


Korespondensi dengan Jurnal Internasional Bereputasi : Indonesian Journal of Science and Technology (IJOST):

" The Expansion and Spatial Pattern of Shopping and Tourism Services Facilities in North Bandung Region, Indonesia"







RESPONSE TO REVIEWER #1

Reviewer #1:

This paper is interesting, but it needs revision. The current paper will not be cited. There is nothing new. But, I think that there is a possible way if editor wants to accept this paper.

1. Title must be changed. For example, by adding "literature review" word. I suggest "literature review and experiments for xxx"

But, authors can check again the English. Please discuss with English proof reader

Response to the Reviewer #1:

Thank you for the suggestion.

We did not use experimental methods for this study but a survey of shopping facilities and tourism service facilities in the North Bandung Region. The literature review is an integral part of this research. Therefore, in our opinion, there is no need to add the words "literature review and experiment."

By the reviewer's suggestion, we have also discussed this with the English proofreader.

Reviewer #1

2. English must be re-checked.

Response to the Reviewer #1:

Thank you for reminding us. We have re-checked the English.

Reviewer #1

- 3. Add 1 section about literature review. I suggest to put the structure:
 - Introduction
 - Literature review
 - Materials and Methods, etc

Response to the Reviewer #1:

We are grateful for the advice.

We already added one section about literature review

Reviewer #1

4. Add 1 paragraph in the last paragraph in Introduction. Put sentences: The main novelties are (1) xxxx, (2) xxxx, (3) xxx, (4) xxx, etc.

Response to the Reviewer #1:

We appreciated the suggestion. We already added a paragraph in the Introduction.

Reviewer #1

5. Improve the description of the context where this study results will provide

Response to the Reviewer #1:

Thank you for the suggestion. We already improved the context of the study results.

Reviewer #1

6. Need to update the citation if possible

Response to the Reviewer #1:

Yes, it is possible to update the citation.

We have already updated the citations.

Reviewer #1

7. In the Introduction should be included the existing research gap, explaining the unique differences between this study compared to similar previous studies.

Response to the Reviewer #1:

We are thankful for the advice. We already included the research gap in the Introduction clearly and explained the unique differences between this study compared to similar previous studies.

Reviewer #1

8. The results of the study are presented in the form of narrative/textual, tables, or images in the form of graphs or diagrams. Avoid displaying raw data.

Response to the Reviewer #1:

Thank you for reminding us. We already avoided displaying raw data.

RESPONSE TO REVIEWER #2

Reviewer #2:

This paper is quite good, but some parts need revision.

Reviewer #2:

1. The method must explain how data is obtained.

Response to Reviewer #2:

Thank you for the suggestion. We already have explained how the data is obtained.

Reviewer #2:

2. The author should be written how the results will be measured, tested, and evaluated.

Response to Reviewer #2:

We appreciate the advice. We already have written how the result was measured, tested, and evaluated.

Reviewer #2:

3. Add explanation for the formula. Such as NNI stand for xxxx

Response to Reviewer #2:

Thank you for reminding us. In the method, the formula is already explained.

Reviewer #2:

4. Avoid spelling mistakes, typos, and grammatical errors. You can use a tool such as Grammarly or recommendations provided by MS Word for language checking.

Response to Reviewer #2:

Thank you for reminding us. We used Grammarly licensed in writing this paper.

Reviewer #2:

5. The figures and tables must be self-explanatory, such as degree of distribution or percentage distribution.

Response to Reviewer #2:

We appreciated the suggestion. We already checked the figures, and the tables are self-explanatory.

Reviewer #2:

6. The figure must be clearly and visible when published online (colored) or printed (black and white)

Response to Reviewer #2:

We are thankful for reminding us. We have already revised the figures into higher resolution images.

Reviewer #2:

7. Please check the guideline of the Journal

Response to Reviewer #2:

We are grateful for reminding us. We have checked the Journal's guidelines.

Reviewer #2:

8. Please add citations from International Journal of UNIKOM, IJOST, and Indonesian national accredited journals (SINTA 1/2) related with this research.

Response to Reviewer #2:

Thank you for the suggestion. We added citations from IJOST and Indonesian national accredited journal (Jurnal Wilayah dan Lingkungan/ SINTA 2)

Reviewer #2:

9. Put detail process of methodology and match with data analysis will be good.

Response to Reviewer #2:

Thank you for reminding us; we have put a detailed process in the method.

Reviewer #2:

10. Some of the literature too old, please using the last 5 years literature (except the basic theory) **Response to Reviewer #2:**

We appreciated the comment. For some reason, the relevant research articles are more than five years old. However, we also applied the latest references.

Reviewer #2:

11. If possible the authors may add some limitations of study or threat to validity.

Response to Reviewer #2:

We are grateful for the suggestion. However, it is possible to add some limitations to the study. Therefore, we put this limitation in conclusion.

Reviewer #2:

12. The header should be written according to the author's name and the title.

Response to Reviewer #2:

Thank you for reminding us regarding the header. We have changed the header.

Reviewer #2:

13. The place and time of research do not need to be included in the title unless the research is specific to a particular time and place.

Response to Reviewer #2:

We appreciated the comment. However, the place is essential to be included in the title.

Reviewer #2:

14. Re-check the font size in the reference. The last reference should be 12 Calibri.

Response to Reviewer #2:

Thank you for the information. We have revised the font size of the last reference into 12 pt Calibri.

Reviewer #2:

15. The reference must come from credible sources.

Response to Reviewer #2:

We are grateful for reminding us. We applied the references are from credible resources.

Reviewer #2:

16. Make sure that you already double-check the citation according to the reference

Response to Reviewer #2:

We appreciated the suggestion, and we have double-checked the citation and the references.