

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

Maria Valentina Clavijo Mesa¹

¹ Universidade de São Paulo

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Dear Authors,

I hope this message finds you well. I found the practical application of FMEA in conjunction with SCRM principles interesting. However, I have several suggestions for improvement:

Title: Consider avoiding unnecessary details such as "the Aceh Besar Agency" to ensure clarity and conciseness.

Abstract: I recommend substituting "responder" with "experts" to accurately reflect the nature of the expert judgment involved in the study. Additionally, clarify the research gap addressed in the paper and provide examples of the types of uncertainties managed in the supply chain. Remember that there are different types of uncertainty: epistemic, aleatory... which one are you addressing with your proposal?

Section 2.1: Streamline the paragraphs to avoid repetition and ensure coherence between subsections. Define terms such as "green performance" for better reader understanding, and note that paragraph 2 in this section is a copy of the first one (*paragraph 1:* This encompasses the movement and storage of raw materials, work-in-progress..., *paragraph 2:* This includes the movement and storage of raw materials, work-in-progress, and finished products).

Section 2.5: Correct the title to "Failure Mode and Effect Analysis" instead of "Failure Mode and Error Analysis." Additionally, address the mathematical error in Equation 2.

Section 3.1: Clarify the distinction between risk assessment and risk evaluation. Ensure that the quantitative phase focuses primarily on risk assessment and prioritization, while the qualitative phase deals with risk identification. Note that in your text, you mentioned that risk identification occurs during risk quantification. This is incorrect.

Section 3.4: Discuss the variance in the number of experts in each category to provide insights into strategic and operational aspects of risk perception. Revise *Figure 4* to present the number of experts and percentages separately for clarity. Exposing both together could generate confusion, showing an overestimation about the few amount of experts analyzed.

Table 2: Consider grouping risk events and their respective agents to enhance readability and comprehension.

Results: Need to be better explored. For example, 'Delay in the arrival of raw material' appears in different rows. Grouping this into only one row allows the reader to see all the risk agents for this risk event clearly.

Overall, your paper presents an interesting practical application of traditional techniques. Unfortunately, I do not perceive



any valuable research gap in the paper.

Best regards,