FW: PACIS 2014 - Please modify the format problems in your submission and resubmit it

Jing Gao <Jing.Gao@unisa.edu.au>
Mon 6/2/2014 9:26 AM
To: Faisal, - yyyfy002 <faisal@mymail.unisa.edu.au>
225

please fix it accordingly - easy fix.

Cheers
Jing

From: PACIS 2014 [pacis2014@easychair.org]
Sent: Monday, 2 June 2014 1:15 AM
To: Jing Gao
Subject: PACIS 2014 - Please modify the format problems in your submission and resubmit it

Dear Authors:

Thank you for your submission to PACIS 2014.
The PACIS 2014 Committee is preparing our conference proceedings. When we check the format of all the accepted papers, we find some problems in your submission.
Attached please find the PACIS paper template and a document that includes the format problems in your submission.
Please modify your submission and re-submit it. The online submission system will be open from June 2 to June 8 (Beijing Time).

If you did not register or have no intention to attend PACIS 2014, please ignore this email.

Best regards
PACIS 2014 Committee

PACIS 2014 Submission 256

Submission information updates are disabled.

For all questions related to processing your submission you should contact the conference organizers. Click here to see information about this conference.

All **reviews sent to you** can be found at the bottom of this page.

Submission 256	
Title	MOBILE-ENABLED COLLABORATIVE MAINTENANCE
Submission:	(Mar 17, 01:51 GMT)
Track	17. IS Implementation, Adoption, and Diffusion
Author keywords	Mobile maintenance Collaboration technology technology implementation
EasyChair keyphrases	asset maintenance (212), collaborative maintenance (173), maintenance crew (150), mobile collaboration (140), implementation requirement (120), mobile collaboration technology (110), engineering asset (103), mobile collaborative (85), technology implementation (80), delphi study (80), maintenance task (80), mobile collaborative maintenance (79), engineering asset maintenance (79), expert panel member (79), collaborative maintenance system (79), work order (70), mobile technology (70), mobile solution (70), collaboration technology (65), maintenance system (65), collaborative asset maintenance (63), collaborative maintenance requirement (63), mobile worker (60), mobile device (60), decision making (60), ranking order (50), maintenance data (50), final round (50), software system (50), common understanding (50)
Abstract	Obtaining engineering asset maintenance data and information on the move is very imperative. However, as equipment develops into large, high-speed, mechatronics and structure-complicated which are traded in global dimension, asset maintenance works become increasingly complex, multi-partners' participation, and geographically located in dispersed locations. As such, mobile collaborative maintenance system (MCMS) has a significant support, especially it is served and shared within and across organisations. Several specialised systems have been invested; however, the success rate is less than thirty per cent. Mobile technologies and solutions are very popular in consumer applications and the exploitation of these technologies is expanding. However, in large-industries, maintenance of mobile solutions has not yet attracted much attention. One explanation is the lack of competence and knowledge for adopting and implementing mobile solutions successfully in professional use. The lack of systematic approach, together with the lack of specific requirements may be the main cause, which calls for a comprehensive framework. A total of 20 mobile collaborative maintenance experts who have strong academic backgrounds, research and professional experiences from 10 different countries participated in this-a three rounds of international Delphi study. In the final round, a total of 26 implementation requirements were ranked according to their importance for creating successful MCMS implementation, covering technology, organisation and personal aspects.

Submitted	Mar 17, 01:51 GMT
Last update	Mar 17, 01:51 GMT
Category	Completed Research

Authors

first name	last name	email	country	affiliation	Web page	corresponding?
Faisal	Syafar	f_syafar@yahoo.com.sg	Indonesia	State University of Makassar		√
Jing	Gao	Jing.Gao@unisa.edu.au	Australia	University of South Australia		
Jia Tina	Du	Tina.Du@unisa.edu.au	Australia	University of South Australia		

Reviews

Review 1

Additional scores

Review

Review

Abstract:
-It is too long
- Author(s) need to be specific. For example, they mentioned:
"Several specialized systems have been invested; however, the success rate is less than thirty per cent". You need to add a reference here (which is uncommon) or you can say that in a different way (e.g. the success rate was very low according to previous research).You also need to be specific about the objective(s) of the study.

Introduction:
In Page 2, "…However, most experts agree that the percentage of success is less than 30% of total systems applications." Which experts? Are you talking about the participants in your research? Or experts' opinions from previous research? Please be specific and clear about your specific statements. You need to put the reference in the right place.

Literature review
It would be useful if you show in a table summary of the main reasons for unsuccessfully implementation of CMMS, and how your proposed framework (or MCMS) will help to address these reasons.

Results (contributions)
I can't see clearly the main contribution of this study? Is it the system requirements? (Which in my opinion is not a research contribution per se) Or, board factors (based on TOP dimensions) that influence on successful implementation/ adoption of MCMS.

I advise the author(s) to revise their research questions/objectives and based on them they need to position the research outcomes/results to right direction.

Review 2

Additional scores

Review

Review

Through a Delphi study involving experts in engineering asset organisations, this study has identified some requirements that are critical for implementing mobile collaborative maintenance technology. Requirements have been organized into technology, organization, and people categories.

I agree with the authors that a framework for guiding the implementation of mobile collaboration

	technology is needed and this study is timely. The list requirements identified appears relevant and valid. Yet, the contribution of this study to the technology implementation research appears weak and has not been discussed in the paper at all. Many of the requirements have already been identified in prior studies of technology implementation. How is mobile collaborative maintenance technology different and why is it necessary to study it specifically? The authors have not highlighted and explained the unique contribution of this study. There is also a lack of discussion of the implications of this study for future research and practice. There may be an opportunity to use the requirements identified as a basis for conceptualizing mobile collaborative maintenance technology implementation in a way that addresses important gaps in prior research. However, as it is, the list of requirements offer limited new insights.