adequate to show the most important regression coefficient but the formatting is not adequate as they are too close to each other. In addition, the second lines in Table1 are not entitles, probably they contain standard deviation data.

Do you consider any part of the paper would be better presendet in Appendices?

The sentence beginning with the word Notes on page six with the explanation of what particular variables denote should be placed under a table in Appendix and not in the middle of the text.

Are the references adequate and are they all necessary? Does the paper make adequate reference to earlier material in the Periodica Polytechnica?

The references are adequate and the literature is well selected. There are maybe less papers from the last couple of years than from earlier years. There is no referece to earlier material in the Periodica Polytechnica as the earlier paper did not discuss stochastic frontier analysis but Leontief production functions and an industry level analysis of technology was used previously in an innovation analysis of Czech SMEs. But the above mentioned papers do not relate closely to the current paper under review.

Is the summary and/or abstract informative?

Both the summary and abstract are informative but the asbtract seems to contain a factual mistake stating that TFP in Indonesia is negative. It is probably TFP growth that is negative but TFP should not.

Please list any other general comments or specific suggestion.

As I noted it earlier, the statistical methodology need further explanation. And some grammatical revisions are also necessary. Please find attached a list of some detailed remarks.

_____

Miguel Angel <miguel@feb.unair.ac.id>   Sat, Apr 27, 2019 at 2:05 AM
To: Lilik Sugiharti <lilik.soegiyono@gmail.com>

Hi bu, We need to revise the paper... let's try to do it carefully so we can finally make it

Dr. Miguel Angel Esquivias Padilla
Universitas Airlangga
Faculty of Business and Economics
Campus B, Jl. Airlangga No. 4 Surabaya-Indonesia
Telp. +6231-5033642, Fax +6231-5026288
miguel@feb.unair.ac.id
http://feb.unair.ac.id/

[Quoted text hidden]

Miguel Angel <miguel@feb.unair.ac.id>   Thu, May 16, 2019 at 4:56 AM

To: "Mr. András Nemeslaki" <nemeslaki.andras@gmail.com>
Cc: Lilik Sugiharti <lilik-s@feb.unair.ac.id>, Martha Ranggi Primanthi <martharanggi.primanthi@gmail.com>, Djoko Mursinto <djoko-m@feb.unair.ac.id>

Dear Mr Andras Nemeslaki,

Greetings from Indonesia. I have just submitted a revised version of my manuscript to the system including the three required documents, plus supplementary data. Shall I wait for Submission of revised version Acknowledgement from the Journal, or it is enough for me to upload the files?

Thank you very much for your support.

Dr. Miguel Angel Esquivias Padilla
Universitas Airlangga
Faculty of Business and Economics
Campus B, Jl. Airlangga No. 4 Surabaya-Indonesia
Telp. +6231-5033642, Fax +6231-5026288
miguel@feb.unair.ac.id
http://feb.unair.ac.id/

[Quoted text hidden]

Mail Delivery Subsystem <mailer-daemon@googlemail.com>   Thu, May 16, 2019 at 4:56 AM
To: miguel@feb.unair.ac.id

Address not found

Your message wasn't delivered to **lilik-s@feb.unair.ac.id** because the address couldn't be found, or is unable to receive mail.

LEARN MORE

The response was:

```
550 5.1.1 The email account that you tried to reach does not exist. Please try
double-checking the recipient's email address for typos or unnecessary spaces.
Learn more at https://support.google.com/mail/?p=NoSuchUser o16sor2336487vsp.51 - gsmtp
```

Final-Recipient: rfc822; lilik-s@feb.unair.ac.id
Action: failed
Status: 5.1.1
Diagnostic-Code: smtp; 550-5.1.1 The email account that you tried to reach does not exist. Please try
 550-5.1.1 double-checking the recipient's email address for typos or
 550-5.1.1 unnecessary spaces. Learn more at
 550 5.1.1 https://support.google.com/mail/?p=NoSuchUser o16sor2336487vsp.51 - gsmtp
Last-Attempt-Date: Thu, 16 May 2019 03:56:35 -0700 (PDT)

---------- Forwarded message ----------
From: Miguel Angel <miguel@feb.unair.ac.id>
To: "Mr. András Nemeslaki" <nemeslaki.andras@gmail.com>
Cc: Lilik Sugiharti <lilik-s@feb.unair.ac.id>, Martha Ranggi Primanthi <martharanggi.primanthi@gmail.com>, Djoko
Mursinto <djoko-m@feb.unair.ac.id>
Bcc:
Date: Thu, 16 May 2019 17:56:23 +0700
Subject: Re: [SO] Editor Decision: 12489
Dear Mr Andras Nemeslaki,

Greetings from Indonesia. I have just submitted a revised version of my
manuscript to the system including the three required documents, plus
supplementary data. Shall I wait for Submission of revised version
Acknowledgement from the Journal, or it is enough for me to upload the
files?

Thank you very much for your support.

Dr. Miguel Angel Esquivias Padilla
Universitas Airlangga <http://unair.ac.id/>
Faculty of Business and Economics <http://feb.unair.ac.id/>
Campus B, Jl. Airlangga No. 4 Surabaya-Indonesia
Telp. +6231-5033642, Fax +6231-5026288
miguel@feb.unair.ac.id
http://feb.unair.ac.id/

On Sat, Apr 27, 2019 at 2:59 PM Mr. András Nemeslaki <
nemeslaki.andras@gmail.com> wrote:

> Dear Miguel Angel Padilla Esquivias, Lilik Sugiharti, Martha Ranggi
> Primanthi, Djoko Mursinto,
>
> We have reached a decision regarding your submission to Periodica
> Polytechnica Social and Management Sciences, "Indonesia Industrial
> Productivity Growth: Evidence of Reindustrialization or
> deindustrialization?".
>
> Our decision is to: *Revisions are required*
>
> This means that we ask you to carefully consider the reviewers' remarks,
> modify the paper accordingly, and then upload a revision.
>
> Please go to the *Review page* of your paper. Scrolling down you can find
> the *Revisions* section where you are supposed to press the *Upload File*.
>
>
>

> In which category would you place the paper? Please tick relevant boxes.
>
> a) Reporting advances in
>
>   - Application
>
>
> b) Presenting a
>
>   - General survey
>
>
> c) Presenting information in the form of
>
>   - Other
>
>
> Does the title accurately describe the content of the paper?
>
> The article is rather attention-catching than professionally well-defined
> but it duly refers to the productivity analysis in the industry sector the
> paper indeed delivers. It does not reveal, however, the micro or sectoral
> approach of the paper and the method used.
>
> How relevant is the paper to practical problems?
>
> It is relevant from the point of you of the structural change of emerging
> economies and helps understand how productive factors contibute to
> production in different industries and company segments and what role
> technology plays in the various industrial branches.
>

> What is its potential usefulness in practice?
>
> The method the paper applies is a TFP decomposition (stochastic frontier
> analisys) based on a Hicks-neutral production function. It can be adopted
> for the analyisis of national economies, industries and industry branches.
> The authors of the paper further break down the data into different firm
> size categories, and according to labour and capital intensity, location
> and technology intensity which means that the method can be used for a
> multifaceted examination. In addition, the paper concludes with policy
> advice to government decision-makers.
>
> Is this a new and original contribution?
>
> As the paper suggests there have been research efforts in the
----- Message truncated -----

Mail Delivery Subsystem <mailer-daemon@googlemail.com>   Thu, May 16, 2019 at 4:56 AM
To: miguel@feb.unair.ac.id

Address not found

Your message wasn't delivered to **djoko-m@feb.unair.ac.id**
because the address couldn't be found, or is unable to receive
mail.

LEARN MORE

The response was:

```
550 5.1.1 The email account that you tried to reach does not exist. Please try
double-checking the recipient's email address for typos or unnecessary spaces.
Learn more at https://support.google.com/mail/?p=NoSuchUser z3sor2348437vsp.22 - gsmtp
```

Final-Recipient: rfc822; djoko-m@feb.unair.ac.id
Action: failed
Status: 5.1.1
Diagnostic-Code: smtp; 550-5.1.1 The email account that you tried to reach does not exist. Please try
 550-5.1.1 double-checking the recipient's email address for typos or
 550-5.1.1 unnecessary spaces. Learn more at
 550 5.1.1 https://support.google.com/mail/?p=NoSuchUser z3sor2348437vsp.22 - gsmtp
Last-Attempt-Date: Thu, 16 May 2019 03:56:35 -0700 (PDT)

---------- Forwarded message ----------
From: Miguel Angel <miguel@feb.unair.ac.id>
To: "Mr. András Nemeslaki" <nemeslaki.andras@gmail.com>
Cc: Lilik Sugiharti <lilik-s@feb.unair.ac.id>, Martha Ranggi Primanthi <martharanggi.primanthi@gmail.com>, Djoko
Mursinto <djoko-m@feb.unair.ac.id>

Bcc:
Date: Thu, 16 May 2019 17:56:23 +0700
Subject: Re: [SO] Editor Decision: 12489
Dear Mr Andras Nemeslaki,

Greetings from Indonesia. I have just submitted a revised version of my manuscript to the system including the three required documents, plus supplementary data. Shall I wait for Submission of revised version Acknowledgement from the Journal, or it is enough for me to upload the files?

Thank you very much for your support.

Dr. Miguel Angel Esquivias Padilla
Universitas Airlangga <http://unair.ac.id/>
Faculty of Business and Economics <http://feb.unair.ac.id/>
Campus B, Jl. Airlangga No. 4 Surabaya-Indonesia
Telp. +6231-5033642, Fax +6231-5026288
miguel@feb.unair.ac.id
http://feb.unair.ac.id/

On Sat, Apr 27, 2019 at 2:59 PM Mr. András Nemeslaki < nemeslaki.andras@gmail.com> wrote:

> Dear Miguel Angel Padilla Esquivias, Lilik Sugiharti, Martha Ranggi
> Primanthi, Djoko Mursinto,
>
> We have reached a decision regarding your submission to Periodica
> Polytechnica Social and Management Sciences, "Indonesia Industrial
> Productivity Growth: Evidence of Reindustrialization or
> deindustrialization?".
>
> Our decision is to: *Revisions are required*
>
> This means that we ask you to carefully consider the reviewers' remarks,
> modify the paper accordingly, and then upload a revision.
>
> Please go to the *Review page* of your paper. Scrolling down you can find
> the *Revisions* section where you are supposed to press the *Upload File*.
>
>
>
>
> Please upload
>
> 1) the revised version of the paper;
>
> 2) the revised version of the paper with the changes tracked;
>
> 3) a document that answers point-by-point to the reviewers' comments.
>
> Please do not use the Discussion section to upload your files.
>
> *If you are willing to do the required revision, please do it within 4
> weeks.* Should you not be able to finish the revision in this time,
> please email us as soon as possible, otherwise we assume that you have
> withdrawn your paper.
>
> Best regards
>
> Mr. András Nemeslaki
> Technical University of Budapest

> Phone +36-30-600-7314
> nemeslaki.andras@gmail.com
>
>
>
> Andras Nemeslaki
>
>
>
> --
> Reviewer A:
>
> --
>
> In which category would you place the paper? Please tick relevant boxes.
>
> a) Reporting advances in
>
>   - Application
>
>
> b) Presenting a
>
>   - General survey
>
>
> c) Presenting information in the form of
>
>   - Other
>
>
> Does the title accurately describe the content of the paper?
>
> The article is rather attention-catching than professionally well-defined
> but it duly refers to the productivity analysis in the industry sector the
> paper indeed delivers. It does not reveal, however, the micro or sectoral
> approach of the paper and the method used.
>
> How relevant is the paper to practical problems?
>
> It is relevant from the point of you of the structural change of emerging
> economies and helps understand how productive factors contibute to
> production in different industries and company segments and what role
> technology plays in the various industrial branches.
>
> What is its potential usefulness in practice?
>
> The method the paper applies is a TFP decomposition (stochastic frontier
> analisys) based on a Hicks-neutral production function. It can be adopted
> for the analyisis of national economies, industries and industry branches.
> The authors of the paper further break down the data into different firm
> size categories, and according to labour and capital intensity, location
> and technology intensity which means that the method can be used for a
> multifaceted examination. In addition, the paper concludes with policy
> advice to government decision-makers.
>
> Is this a new and original contribution?
>
> As the paper suggests there have been research efforts in the
----- Message truncated -----

[SO] Editor Decision: 12489

3 messages

Mr. András Nemeslaki <nemeslaki.andras@gmail.com>   Mon, Jun 10, 2019 at 2:05 AM
To: Miguel Angel Padilla Esquivias <miguel@feb.unair.ac.id>, Lilik Sugiharti <sugiharti.lilik@feb.unair.ac.id>, Martha Ranggi Primanthi <martharanggi.primanthi@gmail.com>, Djoko Mursinto <djoko-m@feb.unair.ac.id>

Dear Miguel Angel Padilla Esquivias, Lilik Sugiharti, Martha Ranggi Primanthi, Djoko Mursinto,

We have reached a decision regarding your submission to Periodica Polytechnica Social and Management Sciences, "Indonesia Industrial Productivity Growth: Evidence of Reindustrialization or deindustrialization?".

Our decision is: **Accept Submission on condition that the final version meets formal requirements**

Please upload your paper in final form. **The final version is due within 4 weeks.** Should you not be able to meet this deadline, please contact us as soon as possible. Otherwise, we assume that the paper is withdrawn. By uploading the final version, you declare that this paper has not been and will not be submitted to other journals or conferences for publication.

Here is an **MS Word Template**, **sample file** and **description** for preparing the final version of the manuscript. When the final version is ready, please login the on-line journal system and select the mentioned paper by clicking on its author name/title. The program will open the Copyediting page where you should start the Copyediting Discussions by clicking on the Add discussion link. The files of the final version should be attached to this discussion by clicking on the Upload File link. The Message body should explain the roles of attached files. We expect an Article text source prepared with this **MS Word Template**. **Figures should be uploaded as separate files and the text source should not embed them. However, the text source should clearly identify where figures are to be inserted by our copy editor.**

We also require an Article text PDF file to show the final outlook of the paper. This PDF file is used only for checking the typesetting.

Please follow the instructions very carefully to make the final typesetting easy and error free. Should the submitted final version not meet the requirements stated here, we shall ask revision and may reject the publication of your paper even in this phase of the procedure.

ILLUSTRATIONS

Figures should be uploaded in separate files. **Bitmap images are expected in jpg, png, gif or tiff formats, vector graphics in eps or pdf formats**. Please do not create line drawings with the built-in features of Microsoft.

It is essential that the bitmap images have sufficient resolution to allow faithful reproduction (**300 dpi or more**). To determine the optimum resolution (width x height) of an image, measure the width and height as it appears in your document (in millimeters), and then multiply those two values by 12. For example, a square image of 80 mm wide, i.e. having the width of a single column, the optimal size is about 1000 x 1000 pixel resolution and should be at least 600 x 600.

The dimensions of the figures have strict limitations: the *maximum width* of them in a column is 89.5 mm, the maximum width for a two-column picture is 183 mm, and for a wide picture with side-caption is 120 mm. So try to keep lettering in a figure resized for the manuscript in a readable but moderate size (ideally equivalent to 8-10 pt).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bibliography (References) should be complete. Each item must have proper and not misunderstandable data (see the sample Word file or its PDF version for examples). Please *add the DOI number* or URL of a full-text version if it exists. The DOI of journal papers can be found in page http://www.crossref.org/SimpleTextQuery/ (you need to register first). DOIs must be given for conference papers, too.

The bibliography style for Mendeley users:

Our Copy Editor will check all figure and bibliography requirements and lets typesetting start only when all of them are met. The precise preparation of your final version speeds up the publication of your paper.

As soon as typesetting is ready, you will be asked to check it within a few days. Then, your paper will appear in the "online first" section of the journal and will immediately receive a DOI.

Thanks for your cooperation and best regards
Mr. András Nemeslaki
Technical University of Budapest
Phone +36-30-600-7314
nemeslaki.andras@gmail.com

Andras Nemeslaki

Reviewer A:

In which category would you place the paper? Please tick relevant boxes.

a) Reporting advances in

- Application

b) Presenting a

- General survey

c) Presenting information in the form of

- Other

Does the title accurately describe the content of the paper?

> The titile is rather attention-catching than professionally well-defined but it duly refers to the productivity analysis in the industry sector the paper indeed delivers.

How relevant is the paper to practical problems?

> It is relevant from the point of you of the structural change of emerging economies and helps understand how productive factors contribute to production in different industries and company segments and what role technology plays in the various industrial branches.

What is its potential usefulness in practice?

> The method the paper applies is a TFP decomposition (stochastic frontier analisys) based on a Hicks-neutral production function. It can be adopted for the analyisis of national economies, industries and industry branches. The authors of the paper further break down the data into different firm size categories, and according to labour and capital intensity, location and technology intensity which means that the method can be used for a multifaceted examination. In addition, the paper concludes with policy advice to government decision-makers.

Is this a new and original contribution?

> In the second version of the paper the authors underline the novelty of the paper even better by stating that "previous studies of manufacturing in Indonesia mainly differentiate firms by industry, size, location, and ownership, not covering tech groups, nor grouping firms at input intensity, or

evaluating the role inputs place in cost of production".

It is clearly presented?

As mentioned above the authors insertes additional references to the novelty of the paper.

Are there any errors of fact or logic?

In the first version there was some gap in the explanation of the statistical methodology and the content of certain variables, but the authors made up for these shortcomings i the second version of the paper by giving additional information on the Maximum likelihood approach they used and the way technological efficiency is interpreted and incorporated in the production function.

Should the text be concensed or expanded? If YES please suggest alterations.

The paper has adequate length also taking into consideration that the complex statistical analysis the authors apply needs a detailed explanation.

Are the examples, illustrations and tables all necessary and acceptable?

Tables within the text have been reformatted and made clearer.

Do you consider any part of the paper would be better presendet in Appendices?

The tables contained in the text are relevant and two of them are in the appendix which the authors did not want to insert in the main text. I think they could well judge which should be placed in which part.

Are the references adequate and are they all necessary? Does the paper make adequate reference to earlier material in the Periodica Polytechnica?

The references are adequate and the literature is well selected. The references have been suplplemented corresponding to the more detailed methodological expanation. There is no reference to earlier material in the Periodica Polytechnica as the earlier paper did not discuss stochastic frontier analysis but Leontief production functions and an industry level analysis of technology was used previously in an innovation analysis of Czech SMEs. But the above mentioned papers do not relate closely to the current paper under review.

Is the summary and/or abstract informative?

Both the summary and abstract are informative and the abstract was corrected as concerns TFP growth.

Please list any other general comments or specific suggestion.

First of all, I would like to thank to the authors for correcting a lot of grammatical mistakes and methodological deficiencies. The paper is now even mor well elaborated.

However, I would still correct the following sentence:
The output elasticity is estimated as the value of the input at i'th firm in t time (Verbeek, 2008, p. 56): my suggestion is: The output elasticity is estimated as the impact of the change in the value of the input of firm i at time t on output.

And I still do not understand how can factors be in substitution if the coefficient of their interaction is positive. If one is growing the other should be shrinking if there is a substitution or am I wrong? Please give me a short explanation to this wher I am wrong in my way of thinking,

The other point I still do not understand and I would like to get

----

Miguel Angel <miguel@feb.unair.ac.id>   Fri, Jun 21, 2019 at 3:28 AM
To: "Mr. András Nemeslaki" <nemeslaki.andras@gmail.com>

Dear Editor,

Greetings from Indonesia. I hope this email finds you well.

I would like to ask regarding the copyediting process. Nearly 2 weeks ago I submitted the final draft based on the required formats. I suppose it takes time to carry out the typesetting and the copy editing. If there is something else needed from me, I'm ready to do so. If more time is needed is ok, just trying to figure out if all is in Place.

I appreciate the support during all this process

Best regards

Miguel Esquivias
[Quoted text hidden]

Miguel Angel <miguel@feb.unair.ac.id>   Thu, Sep 30, 2021 at 3:40 AM
To: "khoerul mubin M." <mkmubin@feb.unair.ac.id>

---------- Forwarded message ---------
From: **Mr. András Nemeslaki** <nemeslaki.andras@gmail.com>
Date: Mon, Jun 10, 2019 at 3:05 PM
Subject: [SO] Editor Decision: 12489
To: Miguel Angel Padilla Esquivias <miguel@feb.unair.ac.id>, Lilik Sugiharti <sugiharti.lilik@feb.unair.ac.id>, Rudi Purwono, Martha Ranggi Primanthi

Dear Miguel Angel Padilla Esquivias, Lilik Sugiharti, Rudi Purwono, Martha Ranggi Primanthi,

[Quoted text hidden]

[Quoted text hidden]