



ABDULLAH ALABDULKARIM &lt;a.alabdulkarim@mu.edu.sa&gt;

---

## Business Process Management Journal - Decision on Manuscript ID BPMJ-12-2012-0135.R1

---

malmashari@yahoo.com &lt;malmashari@yahoo.com&gt;

Sat, Jun 1, 2013 at 2:45 PM

To: a.alabdulkarim@mu.edu.sa, a.alabdulkarim@cranfield.ac.uk

01-Jun-2013

Dear Mr. Alabdulkarim:

Manuscript ID BPMJ-12-2012-0135.R1 entitled "Influence of Resources on Maintenance Operations with Different Asset monitoring levels: A Simulation Approach" which you submitted to the Business Process Management Journal, has been reviewed. The comments of the reviewer(s) are included at the bottom of this letter.

The reviewer(s) have recommended publication, but also suggest some revisions to your manuscript. Therefore, I invite you to respond to the reviewer(s)' comments and revise your manuscript.

To revise your manuscript, log into <http://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/bpmj> and enter your Author Centre, where you will find your manuscript title listed under "Manuscripts with Decisions." Under "Actions," click on "Create a Revision." Your manuscript number has been appended to denote a revision.

You will be unable to make your revisions on the originally submitted version of the manuscript. Instead, revise your manuscript using a word processing program and save it on your computer. Please also highlight the changes to your manuscript within the document by using the track changes mode in MS Word or by using bold or coloured text. Once the revised manuscript is prepared, you can upload it and submit it through your Author Centre.

When submitting your revised manuscript, you will be able to respond to the comments made by the reviewer(s) in the space provided. You can use this space to document any changes you make to the original manuscript. In order to expedite the processing of the revised manuscript, please be as specific as possible in your response to the reviewer(s).

**IMPORTANT:** Your original files are available to you when you upload your revised manuscript. Please delete any redundant files before completing the submission.

Because we are trying to facilitate timely publication of manuscripts submitted to the Business Process Management Journal, your revised manuscript should be uploaded no later than 01-Jul-2013. If it is not possible for you to submit your revision in a reasonable amount of time, we may have to consider your paper as a new submission.

Please note that Emerald requires you to clear permission to re-use any material not created by you. If there are permissions outstanding, please upload these when you submit your revision. Emerald is unable to publish your paper with permissions outstanding.

Once again, thank you for submitting your manuscript to the Business Process Management Journal and I look forward to receiving your revision.

Sincerely,  
Prof. Majed Al-Mashari  
Editor, Business Process Management Journal  
[malmashari@yahoo.com](mailto:malmashari@yahoo.com)

DEADLINE: 01-Jul-2013

## Reviewer(s)' Comments to Author:

Reviewer: 1

Recommendation: Major Revision

## Comments:

In general, the paper is interesting and worth reading. However, the present version has several weaknesses as explained in the following comments.

1. The authors should include a specific example of asset monitoring in order to make the paper easier to diggest for readers that are not familiar with the topic.
2. Figure 1 appears to be a waste of space. Either explain and discuss it or remove it.
3. Improve the use of the english language. Proof read the paper and correct the language.
4. P. 6: On what grounds are RCM and TPM rejected? Make the reasons and arguments for the rejection more explicit and clear.
5. Only 7 references are newer than 2009. Add newer references if possible.
6. Add a lessons learned section before the conclusion. List all findings and be sure to provide answers to all asked questions (p. 2, p. 7 etc.). Discuss the applied simulation method and the lessons learned that may be relevant for other reseachers / practitioners that want to use a similar approach. Has anything be learned about the pros and cons of analytical methods and simulation methods? Discuss the implications of the paper's findings for research and practice. The lessons learned should be formulated as general as possible - raised above the level of the specific results of the simulations - in order to make them useful for other researchers and practitioners.
7. Methodology: The authors should add a discussion of the scientific characteristics of the used simulation method. For example, what does the output of a simulation tell us about the simulated part of reality? How should the output be interpreted? This discussion should be raised above the specific level of the paper's simulations - it should focus on the general scientific characteristics of process simulations. To the extend that it is possible based on the presented research the authors should validate their approach.
8. The research in the paper is based on a distinction between reactive maintenance, diagnostics maintenance, and prognostics maintenance. It should be made clear how these three categories have been identified and how are related to the four categoris on p. 4. and other related concepts discussed in the paper.
9. The authors should relate the paper to the general area of business process management in a more explicit manner.

## Additional Questions:

**1. Originality:** Does the paper contain new and significant information adequate to justify publication?: The simulation method seems to be a useful addition to existing analytical methods. However, as suggested below, the authors must include a discussion of the general pros and cons of the simulation method in a manner that makes it useful for others that want to use a similar approach.

**2. Relationship to Literature:** Does the paper demonstrate an adequate understanding of the relevant literature in the field and cite an appropriate range of literature sources? Is any significant work ignored?: The refereed literature seems to be relevant and the amount of references is sufficient. It is worth noting, that only 7 references are newer than 2009.

**3. Methodology:** Is the paper's argument built on an appropriate base of theory, concepts, or other ideas? Has the research or equivalent intellectual work on which the paper is based been well designed? Are the methods employed appropriate?: The applied methodology is appropriate but as described in the comments to the authors they fail to discuss the general scientific characteristics of the methodology.

**4. Results:** Are results presented clearly and analysed appropriately? Do the conclusions adequately tie together the other elements of the paper?: The specific results of the simulation are discussed. However, the paper could be significantly improved if a leasons learned section is added as suggested in the

comments to the authors.

**5. Implications for research, practice and/or society:** Does the paper identify clearly any implications for research, practice and/or society? Does the paper bridge the gap between theory and practice? How can the research be used in practice (economic and commercial impact), in teaching, to influence public policy, in research (contributing to the body of knowledge)? What is the impact upon society (influencing public attitudes, affecting quality of life)? Are these implications consistent with the findings and conclusions of the paper?: As described in the comments to the authors they should include a discussion of such implications.

**6. Quality of Communication:** Does the paper clearly express its case, measured against the technical language of the field and the expected knowledge of the journal's readership? Has attention been paid to the clarity of expression and readability, such as sentence structure, jargon use, acronyms, etc.: The use of the English language must be proof read and corrected.

To go straight to your paper click this link: [http://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/bpmj?URL\\_MASK=XBsCDPh2yRmTCYqj9Yw](http://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/bpmj?URL_MASK=XBsCDPh2yRmTCYqj9Yw)



**\* How-to-submit-a-revision.doc**

33K