

I. RESPONSE TO FIRST REVIEWER

Dear Professor Dr. Kassem Saleh,
Editor in Chief Journal of Software

Response to Reviewers comments on

"AHP Analysis with Open Office Calc on Information Security Policy Decision Making"
Assigned Code : **jsw 100110**

Thank you very much for the anonymous reviewers for their very valuable comments on our manuscript. We have improved our paper and addressed the issues the reviewers pointed out.

Once again, thank you very much for kindest support and help.

We are looking forward to a possibility of publishing our work in the Journal of Software.

Yours sincerely

Irfan Syamsuddin and Junseok Hwang

Attached responses to reviewer comments:

First Reviewer

The following are the comments that should be considered while revising the paper:

Thank you very much for the valuable suggestions, please refer to our improved manuscript accordingly.

1. The title of the paper should reflect the contents of your paper. Modify the title to make it more accurate, sort and attractive. You can check any Emerald/Inderscience publishers' web site for any journals and change your title.

Answer :

Thank you very much for the suggestion. Then, we modified title to be "*The Use of AHP in Security Policy Decision Making: An Open Office Calc Application*"

2. The paper should not just look like a theory paper but look like a research paper; hence it needs to be developed as a journal paper with significant development rewriting. You can check while writing the full paper.

Answer :

Thank you very much for the suggestion. We have extended the quality of the paper to more like research paper with significant redevelopment in structure and content.

3. Define the acronyms when they first appear. Define key words.

Answer :

Acronyms have been explained in their first appearance such as AHP, and MCDM in the first section.

4. Mostly, the abstract of the paper reads poorly. It lacks motivation and justification. Whatever you mention in abstract, it should reflect in the entire contents of the paper.

Answer :

Many thanks for the valuable comments. We have improved the abstract to address the entire contents of paper such as motivation, justification, findings and implication.

5. For full paper, Introduction section (Section 1) does not suitably motivate the readers in the subject. Therefore, it should be strengthened further by including relevant justification of the current research, using 5-8 latest references (2007-2008) from journals of mentioned journals preferably. This will add the currency of the paper. Also, whenever you, as an author make any bold statements, tall claims please always support the statement with a literature review and empirical results.

Answer :

Many thanks for the suggestions. We have improved the content of section 1 by addressing the following points: reasons why and how AHP can be used in information security policy decision making, what limitation in literature to be filled by this study and how analysis will be done. We strengthened this section with 7 new published references (2007 to 2010) to justify our statements. Also, we have underlined our motivation and main objectives in section 2 (third paragraph on page 3).

6. The paper needs a separate section (Section 2) on "Literature Review". Develop a decent literature review in order to provide the scope, significance and justification of the current research. Also, try to include some latest journal article references (8-10) published from 2005-2008 (including extracts) in the relevant areas to improve the relevance and currency of the research. Also, try to include 3-4 references from the above mentioned journals to improve the currency of the paper; it should contain, scope, limitations, why have you taken the study, what is the motivation, what is the implications etc.

Answer :

To respond this comment, we developed a special section 2 of Literature Review. This covers the significance of our study, the scope and how our research will benefit current literature and its implication (available from page 2 to 3). For this purpose, we have added 9 more reference papers (latest publication) from reference number 27 until 35.

7. You have to clearly define the research objectives and hypotheses in Section 3 (Research Objectives and Methodology)

Answer :

Thank you very much for the suggestions. We have improved section 3 to clearly explain our Research Objectives and Methodology (page 3 to 4). Here, we justify our primary research objective and two extended objectives of (section 3 part A in page 3). In addition, entire explanation about AHP methodology was redeveloped with better presentation such as mathematical equations (part B page 3 to 4). Actually, we did not specify hypothesis to test in this study since, our aim is to answer the research objectives.

8. Section (2/3) on Research Objectives Methodology need to be organized suitably. You should separate the research methodology (Section 3) and Empirical Results and Analysis (Section 4).

Answer :

Thank you very much. We followed these useful suggestions by new structure as follows. Section 3 is for Research Objectives and Methodology. Section 4 is basically a part of methodology (section 3), however in this case we decided to describe AHP Decision Model in more detail to emphasize our contribution in information security literature. In Section 5 of Analysis and Discussion, we provide the analysis of our empirical results using Open Office Calc. Finally section 6 is the concluding remark and future research direction.

9. Section 3 on research methodology should describe the data collection methodology and its justification given the research objectives and hypotheses. Use some citations to justify the research methodology.

Answer :

Thank you very much for the suggestions. Methodology discussion has been extended with clear citations as can be in the beginning section 3. In the last of paragraph of section 4, we explain how data were collected as well as participants involved in this study.

10. Section 4 should be on Empirical Results and Analysis. This section should be developed and suitably presented and motivated.

Answer :

Thank you very much for the suggestions. Details of empirical result and analysis is given in section 5 of Analysis and Discussion (page 5 to 7). We have improved the presentation of this main section to give clear understanding of step by step process of AHP calculations.

11. You might have collected valuable data, but not analyzed, explained and motivated to provide some useful and new insights into the subject. This is the main weakness of the paper. Hence please develop the same and resend it. Authors may ignore if already they have taken note of it and written a quality paper.

Answer :

Thank you very much for the valuable inputs. We realize this weakness; therefore we extend it with our new insight which can be seen in the last three paragraphs of section 5. A new table 4 is also provided to help readers easily grasp the point of final result.

12. The Section on conclusion section looks okay, but it should be expanded to highlight the unique contributions of the paper, limitations of the research and some future research directions. Some of the discussions can be moved to Section 5 if necessary (Implications of the Research).

Answer :

Again we thank to the valuable suggestions. In the conclusion section, we also

highlighted the contribution of our study to information security policy literature, its limitation and future research direction.

13. Update the reference list as per the comments 5-9.

Answer :

Reference has been extended, updated and improved to accommodate new references as mentioned previously.

14. Use Harvard style referencing both within the text and at the end.

Answer :

Reference was redeveloped by following Harvard style in both text and at the end.

15. Missing reference details such as volume, issue and page numbers should be fixed.

Answer :

Reference was corrected to fix such missing.

16. The language of the paper needs a thorough editing. Check the English grammar.

Answer :

We have edited and extended the paper while fixing some language errors.

Finally, we would like to express our great thanks for the valuable suggestions to improve the quality of our manuscript.

II. RESPONSE TO SECOND REVIEWER

Thank you very much for the valuable suggestions, please refer to our improved manuscript accordingly.

1. A careful review of language is needed. There are quite a few mistakes in language.

- a. Page 1: Reference 29 is wrong.

Answer

Thank you very much for the valuable corrections. We have thoroughly fixed language errors as well as incorrect citations.

- b. Page 2: Writing the mathematical equations should be aligned correctly.

$W' = AW$, these terms should be cleared.

'Pair wise' is the correct word, not 'pariwise' in Step 2.

Answer

Many thanks for the valuable corrections. All mathematical equations have been rewritten and aligned properly. Additional terms for W' is also given and all "pairwise" words were replaced with "pair wise".

- c. Page 3: Reference 31 is wrong in Aspect of Culture.

In Aspect of Technology, 'In short, various security technologies.... security attacks.', should be cleared.

In Hierarchy Development, the first paragraph should be cleared.

Answer

Thank you very much for the useful corrections. We have fixed this paragraph with clear sentence and supporting it with related citation.

As can be seen, this new manuscript has been redeveloped with better structure. Hierarchy Development was expanded and put in a separated section 4 (namely AHP Decision Model). We have improved the presentation of this section to be more understandable with appropriate citations.

- d. Page 4: 'Row' is the correct word, not raw in AHP analysis.

Answer

Thank you very much for the useful corrections. We realize this mistake and they were all corrected.

Cell no 13 is empty in figure 3.

Answer

In this case, we mean Cell I3 (I-three) not Cell 13 (thirteen). We have corrected the mistyped in page 5. As can be seen in figure 3, the value of Cell I3 is 0.408.

- e. Page 5: The formulas for Confidentiality and MMUKT are not referred properly.

Answer

Many thanks for this correction. This is our mistake and we have correctly referred it (MMULT function) to reference number 3.

- 2. Conclusion can be improved.

Answer

Thank you very much for the suggestion. We have improved the conclusion section with highlighting the contribution of our study to information security policy literature. Also we briefly described its limitation and future research direction.

- 3. Few references that are mentioned in the text are not in the reference list i.e. reference 31 on Page 3.

Answer

Many thanks for the corrections. We have addressed such missing references by adding related published references and reconstructing the reference list accordingly.

- 4. In 3rd portion of AHP Analysis, figures should be mentioned for the explanatory text on page 5.

Answer

Thank you very much for this useful suggestion. In this new manuscript, we have expanded AHP analysis into new section 4 namely AHP Analysis and Discussion. In this section we improved the explanatory of analysis and additional discussion to put our insight as can be seen from page 5 to page 7. In addition, we added new Table 4 to help readers easily grasp the final result.

Finally, we would like to express our great thanks for the valuable suggestions to improve the quality of our manuscript.