



Firman Noor Hasan <firman.noorhasan@uhamka.ac.id>

[JCBD] Decision on Your Submission

1 message

Nofriadi <nofriadi@delitekno.co.id>

Tue, Jul 21, 2026 at 8:29 AM

To: Vina Trializa <2203015133@uhamka.ac.id>, Firman Noor Hasan <firman.noorhasan@uhamka.ac.id>

Dear Vina Trializa, Firman Noor Hasan,

We are writing to inform you that after careful evaluation, the decision regarding your submission titled "Development of a Business Intelligence Dashboard for Analyzing Trends and the Impact of Natural Disasters in Indonesia Using Tableau" to Journal of Computers and Digital Business is to request **Revisions Required**.

While your manuscript shows promise, certain aspects need to be revised before it can move forward in the publication process. We kindly ask you to address the required changes as per the detailed feedback provided, and resubmit your revised manuscript for further consideration.

If you have any questions or require additional clarification regarding the revisions, please feel free to reach out. We appreciate your efforts and look forward to receiving your revised manuscript.

Best regards,
Editor

Reviewer:

Recommendation: Revisions Required

Kesesuaian Judul

Biasa

Kesesuaian Abstrak

Biasa

Kesesuaian Bagian Pendahuluan

Biasa

Kesesuaian Bagian Metodologi Penelitian

Biasa

Kesesuaian Bagian Hasil dan Pembahasan

Biasa

Kesesuaian Bagian Kesimpulan

Biasa

Kesesuaian Bagian Daftar Putaka

Biasa

Komentar dan Saran Reviewer

Title:

1. The title misspells "Tableu" (should be "Tableau"), a serious credibility flaw in the title itself.
2. The title is long and descriptive without stating a specific scientific contribution.
3. The phrase "Analyzing Trends and the Impact" is generic with no indication of novelty.
4. Suggested title: A Tableau-Based Business Intelligence Dashboard for Multidimensional Analysis of Natural Disaster Impacts in Indonesia

Abstract

1. The abstract is purely process-descriptive (Kimball, ETL, star schema) with no scientific contribution or research gap addressed.
2. The claim that West Java had the highest impact is presented without noting it is likely a population/exposure artifact, not an analytic finding.
3. "Disaster impact predictions" is mentioned but the forecasting method is not named in the abstract.

Introduction:

1. The introduction is long but the research gap is weak; the claim that no prior work integrated multi-disaster data via a warehouse is under-supported and easily contested.
2. The claimed contribution (integrating multiple disaster types in one warehouse) is engineering, not scientific, the paper must justify journal-level significance.
3. The literature review mixes author-year (Lessy et al., 2022) with IEEE numeric citation inconsistently.
4. No explicit, measurable research question or problem statement is given.

Method:

1. A fatal methodological gap: the paper claims forecasting via Tableau but never describes, validates, or evaluates the forecasting method (Tableau's built-in exponential smoothing).
2. Forecasts are built from only ~5 annual data points (2021–2025), statistically insufficient for any forecasting claim.
3. No forecast accuracy metrics (MAPE, RMSE) or validation, predictions are presented as findings without evaluative basis.
4. The section is entirely tool-implementation steps (Pentaho, PostgreSQL, Kimball) with no replicable or testable research design.
5. BNPB data quality (missing values, cross-province reporting consistency) is not critically discussed, though it governs the validity of the entire analysis.

Result and Discussion:

1. There is no genuine discussion, the section merely narrates numbers per visualization without interpretation, comparison, or implications.
2. The "West Java highest impact" claim is not normalized to population or area, so the conclusion is likely biased and misleading.
3. The 2026 forecast figures are presented as valid, yet 2025 only covers data through September, incomplete-year data distorts the trend.
4. No findings are compared to prior work; the contribution to the field is not demonstrated.
5. Table numbering is inconsistent: the preprocessing metadata is called "Table 1" in-text but captioned "Table 3".
6. The fact table name is inconsistent (fact_bencana vs fact_disaster) throughout.

Conculusion:

1. The conclusion merely restates the process built, not the findings or scientific contribution.
2. No limitations are discussed, though the data and forecasting limitations are significant.
3. The claim that the dashboard "improves decision-making effectiveness" is unsupported by any user evaluation or measurement.

References

1. Make sure it complies with the template and writing guidelines

--

[Journal of Computers and Digital Business](#)

PT. Delitekno Media Mandiri, Deli Serdang, Sumatera Utara, Indonesia



B-Vina Trializa-review1-19820.docx

2032K