



Yani Widiarti &lt;muryani@feb.unair.ac.id&gt;

**[Sustainability] Manuscript ID: sustainability-2303202 - Submission Received**

1 pesan

**Editorial Office** <sustainability@mdpi.com>

9 Maret 2023 pukul 19.41

Balas Ke: sustainability@mdpi.com

Kepada: Muryani Muryani &lt;muryani@feb.unair.ac.id&gt;

Cc: Khoirun Nisa' &lt;knisa1412@gmail.com&gt;, Miguel Angel Esquivias &lt;miguel@feb.unair.ac.id&gt;, Siti Hafsa Zulkarnain &lt;siti\_hafsah@uitm.edu.my&gt;

Dear Dr. Muryani,

Thank you very much for uploading the following manuscript to the MDPI submission system. One of our editors will be in touch with you soon.

Journal name: Sustainability

Manuscript ID: sustainability-2303202

Type of manuscript: Article

Title: Strategies to control industrial emissions: An Analytical Network

Process (ANP) approach in East Java, Indonesia

Authors: Muryani Muryani \*, Khoirun Nisa', Miguel Angel Esquivias, Siti Hafsa Zulkarnain

Received: 9 March 2023

E-mails: [muryani@feb.unair.ac.id](mailto:muryani@feb.unair.ac.id), [knisa1412@gmail.com](mailto:knisa1412@gmail.com), [miguel@feb.unair.ac.id](mailto:miguel@feb.unair.ac.id), [siti\\_hafsah@uitm.edu.my](mailto:siti_hafsah@uitm.edu.my)

You can follow progress of your manuscript at the following link (login required):

[https://susy.mdpi.com/user/manuscripts/review\\_info/b4676453a12c18ee15168d2cde397d53](https://susy.mdpi.com/user/manuscripts/review_info/b4676453a12c18ee15168d2cde397d53)

The following points were confirmed during submission:

1. Sustainability is an open access journal with publishing fees of 2200 CHF for an accepted paper (see <https://www.mdpi.com/about/apc/> for details). This manuscript, if accepted, will be published under an open access Creative Commons CC BY license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>), and I agree to pay the Article Processing Charges as described on the journal webpage (<https://www.mdpi.com/journal/sustainability/apc>). See <https://www.mdpi.com/about/openaccess> for more information about open access publishing.

Please note that you may be entitled to a discount if you have previously received a discount code or if your institute is participating in the MDPI Institutional Open Access Program (IOAP), for more information see <https://www.mdpi.com/about/ioap>. If you have been granted any other special discounts for your submission, please contact the Sustainability editorial office.

2. I understand that:

a. If previously published material is reproduced in my manuscript, I will provide proof that I have obtained the necessary copyright permission. (Please refer to the Rights & Permissions website: <https://www.mdpi.com/authors/rights>).

b. My manuscript is submitted on the understanding that it has not been

published in or submitted to another peer-reviewed journal. Exceptions to this rule are papers containing material disclosed at conferences. I confirm that I will inform the journal editorial office if this is the case for my manuscript. I confirm that all authors are familiar with and agree with submission of the contents of the manuscript. The journal editorial office reserves the right to contact all authors to confirm this in case of doubt. I will provide email addresses for all authors and an institutional e-mail address for at least one of the co-authors, and specify the name, address and e-mail for invoicing purposes.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact the Sustainability editorial office at [sustainability@mdpi.com](mailto:sustainability@mdpi.com)

Kind regards,  
Sustainability Editorial Office  
St. Alban-Anlage 66, 4052 Basel, Switzerland  
E-Mail: [sustainability@mdpi.com](mailto:sustainability@mdpi.com)  
Tel. +41 61 683 77 34  
Fax: +41 61 302 89 18

\*\*\* This is an automatically generated email \*\*\*



Yani Widiarti &lt;muryani@feb.unair.ac.id&gt;

**[Sustainability] Manuscript ID: sustainability-2303202 - Major Revisions**

1 pesan

**Sustainability Editorial Office** <sustainability@mdpi.com>

6 April 2023 pukul 11.51

Balas Ke: norval.zhang@mdpi.com

Kepada: Muryani Muryani &lt;muryani@feb.unair.ac.id&gt;

Cc: Khoirun Nisa' &lt;knisa1412@gmail.com&gt;, Miguel Angel Esquivias &lt;miguel@feb.unair.ac.id&gt;, Siti Hafsa Zulkarnain &lt;siti\_hafsah@uitm.edu.my&gt;, Sustainability Editorial Office &lt;sustainability@mdpi.com&gt;

Dear Dr. Muryani,

Thank you again for your manuscript submission:

Manuscript ID: sustainability-2303202

Type of manuscript: Article

Title: Strategies to control industrial emissions: An Analytical Network

Process (ANP) approach in East Java, Indonesia

Authors: Muryani Muryani \*, Khoirun Nisa', Miguel Angel Esquivias, Siti

Hafsah Zulkarnain

Received: 9 March 2023

E-mails: [muryani@feb.unair.ac.id](mailto:muryani@feb.unair.ac.id), [knisa1412@gmail.com](mailto:knisa1412@gmail.com),  
[miguel@feb.unair.ac.id](mailto:miguel@feb.unair.ac.id), [siti\\_hafsah@uitm.edu.my](mailto:siti_hafsah@uitm.edu.my)

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/b4676453a12c18ee15168d2cde397d53>

Please revise the manuscript according to the referees' comments and upload the revised file within 10 days. Please provide detailed and adequate point-by-point responses to all reviewers, especially to Reviewer 3 and 4's comments, which are very negative.

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 appeal.
- (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 native English-speaking colleague.

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,  
Kind regards,  
Mr. Norval Zhang  
E-Mail: [norval.zhang@mdpi.com](mailto:norval.zhang@mdpi.com)

--

MDPI Tianjin Office 170 North Road, Room 1804, Block A, Lujiazui Financial Plaza, Hongqiao District, China

MDPI Sustainability Editorial Office  
St. Alban-Anlage 66, 4052 Basel, Switzerland  
E-Mail: [sustainability@mdpi.com](mailto:sustainability@mdpi.com)  
<http://www.mdpi.com/journal/sustainability>

--

Disclaimer: MDPI recognizes the importance of data privacy and protection. We treat personal data in line with the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) and with what the community expects of us. The information contained in this message is confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you have received this message in error, please notify me and delete this message from your system. You may not copy this message in its entirety or in part, or disclose its contents to anyone.



Yani Widiarti &lt;muryani@feb.unair.ac.id&gt;

**[Sustainability] Manuscript ID: sustainability-2303202 - Manuscript Resubmitted**

1 pesan

**Sustainability Editorial Office** <sustainability@mdpi.com>

14 April 2023 pukul 22.58

Balas Ke: Norval Zhang &lt;norval.zhang@mdpi.com&gt;, Sustainability Editorial Office &lt;sustainability@mdpi.com&gt;

Kepada: Muryani Muryani &lt;muryani@feb.unair.ac.id&gt;

Cc: Khoirun Nisa' &lt;knisa1412@gmail.com&gt;, Miguel Angel Esquivias &lt;miguel@feb.unair.ac.id&gt;, Siti Hafsa Zulkarnain &lt;siti\_hafsah@uitm.edu.my&gt;

Dear Dr. Muryani,

Thank you very much for resubmitting the modified version of the following manuscript:

Manuscript ID: sustainability-2303202

Type of manuscript: Article

Title: Strategies to control industrial emissions: An Analytical Network

Process (ANP) approach in East Java, Indonesia

Authors: Muryani Muryani \*, Khoirun Nisa', Miguel Angel Esquivias, Siti Hafsa Zulkarnain

Received: 9 March 2023

E-mails: [muryani@feb.unair.ac.id](mailto:muryani@feb.unair.ac.id), [knisa1412@gmail.com](mailto:knisa1412@gmail.com), [miguel@feb.unair.ac.id](mailto:miguel@feb.unair.ac.id), [siti\\_hafsah@uitm.edu.my](mailto:siti_hafsah@uitm.edu.my)[https://susy.mdpi.com/user/manuscripts/review\\_info/b4676453a12c18ee15168d2cde397d53](https://susy.mdpi.com/user/manuscripts/review_info/b4676453a12c18ee15168d2cde397d53)

A member of the editorial office will be in touch with you soon regarding progress of the manuscript.

Kind regards,

Sustainability Editorial Office

Postfach, CH-4020 Basel, Switzerland

Office: St. Alban-Anlage 66, CH-4052 Basel

Tel. +41 61 683 77 34 (office)

E-mail: [sustainability@mdpi.com](mailto:sustainability@mdpi.com)<https://www.mdpi.com/journal/sustainability/>

\*\*\* This is an automatically generated email \*\*\*



Yani Widiarti &lt;muryani@feb.unair.ac.id&gt;

## [Sustainability] Manuscript ID: sustainability-2303202 - Accepted for Publication

1 pesan

**Sustainability Editorial Office** <sustainability@mdpi.com>

8 Mei 2023 pukul 08.59

Balas Ke: Norval Zhang &lt;norval.zhang@mdpi.com&gt;, Sustainability Editorial Office &lt;sustainability@mdpi.com&gt;

Kepada: Muryani Muryani &lt;muryani@feb.unair.ac.id&gt;

Cc: Khoirun Nisa' &lt;knisa1412@gmail.com&gt;, Miguel Angel Esquivias &lt;miguel@feb.unair.ac.id&gt;, Siti Hafsa Zulkarnain &lt;siti\_hafsah@uitm.edu.my&gt;, Sustainability Editorial Office &lt;sustainability@mdpi.com&gt;, Norval Zhang &lt;norval.zhang@mdpi.com&gt;

Dear Dr. Muryani,

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

Manuscript ID: sustainability-2303202

Type of manuscript: Article

Title: Strategies to control industrial emissions: An Analytical Network

Process (ANP) approach in East Java, Indonesia

Authors: Muryani Muryani \*, Khoirun Nisa', Miguel Angel Esquivias, Siti

Hafsah Zulkarnain

Received: 9 March 2023

E-mails: [muryani@feb.unair.ac.id](mailto:muryani@feb.unair.ac.id), [knisa1412@gmail.com](mailto:knisa1412@gmail.com),  
[miguel@feb.unair.ac.id](mailto:miguel@feb.unair.ac.id), [siti\\_hafsah@uitm.edu.my](mailto:siti_hafsah@uitm.edu.my)[https://susy.mdpi.com/user/manuscripts/review\\_info/b4676453a12c18ee15168d2cde397d53](https://susy.mdpi.com/user/manuscripts/review_info/b4676453a12c18ee15168d2cde397d53)

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.

If, however, extensive English edits are required to your manuscript, we will need to return the paper requesting improvements throughout.

We encourage you to set up your profile at SciProfiles.com, MDPI's researcher network platform. Articles you publish with MDPI will be linked to your SciProfiles page, where colleagues and peers will be able to see all of your publications, citations, as well as other academic contributions.

We also invite you to contribute to Encyclopedia (<https://encyclopedia.pub>), a scholarly platform providing accurate information about the latest research results. You can adapt parts of your paper to provide valuable reference information, via Encyclopedia, for others both within the field and beyond.

Kind regards,

Kind regards,

Mr. Norval Zhang

E-Mail: [norval.zhang@mdpi.com](mailto:norval.zhang@mdpi.com)

--

MDPI Tianjin Office 170 North Road, Room 1804, Block A, Lujiazui Financial Plaza, Hongqiao District, China

MDPI Sustainability Editorial Office  
St. Alban-Anlage 66, 4052 Basel, Switzerland  
E-Mail: [sustainability@mdpi.com](mailto:sustainability@mdpi.com)  
<http://www.mdpi.com/journal/sustainability>

--  
Disclaimer: MDPI recognizes the importance of data privacy and protection. We treat personal data in line with the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) and with what the community expects of us. The information contained in this message is confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you have received this message in error, please notify me and delete this message from your system. You may not copy this message in its entirety or in part, or disclose its contents to anyone.

~ User Menu ?  
 ■ Home  
 ■ Manage Accounts  
 ■ Change Password  
 ■ Edit Profile  
 ■ Logout  
 ~ Submissions Menu ?  
 ■ Submit Manuscript  
 ■ Display Submitted Manuscripts  
 ■ English Editing  
 ■ Discount Vouchers  
 ■ Invoices  
 ■ LaTeX Word Count  
 ~ Reviewers Menu ?  
 ■ Reviews  
 ■ Volunteer Preferences

Journal **Sustainability** (ISSN 2071-1050)  
 Manuscript ID **sustainability-2303202**  
 Type **Article**  
 Title **Strategies to control industrial emissions: An Analytical Network Process (ANP) approach in East Java, Indonesia**  
 Authors **Muryani Muryani \* , Khoirun Nisa' , Miguel Angel Esquivias , Siti Hafisah Zulkarnain**  
 Topic **Industrial Control Systems**  
 Abstract **This study identifies the main agents, problems, solutions, and strategies to lower industrial carbon dioxide (CO2) emissions in East Java, Indonesia, by applying the Analytical Network Process (ANP). The respondents in this study were government officials, industrial representatives, and environmental experts. The identification revealed that (1) regulators were the critical agent to control emissions, (2) three major problems in lowering industrial emissions were inadequate infrastructure, limited environmental knowledge, and unsound regulations, (3) the main solutions were education and socialization, and infrastructure improvement, (4) the institutional approach was more preferable than command-and-control and economic incentives. This suggests that policymakers need to collaborate closely with regulators, firms, and communities to control emissions more effectively and encourage environmentally friendly practices in industries. Economic incentives were not preferable strategies, most likely due to insufficient environmental knowledge, market distortion by subsidies, and low viability. However, the institutional approach incurs higher costs due to the political, administrative, and legal processes. Parties may agree on achieving socioeconomic demands but not environmental output. The institutional approach also needs extra efforts in education and socialization, as well as government support for infrastructure development and a better regulatory framework.**

The coverletter for this review report has been saved in the database. You can safely close this window.

Authors' Responses to Reviewer's Comments (Reviewer 1)

Author's Notes **Dear Reviewer 1. Thanks for your comments and insights. We try to address each of your suggestions and comments. We appreciate the time and support.**

- The current paper strives to identify both the sources and the solutions to the industrial pollution in East Java. The authors have interviewed representatives of the main sectors involved and used multiple-decision analysis to determine the main issues and solutions.
- The topic of the paper is quite interesting, because it offers an insight into the views of all the main agents involved. The paper is also quite well written (I just found one sentence that needs a minor correction: line 238, "selected *using ANP using* purposive sample"), and includes a good description of the sources of the industrial pollution in Indonesia and the Analytic Network Process method used.

*Response: Thanks for the point. We revised the line*

I have however two issues that prevent me from recommending the publication of the paper at this point:

- If I understand section 3.3 (lines 237 to 251) correctly, the authors have just performed 5 interviews -- is that correct? The authors state that the sample size is less important than the expertise of the respondents, but just 5 interviews seems too few to me. I believe the authors must provide a better justification for the number of interviews and, if necessary, carry out more of them.

*Response: Dear reviewer 1. Thanks for the comment. To clarify the issue of our sample, we specify that five respondents were chosen from each of the three groups of respondents (line 200 – 212). We also added the priorities and weighting for each of the groups (Table 5) and added some comments on the highlights of them (Table 2 and sub-sections in the results section). Sorry for the confusion. We appreciate your comment*

- On section 4, line 310, the authors mention the "in-depth interviews" carried out. However, I can not find the details of these interviews -- which questions were formulated? what were the answers? The authors provide a lot of conclusions based on these interviews, but without some details on them, we can't be sure whether these conclusions are reasonable or not. Please provide detailed information on the interviews.

*Response. Dear reviewer, we are adding the main questions employed in the in-depth interviews in Appendix Table 1. Those were the core questions to engage in discussion with the stakeholders. Certainly, insights expanded to other related issues to those questions.*

*We also added a summary of comments in Table 2, which reflects the insights from stakeholders and how they elaborated on their identification of problems and solutions, which are the basis for our discussion.*

*We appreciate very much your comments and suggestions.*

*We had our paper revised by a professional proofreading service (Editage) to improve the quality of the manuscript.*

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 checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Are all the cited references relevant to the research?	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Are the research design, questions, hypotheses and methods clearly stated?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Are the arguments and discussion of findings coherent, balanced and compelling?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
For empirical research, are the results clearly presented?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Is the article adequately referenced?	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Are the conclusions thoroughly supported by the results presented in the article or referenced in secondary literature?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Comments and Suggestions for Authors  
 The current paper strives to identify both the sources and the solutions to the industrial pollution in East Java. The authors have interviewed representatives of the main sectors involved and used multiple-decision analysis to determine the main issues and solutions.  
  
 The topic of the paper is quite interesting, because it offers an insight into the views of all the main agents involved. The paper is also quite well written (I just found one sentence that needs a minor correction: line 238, "selected *using ANP using* purposive sample"), and includes a good description of the sources of the industrial pollution in Indonesia and the Analytic Network Process method used.  
  
 I have however two issues that prevent me from recommending the publication of the paper at this point:  
 1) If I understand section 3.3 (lines 237 to 251) correctly, the authors have just performed 5 interviews -- is that correct? The authors state that the sample size is less important than the expertise of the respondents, but just 5 interviews seems too few to me. I believe the authors must provide a better justification for the number of interviews and, if necessary, carry out more of them.  
 2) On section 4, line 310, the authors mention the "in-depth interviews" carried out. However, I can not find the details of these interviews -- which questions were formulated? what were the answers? The authors provide a lot of conclusions based on these interviews, but without some details on them, we can't be sure whether these conclusions are reasonable or not. Please provide detailed information on the interviews.

Submission Date 09 March 2023  
 Date of this review 21 Mar 2023 17:28:41



- User Menu
  - Home
  - Manage Accounts
  - Change Password
  - Edit Profile
  - Logout
- Submissions Menu
  - Submit Manuscript
  - Display Submitted Manuscripts
  - English Editing
  - Discount Vouchers
  - Invoices
  - LaTeX Word Count
- Reviewers Menu
  - Reviews
  - Volunteer Preferences

Journal Sustainability (ISSN 2071-1050)  
 Manuscript ID sustainability-2303202  
 Type Article  
 Title Strategies to control industrial emissions: An Analytical Network Process (ANP) approach in East Java, Indonesia  
 Authors Muryani Muryani \*, Khoirun Nisa<sup>1</sup>, Miguel Angel Esquivias<sup>2</sup>, Siti Hafisah Zulkarnain  
 Topic Industrial Control Systems  
 Abstract This study identifies the main agents, problems, solutions, and strategies to lower industrial carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) emissions in East Java, Indonesia, by applying the Analytical Network Process (ANP). The respondents in this study were government officials, industrial representatives, and environmental experts. The identification revealed that (1) regulators were the critical agent to control emissions, (2) three major problems in lowering industrial emissions were inadequate infrastructure, limited environmental knowledge, and unsound regulations, (3) the main solutions were education and socialization, and infrastructure improvement, (4) the institutional approach was more preferable than command-and-control and economic incentives. This suggests that policymakers need to collaborate closely with regulators, firms, and communities to control emissions more effectively and encourage environmentally friendly practices in industries. Economic incentives were not preferable strategies, most likely due to insufficient environmental knowledge, market distortion by subsidies, and low viability. However, the institutional approach incurs higher costs due to the political, administrative, and legal processes. Parties may agree on achieving socioeconomic demands but not environmental output. The institutional approach also needs extra efforts in education and socialization, as well as government support for infrastructure development and a better regulatory framework.

The coverletter for this review report has been saved in the database. You can safely close this window.

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

Author's Notes **Dear Reviewer 2. Thanks for your comments and insights. We try to address each of your suggestions and comments. We appreciate the time and support**

- In my opinion, the paper is well prepared. However, I have a few comments:
- The main remark, necessary: the authors combined the summary and the suggestions, I propose, to change the order first give the suggestions, as a separate item, and then the summary. In my opinion, the suggestions should be called research conclusions and should be numbered.... See the first sentence..... follow:  
 1.....  
 2.....  
*Response: Dear Reviewer 2. Thanks for your comments and suggestion. We revised our Conclusions section, providing suggestions and then summary. Thanks for the suggestion.*
- Another comment: the paper lacks a discussion, in my opinion it should be after the suggestions and before the summary.  
*Response: Dear Reviewer 2. We revised the structure of our paper. One of the changes was the addition of a discussion sub-section within the results section. We extended our comments, discussion, and policy implications. Thanks for the suggestion.*

Minor comments:

- The literature list must follow the authors' instructions e.g. Nowak,A.  
*Response: Thanks. We revised our literature section following comment from reviewer 3 in which the introduction and literature was merge in the first section.*
- Sentence 191. based on Table 1, ..... in my opinion there should be a reference to the table before table 1 and only the conclusions of what the table captures afterwards. No reference to Table 1 before the table.  
*Response: Thanks for the suggestion. We added references to tables before the tables are displayed in the manuscript.*
- Sentences 214, 228 .... are as follows. (not a full stop but ".")  
*Noted, thanks*
- Sentence 244 The bullet point must be to the sentence above and be a continuation of it.  
*Response: Noted, thanks*
- Sentence 330. table 4 no reference in the text before the tables, if I have not noticed this I apologise.  
*Response: Thanks. We revised our references to Tables*
- Please apply these minor corrections as well as the major ones and the paper will be great.  
*Response: Thanks for your comments and suggestions. We appreciate your time and comments.*

We also had our manuscript revised by a professional proofreading service (Editage) to increase the quality of our manuscript.

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 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments and Suggestions for Authors

Dear authors,

In my opinion, the paper is well prepared. However, I have a few comments:

The main remark, necessary: the authors combined the summary and the suggestions, I propose, to change the order first give the suggestions, as a separate item, and then the summary. In my opinion, the suggestions should be called research conclusions and should be numbered.... See the first sentence..... follow:  
 1.....  
 2.....

Another comment: the paper lacks a discussion, in my opinion it should be after the suggestions and before the summary.

Minor comments:

The literature list must follow the authors' instructions e.g. Nowak,A.

Sentence 191. based on Table 1, ..... in my opinion there should be a reference to the table before table 1 and only the conclusions of what the table captures afterwards. No reference to Table 1 before the table.

Sentences 214, 228 .... are as follows. (not a full stop but ".")

Sentence 244 The bullet point must be to the sentence above and be a continuation of it.

Sentence 330. table 4 no reference in the text before the tables, if I have not noticed this I apologise.

Please apply these minor corrections as well as the major ones and the paper will be great.

Best wishes

Reviewer

Submission Date 09 March 2023  
 Date of this review 11 Mar 2023 16:36:53

- ▼ User Menu
  - Home
  - Manage Accounts
  - Change Password
  - Edit Profile
  - Logout
- ▼ Submissions Menu
  - Submit Manuscript
  - Display Submitted Manuscripts
  - English Editing
  - Discount Vouchers
  - Invoices
  - LaTeX Word Count
- ▼ Reviewers Menu
  - Reviews
  - Volunteer Preferences

**Journal** Sustainability (ISSN 2071-1050)

**Manuscript ID** sustainability-2303202

**Type** Article

**Title** Strategies to control industrial emissions: An Analytical Network Process (ANP) approach in East Java, Indonesia

**Authors** Muryani Muryani \* , Khoirun Nisa' , Miguel Angel Esquivias , Siti Hafisah Zulkarnain

**Topic** Industrial Control Systems

**Abstract** This study identifies the main agents, problems, solutions, and strategies to lower industrial carbon dioxide (CO2) emissions in East Java, Indonesia, by applying the Analytical Network Process (ANP). The respondents in this study were government officials, industrial representatives, and environmental experts. The identification revealed that (1) regulators were the critical agent to control emissions, (2) three major problems in lowering industrial emissions were inadequate infrastructure, limited environmental knowledge, and unsound regulations, (3) the main solutions were education and socialization, and infrastructure improvement, (4) the institutional approach was more preferable than command-and-control and economic incentives. This suggests that policymakers need to collaborate closely with regulators, firms, and communities to control emissions more effectively and encourage environmentally friendly practices in industries. Economic incentives were not preferable strategies, most likely due to insufficient environmental knowledge, market distortion by subsidies, and low viability. However, the institutional approach incurs higher costs due to the political, administrative, and legal processes. Parties may agree on achieving socioeconomic demands but not environmental output. The institutional approach also needs extra efforts in education and socialization, as well as government support for infrastructure development and a better regulatory framework.

The coverletter for this review report has been saved in the database. You can safely close this window.

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

**Author's Notes** **Thanks for your comments and insights. We try to address each of your suggestions and comments. We appreciate the time and support**

**Summary:** the main issue with the manuscript is that it is a combination of a research article and a review article.

Literature review is presented extensively in sections where it shouldn't be presented. While literature review should only be presented in the Introduction (Section ), we find literature review extensively in Sections 1, 2, 3 (the Methodology 3.1,3.2,3.3). The manuscript should be revised to become a research article rather than a literature review.

*Response: Dear Reviewer 3. We had revised the structure of our paper and reduced the methodology section. Section one presents the background and the literature (combined) as suggested.*

The Methods section should not contain literature review as presented and as described below.

*Response: Dear reviewer 3. Thanks for the suggestion. We reduced the length of the Methodology and removed what seemed unnecessary for the paper. We also clarify our sample. Thanks*

In the results section, the criteria, problems, solutions, and strategies are presented in very general terms without any description of what they entail. The authors simply refer to problems as lack of knowledge without any mention of what that really means, or inadequate infrastructure without what that entails, or education as the solution without mention of how and what type of education, etc.

*Response: Dear reviewer 3. We have addressed your comments in the following ways. First, we described how we elaborate the ANP framework, we added questions of the in-depth interviews (Appendix), we provided insights given by the respondents during the interviews (Table 2), and extended Table 5 were all sub-criteria are displayed (not only top). We expanded our discussion to provide more insights on what the problems entail, the solutions, and strategies.*

1. **Introduction:** there is no discussion of previous research on the application of ANP for strategies to control industrial emissions, which is the main focus of the research. The Introduction should present a detailed literature review of the latest research in adopting the ANP approach within the region and other regions of relevance.

*Response: Dear reviewer 3. We reorganized our section one. We reduced background issues and focused more on the literature on problems in the cement industry, challenges in emissions control in Indonesia, and alternatives and strategies presented in Indonesia and other regions. The literature is spread in approaches (we refer to some using ANP as in refs 31, 34), so we focus on issues that seem to be the most relevant aspects of emissions control. Thanks for your suggestions. We hope the introduction has a clear focus now. Thanks*

2. **Aims:** L.96-105 provide justification for carrying out the research. However the authors need to identify the gaps in the existing literature and how this research aims to address those gaps, and how the research adds to the understanding of strategies for emissions control. The authors should present the gaps in the literature and how this research adds to our understanding of the topic

*Response: Dear Reviewer, thanks for the suggestion. We hope that our revised version of the introduction addresses the concern on the gaps. We mostly highlight the need to identify main solutions and strategies in sector that presents substantial deficiencies in policies, controls, and market failures. We highlight that available strategies have been identified in the literature with pro and cons when choosing them, the challenges that it encompasses to find solutions, and the need for Indonesia (east java) to better understand stakeholder choices (rather than imposing) approaches. Please see our revised comments on red, we really try to highlight gaps so a novelty is offered in the paper.*

*Once again, thanks*

3. **Section 2:** this section is mainly a literature review of the emissions control policies and is an extension to Section 1, the Introduction. I believe both Sections 1 and 2 need to be combined and condensed into one Introduction for the following reasons:

3.1 Section 1 talks extensively about East Java which can be condensed and combined with policy controls mentioned in Section 2.

3.2 The manuscript shifts from the specific research on East Java (Section 1) to the general description of control policies (Section 2).

*Response: We addressed comments 3.1 to 3.2 by merging the introduction section and the former literature review. We think that putting them together now offers enough insights for readers and focuses on what is most essential. Thanks for the suggestions. Please see our red text where we indicate the merging of text.*

4. **Section 3:** this is the methods section but what is presented is extensive literature review. Section 3.1 describes ANP. Section 3.2 describes ANP further. Section 3.3 presents the principles of ANP. This entire section should be rewritten so that it presents the methodology adopted only without the literature review presented.

*Response: We reduced the methodology section (principles of ANP) and extended the presentation of the sample (respondents), adding questions on the in-depth interviews to clarify how the ANP was designed. We also extended the ANP framework by introducing the summary of insights from stakeholders which are the basic info to the modelling of the ANP.*

4. Section 3: this section focuses heavily on the publications of Saaty. The Authors should just refer to those references without presenting a detailing description of the work of Saaty.

*Response: Noted. We simplified our Section 3 (now Section 2)*

5. L.260-266: these are results and belong in the Results section not the Methods section

*Response: Noted. Results were transferred to Section 3. We added sub-sections referring to the formulation of the ANP (The ANP model framework), the Results on Scoring and Computations (with some sub-sections), and a discussion section*

6. L.260-266: it is unclear how the authors came to those conclusions. What methodology was adopted to construct the interviews? what questions were asked? what statistical procedure was used? how did the authors conclude those statements presented? this should be made clear and presented in the Results section

*Response: Dear reviewer. We included in the appendix our main questions during the in-depth interviews with stakeholders. We present a summary of insights obtained from stakeholders during the in-depth interviews employed for the ANP design (Table 2) and the discussion. The weighting and computations are based on data collected from the sample (3 groups of respondents – 5 respondents each, reported in Table 5 as a whole sample and independent groups). For the computation of weighted, we follow the ANP approach (8 stages described in the results section). Please see our Result section. We described how we developed the ANP framework (following eight stages of data processing common in ANP). Please see lines 241 – 269. We report the progress in the results section, as is common in ANP literature (process).*

*Figure 1 also presents the clusters and aspects that represent the basics of the ANP computations based on interactions.*

*We incorporate comments from respondents in the new discussion sub-section (Section 3 in Results)*

*Thanks for the comments.*

7. The sub-heading 3.3 is given twice

8. The Tables and figures do not present informative captions. Table 2 simply states "Criteria and sub-criteria of emission controls in East Java province". Table 3 simply states "The Rating and Numerical Scales". Table 4 simply states "Results ANP". Figure 1 simply states "ANP modelling". The Captions need to accurately describe the tables and their contents

*Response: Thanks for the suggestion. We re-label our captions to provide a more accurate descriptions of what is contained in the tables. Apologize for that. Thanks*

9. L. 333 onwards: the Legislations presented are not properly cited. The authors simply refer to law 44 of 1999, or 7 of 2012. The regulations should be properly cited with their titles

*Response: Sorry for that. We added the entire name of the regulations for clarity.*

10. Conclusion: this section repeats the methodology (L.420-426) and the results (L.427 onwards). The Conclusion should present what the researchers have concluded from the results in light of the latest findings.

*Response: We revised our conclusion and suggestion section following some comments from reviewer 2. We also added a new sub-section (Discussion) to provide more insights into the findings.*

11. L.336-340: it is mentioned that companies consider regulations as the least important (L.338). But then it is mentioned that Regulation 7/2012 is the reason that obliges industries to control emissions.

*Response: Well noted. We clarify the confusion by adding results in sub-sample groups. When looking at the firm sample (Column 3 in Table 5), it's noted that companies consider regulations as a problem. However, firms do not see regulatory improvement as a solution, and neither they see that regulators should get too involved as main agents. We revise our explanation of the perception of companies about regulations.*

12. The Results are very general and do not points to specific aspects of knowledge, education, infrastructure, or regulations. For example,

*Response: Dear reviewer, we have expanded our discussion section where each of the aspects (knowledge, education, infrastructure, and regulation) were considered. We also added Table 2, where we summarize the context in which such aspects were highlighted by stakeholders during the in-depth interviews (problems and solutions). We also added results per each of the sub-groups to highlight priorities among each of the groups to enrich the discussion.*

13. L.115-117: redundant. This has been mentioned previously

*Response: Thanks. We revised our paper for redundancy and send it to a professional proofreading service (Editage) to improve the readability of our paper, reduce redundancy, and simplify sentences.*

14. L.109-114: redundant. This has been mentioned previously

*Noted and revised*

15. L.128-130: citation required

*Response: Noted and revised*

16. L.183-184: please remove "a professor at the University of Pittsburgh"

*Response: Noted and revised*

*We also had our manuscript revised by a professional proofreading service (Editage) to increase the quality of our manuscript.*

Review Report Form

Quality of English Language	( ) English very difficult to understand/incomprehensible ( ) Extensive editing of English language and style required (x) 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?	( ) ( ) (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	<p>Summary: the main issue with the manuscript is that it is a combination of a research article and a review article. Literature review is presented extensively in sections where it shouldn't be presented. While literature review should only be presented in the Introduction (Section ), we find literature review extensively in Sections 1, 2, 3 (the Methodology 3.1,3.2,3.3). The manuscript should be revised to become a research article rather than a literature review. The Methods section should not contain literature review as presented and as described below. In the results section, the criteria, problems, solutions, and strategies are presented in very general terms without any description of what they entail. The authors simply refer to problems as lack of knowledge without any mention of what that really means, or inadequate infrastructure without what that entails, or education as the solution without mention of how and what type of education, etc.</p> <p>1. Introduction: there is no discussion of previous research on the application of ANP for strategies to control industrial emissions, which is the main focus of the research. The Introduction should present a detailed literature review of the latest research in adopting the ANP approach within the region and other regions of relevance.</p> <p>2. Aims: L.96-105 provide justification for carrying out the research. However the authors need to identify the gaps in the existing literature and how this research aims to address those gaps, and how the research adds to the understanding of strategies for emissions control. The authors should present the gaps in the literature and how this research adds to our understanding of the topic</p> <p>3. Section 2: this section is mainly a literature review of the emissions control policies and is an extension to Section 1, the Introduction. I believe both Sections 1 and 2 need to be combined and condensed into one Introduction for the following reasons:</p> <p>3.1 Section 1 talks extensively about East Java which can be condensed and combined with policy controls mentioned in Section 2.</p> <p>3.2 The manuscript shifts from the specific research on East Java (Section 1) to the general description of control policies (Section 2).</p> <p>4. Section 3: this is the methods section but what is presented is extensive literature review. Section 3.1 describes ANP. Section 3.2 describes ANP further. Section 3.3 presents the principles of ANP. This entire section should be rewritten so that it presents the methodology adopted only without the literature review presented.</p> <p>4. Section 3: this section focuses heavily on the publications of Saaty. The Authors should just refer to those references without presenting a detailing description of the work of Saaty.</p> <p>5. L.260-266: these are results and belong in the Results section not the Methods section</p> <p>6. L.260-266: it is unclear how the authors came to those conclusions. What methodology was adopted to construct the interviews? what questions were asked? what statistical procedure was used? how did the authors conclude those statements presented? this should be made clear and presented in the Results section</p> <p>7. The sub-heading 3.3 is given twice</p> <p>8. The Tables and figures do not present informative captions. Table 3 simply states "Criteria and sub-criteria of emission controls in East Java province". Table 3 simply states "The Rating and Numerical Scales". Table 4 simply states "Results ANP". Figure 1 simply states "ANP modelling". The Captions need to accurately describe the tables and their contents</p> <p>9. L. 333 onwards: the Legislations presented are not properly cited. The authors simply refer to law 44 of 1999, or 7 of 2012. The regulations should be properly cited with their titles</p> <p>10. Conclusion: this section repeats the methodology (L.420-426) and the results (L.427 onwards). The Conclusion should present what the researchers have concluded from the results in light of the latest findings.</p> <p>11. L.336-340: it is mentioned that companies consider regulations as the least important (L.338). But then it is mentioned that Regulation 7/2012 is the reason that obliges industries to control emissions.</p> <p>12. The Results are very general and do not points to specific aspects of knowledge, education, infrastructure, or regulations. For example,</p> <p>First, Table 4 points out to Limited Knowledge of the Environment as the main problem. Lines 430-431 also place limited knowledge at the top order</p> <p>Second, what is meant by limited knowledge of the environment? and how was it determined?</p> <p>Third, if limited knowledge of the environment is a main problem, why isn't addressed in the manuscript? the solution is simply stated as "education and outreach". This is a vague terms. What is meant by education and outreach and how is it proposed to be carried out? there is no mention of that in the in the manuscript</p> <p>Fourth, the term infrastructure is very general and it is not detailed in the manuscript. What is meant by infrastructure and what type of infrastructure is needed as a solution?</p> <p>Fifth, L.352-370 it is mentioned that lack of infrastructure is the main problem in East Java. The lack of knowledge is the main issue but why is the focus on infrastructure instead?</p> <p>13. L.115-117: redundant. This has been mentioned previously</p> <p>14. L.109-114: redundant. This has been mentioned previously</p> <p>15. L.128-130: citation required</p> <p>16. L.183-184: please remove "a professor at the University of Pittsburgh"</p>
Submission Date	09 March 2023
Date of this review	25 Mar 2023 12:03:02



### ▼ User Menu ?

- [Home](#)
- [Manage Accounts](#)
- [Change Password](#)
- [Edit Profile](#)
- [Logout](#)

### ▼ Submissions Menu ?

- [Submit Manuscript](#)
- [Display Submitted Manuscripts](#)
- [English Editing](#)
- [Discount Vouchers](#)
- [Invoices](#)
- [LaTeX Word Count](#)

### ▼ Reviewers Menu ?

- [Reviews](#)
- [Volunteer Preferences](#)

Journal [Sustainability](#) (ISSN 2071-1050)

Manuscript ID [sustainability-2303202](#)

Type [Article](#)

Title [Strategies to control industrial emissions: An Analytical Network Process \(ANP\) approach in East Java, Indonesia](#)

Authors [Muryani Muryani \\*](#) , [Khoirun Nisa'](#) , [Miguel Angel Esquivias](#) , [Siti Hafsa Zulkarnain](#)

Topic [Industrial Control Systems](#)

Abstract This study identifies the main agents, problems, solutions, and strategies to lower industrial carbon dioxide (CO2) emissions in East Java, Indonesia, by applying the Analytical Network Process (ANP). The respondents in this study were government officials, industrial representatives, and environmental experts. The identification revealed that (1) regulators were the critical agent to control emissions, (2) three major problems in lowering industrial emissions were inadequate infrastructure, limited environmental knowledge, and unsound regulations, (3) the main solutions were education and socialization, and infrastructure improvement, (4) the institutional approach was more preferable than command-and-control and economic incentives. This suggests that policymakers need to collaborate closely with regulators, firms, and communities to control emissions more effectively and encourage environmentally friendly practices in industries. Economic incentives were not preferable strategies, most likely due to insufficient environmental knowledge, market distortion by subsidies, and low viability. However, the institutional approach incurs higher costs due to the political, administrative, and legal processes. Parties may agree on achieving socioeconomic demands but not environmental output. The institutional approach also needs extra efforts in education and socialization, as well as government support for infrastructure development and a better regulatory framework.

The coverletter for this review report has been saved in the database. You can safely close this window.

### Authors' Responses to Reviewer's Comments (Reviewer 4)

Author's Notes *Dear Reviewer 4, Thanks for your suggestion.*

*We sent our paper to a professional proofreading service (Editage) to improve the readability of our paper, reduce redundancy, and simplify sentences. We apologize if it was hard to read.*

*We address several comments from reviewers 1 to 3 as well.*

*We appreciate the time and support during the first round of reviews.*

### 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Are all the cited references relevant to the research?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Are the research design, questions, hypotheses and methods clearly stated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Are the arguments and discussion of findings coherent, balanced and compelling?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
For empirical research, are the results clearly presented?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Is the article adequately referenced?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Are the conclusions thoroughly supported by the results presented in the article or referenced in secondary literature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Comments and Suggestions for Authors *The current manuscript is nonreadable. I suggest the authors resubmit it after getting the language fixed.*

Submission Date *09 March 2023*

Date of this review *20 Mar 2023 16:11:12*

