



Thomas Goh <gohtho@gmail.com>

[IJCS] Editor Decision

1 message

Dr. Puji Lestari, M.Si | Scopus ID: 56669619900 <puji.lestari@upnyk.ac.id>

Sat, Dec 11, 2021 at 11:38 AM

To: Mrs Ira Kristiana <admin@aibpm.org>

Cc: Thomas Sumarsan Goh <gohtho@gmail.com>, Henry Henry <henry058@students.usu.ac.id>, Nagian Toni <nagiantoni@unprimdn.ac.id>, Erika Erika <iyoori.seol@gmail.com>

Mrs Ira Kristiana:

We have reached a decision regarding your submission to International Journal of Communication and Society, "Factors Affect Tourism Stock Price in Indonesia".

Our decision is: Revisions Required

Dr. Puji Lestari, M.Si | Scopus ID: 56669619900
Universitas Pembangunan Nasional "Veteran" Yogyakarta
puji.lestari@upnyk.ac.id

Reviewer A:

Significance (- How important is the work reported? Does it attack an important/difficult problem (as opposed to a peripheral/simple one)? - Does the approach offered advance the state of the art? - Does it involve or synthesize ideas, methods, approaches from multiple disciplines? - Does it have interesting implications for multiple disciplines?):
Good

Originality (- Is this a new issue? Is this a novel approach to an issue? - Is this a novel combination of familiar ideas/techniques/methods/approaches? - Does the paper point out differences from related research? - Does the paper properly situate itself with respect to previous work?):
Good

Quality (- Is the paper technically sound? How are its claims backed up? - Does it carefully evaluate the strengths and limitations of its contribution?):
Good

Clarity (- Is the paper clearly written? Does it motivate the research? Does it describe clearly the methods employed (e.g., experimental procedures, algorithms, analytical tools), if any? - Are the results, if any, described and evaluated thoroughly? - Is the paper organized in a sensible and logical fashion?):
Good

Relevance (- Is the paper closely related to the theme of the journal (broadly conceived)? - Is the content interesting enough to a broad audience? - Is the paper readable in a multi-disciplinary context?):
Good

Technical (1): Structure of the paper:
Good

Technical (2): Standard of English:
Good

Technical (3): Appropriateness of abstract as a description of the paper:
Good

Technical (4): Use and number of keywords/key phrases:
Good

Technical (5): Relevance and clarity of drawings, graphs and tables:
Good

Technical (6): Discussion and conclusions:
Fair

Technical (7): Reference list, adequate and correctly cited:
Fair

Explanations for the above ratings and other general comments on major issues:

For your academic article's Future Research Directions, you should:

1. Correlate possible new avenues for research with your results (either the ones that were discovered, or the unexpected findings)
2. Depict the hypotheses, relationships, connections that resulted from your analysis and offer perspective on what they mean to general knowledge of the subject being studied.
3. Identify limitations and restrictions of your research paper
4. Outline your recommendations for additional research to the limitations of your study or to aspects that your analysis revealed and need further examination

Comments on the minor details of the article:

Use concluded results. From raw data, filter the results, and then conclude your studies based on measurements and observations taken. An appropriate number of decimal places should be used. Parenthetical remarks are prohibited here. Proofread carefully at the final stage. At the end, give an outline to your arguments. Spot perspectives of further study of the subject. Justify your conclusion at the bottom sufficiently, which will probably include examples.

Reviewer B:

Significance (- How important is the work reported? Does it attack an important/difficult problem (as opposed to a peripheral/simple one)? - Does the approach offered advance the state of the art? - Does it involve or synthesize ideas, methods, approaches from multiple disciplines? - Does it have interesting implications for multiple disciplines?):
Good

Originality (- Is this a new issue? Is this a novel approach to an issue? - Is this a novel combination of familiar ideas/techniques/methods/approaches? - Does the paper point out differences from related research? - Does the paper properly situate itself with respect to previous work?):
Good

Quality (- Is the paper technically sound? How are its claims backed up? - Does it carefully evaluate the strengths and limitations of its contribution?):
Good

Clarity (- Is the paper clearly written? Does it motivate the research? Does it describe clearly the methods employed (e.g., experimental procedures, algorithms, analytical tools), if any? - Are the results, if any, described and evaluated thoroughly? - Is the paper organized in a sensible and logical fashion?):
Fair

Relevance (- Is the paper closely related to the theme of the journal (broadly conceived)? - Is the content interesting enough to a broad audience? - Is the paper readable in a multi-disciplinary context?):
Good

Technical (1): Structure of the paper:
Good

Technical (2): Standard of English:
Good

Technical (3): Appropriateness of abstract as a description of the paper:
Good

Technical (4): Use and number of keywords/key phrases:
Good

Technical (5): Relevance and clarity of drawings, graphs and tables:
Good

Technical (6): Discussion and conclusions:
Fair

Technical (7): Reference list, adequate and correctly cited:
Good

Explanations for the above ratings and other general comments on major issues:

The writing of introduction section is in simple language, in present tense. State the purpose with clear rationale why the study is being carried out. This includes background information of the problem already known, current status, and then narrow down to what is unsolved and the gap that present study is going to bridge. And obviously, if the problem is not stated in a reasonable, understandable way, readers will have no interest in your solution

Comments on the minor details of the article:

In summary, the purpose of the Introduction is to provide sufficient background information to allow the readers to understand the problem and see the importance of the present study without needing to refer to other publications on the topic. The writing has to be short and sweet, like the vitals details on the 'matrimonial website' to attract best match! The tips for a strong introduction is to arouse interest and encourage the reader to read the rest of your work, keeping it short by sticking closely to the problem, the aim of the research so as the conclusion and discussion that will follow later are aligned to the introduction section. The introduction concludes with a clear statement the purpose and objectives to help readers see clearly the evolution, importance, and critical aspects of the study.

International Journal of Communication and Society
<http://pubs2.ascee.org/index.php/ijcs>



Thomas Goh <gohtho@gmail.com>

[IJCS] Editor Decision

1 message

Dr. Puji Lestari, M.Si | Scopus ID: 56669619900 <puji.lestari@upnyk.ac.id>

Tue, Dec 21, 2021 at 3:02 PM

To: Mrs Ira Kristiana <admin@aibpm.org>

Cc: Thomas Sumarsan Goh <gohtho@gmail.com>, Henry Henry <henry058@students.usu.ac.id>, Nagian Toni <nagiantoni@unprimdn.ac.id>, Erika Erika <iyoori.seol@gmail.com>

Mrs Ira Kristiana:

We have reached a decision regarding your submission to International Journal of Communication and Society, "Factors Affect Tourism Stock Price in Indonesia".

Our decision is to: Accept Submission

Dr. Puji Lestari, M.Si | Scopus ID: 56669619900
Universitas Pembangunan Nasional "Veteran" Yogyakarta
puji.lestari@upnyk.ac.id

International Journal of Communication and Society
<http://pubs2.ascee.org/index.php/ijcs>