

Review of: "Enhancing Supply Chain Management Risk Mitigation: A House of Risk Methodology Applied to Brick Manufacturing in Aceh Besar Regency"

Luisa Mennecke

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

- Introduction: SCM orchestrates flow of goods and services. Flow of information is missing.
- Introduction could be shorter and more on point.
- 2.1 second paragraph has no new information, or the contents are doubled.
- Fig.1 is fuzzy. Also, there are overlapping parts (Customers overlaps with Buy, Logistics overlaps with Test, and the caption overlaps the figure). There is no reference in the text to this figure. Is it really useful for understanding? I think this figure can be removed.
- The abbreviations are described multiple times (especially SCM). After the first time, it is sufficient to use either the abbreviation or the complete word.
- 2.2, Paragraph about Integration: Integrations contribute to financial/green performance. Effective CSCM is a benefit. Why? What is the source?
- 2.3: If you want to add more figures, maybe you can add a picture of the manufacturing process of bricks?
- 2.3 second paragraph and last paragraph: Information is doubled.
- 2.4 Key points: Point 5 is not understandable for me. What does value 7.5 mean?
- Fig.2 is also fuzzy. But I think it is a good figure, so I would keep it in the paper.
- Above the figure "successful project outcomes" is underlined. Why?
- I think 2.4 should be overall shortened.
- ARP Equation: What is the meaning of i and j ? Are there any constraints on them?
- 2.5.2: What is the meaning of Total Effectiveness and Effectiveness to Difficulty? A short explanation would be helpful.
- TEk formula: E_{jk} is not described. R_{jk} is described but not used in the formula.
- ETDk formula is doubled.
- 2.6: No abbreviations in the heading.
- 2.6: Too much theory about SCOR. I would need more explanation on how the framework is defined and not about its history.
- State of the art is very long (around 50% of the paper). I think it needs to be shortened.
- In Figure 4, there is overlapping between "3" and "Percentage."
- In Table 1, I don't understand where the activities come from. Why is the only activity for the process "Make" the execution not according to plan?
- In 4.3, it is written that the risk agents are corresponding to the risk events. I don't think that in Table 2 the agents are

matching the events. If they are matching, it misses an explanation. For example, why is the risk agent for “Weather influence” “human error”? Is it correct that there is only one risk agent for each risk event? I think there could be more than one.

- In Table 3, it is not clear what the ranking is. Is it ranked as shown by the code? Or does Pj is the value for the ranking? I think another representation of the data would be better so you can see at first sight which risk agent has the highest priority.
- There is no proper discussion of the results. The results are shown in tables with almost no explanation, and there is no critical erosion of them. In the conclusion, it is unclear where the findings come from.