

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: **IJAR-52630**

Date: 04.07.2025

Title:

"RISK OF BRIDGE CONSTRUCTION USING THE PROMETHEE METHOD IN PAPUA"

Recommendation:

Accept after major revision

| Rating | Excel. | Good | Fair | Poor |
|----------------|--------|------|------|------|
| Originality | | | ✓ | |
| Techn. Quality | | | ✓ | |
| Clarity | | | ✓ | |
| Significance | | | ✓ | |

Reviewer Name: Dr.K.Arumuganainar

Date: 04.07.2025

Reviewer's Comment for Publication.

The topic is important and methodology appropriate, but the manuscript requires substantial improvements in language, structure, analysis explanation, and formatting for publication in a reputed journal.

Detailed Reviewer's Report

"RISK OF BRIDGE CONSTRUCTION USING THE PROMETHEE METHOD IN PAPUA"

1. Title Evaluation

- **Relevance & Specificity:** The title reflects the core content well, highlighting both the region (Papua) and the methodology (PROMETHEE) used for risk analysis.
 - **Suggestion:** Minor refinement such as *"Risk Assessment in Bridge Construction Projects in Papua Using PROMETHEE Method"* could enhance clarity.
-

2. Abstract Review

- **Content:** The abstract outlines the background, purpose, methodology (SI, RBS, PROMETHEE), and key findings.
 - **Clarity:** Some grammatical errors and overly long sentences reduce readability.
 - **Key Issue Identified:** Culture and customs of local communities are the dominant risk factor.
 - **Recommendation:** Revise for grammar and conciseness.
-

3. Introduction

- **Strengths:**
 - Clearly sets the geographical and infrastructural context of Papua.
 - Justifies the need for risk management in the bridge construction sector.
 - **Areas for Improvement:**
 - Needs better flow and logical transitions between ideas.
 - Several references are not well integrated into the discussion.
-

4. Literature Review

- **Coverage:** Adequate theoretical foundation on risk, risk management, project management, and PROMETHEE method.
 - **Citations:** Included but sometimes outdated or inconsistently formatted.
 - **Improvement:** More current international literature could strengthen the review; citation style should be standardized (APA/IEEE).
-

5. Methodology

- **Design:**
 - Data from four bridge projects in Papua.
 - Primary data through questionnaires, interviews, and observations.
 - Use of Severity Index (SI), Risk Breakdown Structure (RBS), and PROMETHEE method for ranking.
 - **Strengths:**
 - Multi-method data collection.
 - Structured risk variable breakdown (internal/external; predictable/unpredictable).
 - **Limitations:**
 - Sample size (only 4 projects and limited respondents) may affect generalizability.
 - The PROMETHEE explanation is basic and lacks visual tools like decision trees or pairwise comparison charts.
 - **Recommendation:** Include a more robust justification for using PROMETHEE over other MCDM methods (e.g., AHP, TOPSIS).
-

6. Data Analysis and Results

- **Strengths:**
 - Clear application of SI and RBS in identifying key risks.
 - PROMETHEE is effectively used to rank high-risk factors based on time and cost impact.

- **Key Findings:**
 - **Top risk:** Local cultural/customary issues.
 - Other risks: Material unavailability, delayed deliveries, and unstable soil.
 - **Presentation:** Tables and calculations are detailed but poorly formatted in places.
 - **Improvement:**
 - Use of graphs/diagrams for PROMETHEE output would improve visual interpretation.
 - Clarify weighting logic and consistency in PROMETHEE ranking.
-

7. Discussion

- **Strengths:**
 - Results are well-aligned with the study objectives.
 - Explanation of how cultural challenges directly influence project risk is insightful.
 - **Weaknesses:**
 - Discussion lacks depth on how risks can be mitigated.
 - No comparison with similar regional or international cases.
-

8. Conclusion

- **Summary:** Accurately reflects findings—local culture is the highest risk factor in bridge construction delays/cost overruns in Papua.
 - **Missing Element:** Practical recommendations for mitigation, stakeholder engagement, or policy suggestions.
 - **Recommendation:** Expand conclusion to suggest actionable steps and future research direction.
-

9. References

- **Quantity:** Sufficient.
 - **Quality:** Mix of local and academic sources; several are useful.
 - **Formatting:** Inconsistent—needs alignment to a specific referencing style (APA preferred).
-

10. Language and Style

- **Grammar and Syntax:** Frequent errors (e.g., “Sevirity Index” should be “Severity Index”), awkward phrasing, and some untranslated terms.
 - **Recommendation:** Full language editing by a native speaker or use of advanced proofreading software.
-

Overall Strengths

- Addresses a crucial and under-researched issue (bridge construction in remote areas).
 - Applies PROMETHEE method innovatively to risk analysis.
 - Data collected from real projects.
-

Overall Weaknesses

- Poor English language quality.
 - Formatting inconsistencies.
 - Lack of visual tools for PROMETHEE analysis.
 - Limited sample size and geographical coverage.
-

Final Recommendation

- **Recommendation: Major Revision**

- **Justification:** The topic is important and methodology appropriate, but the manuscript requires substantial improvements in language, structure, analysis explanation, and formatting for publication in a reputed journal.