

[ICLCA20] Decision for ICLCA20.0036
The Carbon Footprint of Geothermal Exploration Project
in Indonesia: A Life Cycle Assessment Approach

Inbox



ICLCA20@sdewes.org

Fri, Sep 11, 2020,
3:09 PM

to me, iclcatech, jslim, alafiza

Dear Dr. ADIANSYAH,

The manuscript of your submission:

The Carbon Footprint of Geothermal Exploration Project in Indonesia: A Life Cycle
Assessment Approach

-

Joni Adiansyah*, UNIVERSITAS MUHAMMADIYAH MATARAM, Indonesia
Wahidul Biswas, Curtin University, Australia

Has been reviewed, and the Editor assigned to your submission has made the
following decision:

ACCEPT

This submission has reached the end of the process.

You are free to make another submission.

Please note the following comment/s:

The authors have addressed all the comments.

The editor will contact you by email for further editing on the format.

For CET publication, please make sure you have signed the copyright transfer
agreement via the online system.

Please log in to the system (<http://registration.sdewes.org/iclca20>) for further steps.

[ICLCA20] Decision for ICLCA20.0036 The Carbon Footprint of Geothermal Exploration Project in Indonesia: A Life Cycle Assessment Approach

Inbox



ICLCA20@sdewes.org

Tue, Aug 18,
2020, 2:08 PM

to me, iclcatech, jslim, alafiza

Dear Dr. ADIANSYAH,

The manuscript of your submission:

The Carbon Footprint of Geothermal Exploration Project in Indonesia: A Life Cycle Assessment Approach

-

Joni Adiansyah*, UNIVERSITAS MUHAMMADIYAH MATARAM, Indonesia

Has been reviewed, and the Editor assigned to your submission has made the following decision:

MINOR REVISION

Please download the following edited file by editors and revise your file directly based on this version:

<http://registration.sdewes.org/iclca20/dfile.php?dr=f0a2b5686f5dd3894fcf912c8a181fc73e138089>

The current status of the submission is: waiting for minor revision.

Please make sure you complete the next actions before the 25.08.2020 deadline.

Please note the following comment/s:

Editor's comment

1) The author didn't respond to the one of the reviewer comments. Please address this comment

- The author could add some information regarding on the comparison with other works and discussing in the Result and Discussion. The current form has no comparison of result.

2) There are further comments by reviewer. Please address the comments and highlight in yellow color or use track changes

3) There are still issues in terms of formatting and reference. Please improve the content and format of your file based on the version edited by the editor given in the link above.

4) Please highlight the changes in yellow colour or use track changes.

Reviewer 1:

The authors have addressed my comments.

Reviewer 2:

The reviewer didn't satisfy with the following responses:

- It should be clarified if manufacturing process of machines are included in the system boundary

Response: Thank you for your suggestion. We have added a note in the section 1.2

to address your suggestion – “manufacturing process of machineries was excluded”

Where did you address this comment? There is no Section 1.2. Please highlight the changes you have done so that easy for reviewer to review the revised version of manuscript.

- Reviewer recommend to discuss implication of the result on whole life cycle of project (development and operation). It is because this paper pointed that a lack of development stage in previous LCA study on geothermal project

Response: Thank you for your suggestion, we are scoping our study in the geothermal exploration stage (excluding development and operation). None of the

LCA current studies cover the exploration stage of geothermal project.

Therefore, this study would fill the gap of the current studies.

The reviewer recommends to DISCUSS the result of this study on whole life cycle of project. Or in other word, what is the significance of this study/result for the whole life cycle?

- Conclusion section contains too much general background information compared to output of the research. It is better to emphasize findings of the study rather than necessity of the study.

Response: Thank you for your suggestion. The findings have discussed in the results and discussion section in order to make the page efficient and compact (6 full pages requirement).

The response is not answering the reviewer's comment. Yes, agree the findings were discussed in result and discussion, however, in conclusion section, you need to conclude your findings rather than put general information (this should be in the introduction part). Author also can highlight future research work in this section.

Other comments have been well addressed.

Please log in to the system (<http://registration.sdewes.org/iclca20>) for further steps.

ICLCA20: Manuscript submitted (ICLCA20.0036 The Carbon Footprint of Geothermal Exploration Project in Indonesia: A Life Cycle Assessment Approach)

Inbox



ICLCA20 iclca20@sdewes.org via eu01.server.plus

Sun, Jun 21,
2020, 3:16 PM

to me, iclcatech

Dear Dr. ADIANSYAH,

Thank you for submitting the manuscript

The Carbon Footprint of Geothermal Exploration Project in Indonesia: A Life Cycle Assessment Approach

-

Joni Adiansyah*, UNIVERSITAS MUHAMMADIYAH MATARAM, Indonesia

It was received by the system and the editors have been notified.
If any errors have occurred during the submissions, you will be notified as soon as possible.

Thank you very much and best regards,

ICLCA
COMET SYSTEM