

BUKTI KORESPONDENSI

Jurnal Internasional Bereputasi terindeks Scopus dan SJR

Judul paper:

“Vertical Extensions: Stakeholder Perspectives on Development Decisions and Construction Strategies”

Nama jurnal:

Journal of Architectural Engineering, Vol. 29, No. 2, April 2023, halaman 04023010

Daftar korespondensi:

1. Konfirmasi submit paper - 7 Apr 2022
2. Informasi bahwa paper sedang dalam proses review - 19 Jul 2022
3. Notifikasi hasil review dan deadline submit revisi paper - 23 Agt 2022
4. Konfirmasi submit revisi paper 1 - 23 Sep 2022
5. Notifikasi hasil review 2, permintaan minor revision - 6 Des 2022
6. Konfirmasi submit revisi paper 2 - 19 Des 2022
7. Notifikasi paper 'accepted for publication' - 11 Jan 2023
8. Permintaan untuk perubahan format pada paper - 10 Feb 2023
9. Permintaan untuk mereview paper proof - 9 Mar 2023
10. Permintaan approval final paper untuk dipublish - 22 Mar 2023
11. Notifikasi bahwa paper telah terpublish - 4 Apr 2023

1. Konfirmasi submit paper - 7 Apr 2022

From: em.jrnaeng.0.7a7c73.5e9d89b8@editorialmanager.com on behalf of [Journal of Architectural Engineering](#)
To: [Eunike Kristi Julistiono](#)
Subject: Technical Paper AEENG-1474 sent to Editor - [EMID:16b915078515350f]
Date: Thursday, 7 April 2022 11:03:16 AM

CC: "Philip Oldfield" p.oldfield@unsw.edu.au, "Luciano Cardellicchio" luciano.cardellicchio@unsw.edu.au

Dear Eunike Kristi Julistiono,

Your submission, entitled "Vertical Extensions: Stakeholder Perspectives on Why and How They Are Built," has been assigned manuscript number AEENG-1474 and has been forwarded to the Editor to begin the review process.

You may check the progress of your submission by logging onto the Editorial Manager system at <https://www.editorialmanager.com/jrnaeng/>.

Thank you for submitting your work to this journal.

Sincerely,

Journal of Architectural Engineering

In compliance with data protection regulations, you may request that we remove your personal registration details at any time. (Use the following URL: <https://www.editorialmanager.com/jrnaeng/login.asp?a=r>). Please contact the publication office if you have any questions.

2. Informasi bahwa paper sedang dalam proses review - 19 Jul 2022

From: [ASCE ASCE](#)
To: [Eunike Kristi Julistiono](#)
Subject: Re: Query Journal of Architectural Engineering AEENG-1474 - [EMID:46d90b8d64cd37da]
Date: Tuesday, 19 July 2022 3:39:42 AM

Hi Dr. Julistiono,

Thank you for your message. Your manuscript is currently under peer review. One review has been completed and the second one is outstanding. Once all required reviews have been received your paper will return to the editors for a decision. After a decision has been made you will be notified by email.

If you have any questions or concerns in the meantime, please be sure to let me know.

Best regards,
Elie Wright
they/them
Editorial Coordinator
Journal Architectural Engineering
American Society of Civil Engineers
1801 Alexander Bell Drive
Reston, VA 20191
(919) 650-1459
ascearchitectural@gmail.com

On Mon, Jul 18, 2022 at 7:38 AM Eunike Kristi Julistiono <em@editorialmanager.com> wrote:

Ref.: Ms. No. AEENG-1474
Vertical Extensions: Stakeholder Perspectives on Why and How They Are Built
Eunike Kristi Julistiono; Philip Oldfield; Luciano Cardellicchio

Dear Sir/Madam,
Journal of Architectural Engineering

I would like to ask regarding the progress of my paper. It was submitted on April 7th and currently the status is under review.

Is there any updates on the status? Is there anything which I need to add to the submission?

I'm really looking forward to hearing some updates on my paper.

Best regards,

Eunike Kristi Julistiono

In compliance with data protection regulations, you may request that we remove your personal registration details at any time. (Use the following URL: <https://www.editorialmanager.com/jrnaeeng/login.asp?a=r>). Please contact the publication office if you have any questions.

3. Notifikasi hasil review dan deadline submit revisi paper - 23 Agt 2022

From: em.jrmaeng.0.7d8233.6543225c@editorialmanager.com on behalf of [Journal of Architectural Engineering](#)
To: [Eunike Kristi Julistiono](#)
Subject: Decision on Manuscript MS AEENG-1474 - [EMID:a6b261894f6cb113]
Date: Tuesday, 23 August 2022 12:22:44 AM
Attachments: [Revision Due.ics](#)

Ref.: Ms. No. AEENG-1474

Vertical Extensions: Stakeholder Perspectives on Why and How They Are Built
Eunike Kristi Julistiono; Philip Oldfield; Luciano Cardellicchio

Dear Eunike Kristi Julistiono,

Your Technical Paper, listed above, has completed a review for publication in ASCE's Journal of Architectural Engineering. The editor has requested that a revised manuscript be prepared based on the reviewers' evaluations (shown at the end of this email) and submitted for re-review by 09/26/2022.

When preparing the revised manuscript in accordance with the reviewers' concerns and suggestions, be sure to address the following additional corrections:

- Please upload your revised manuscript file in Microsoft Word or LaTeX format. If you using LaTeX, you may submit a PDF file for review. Please see our LaTeX instructions on the Author main page for more information.
- Remove the figures from your manuscript text and upload them separately (one figure per file) in TIFF, EPS or PDF format. Also, please make sure to reference the figure number in each file name.
- Graphics or colored / shaded cells in tables. Please remove the graphics or shaded cells from your tables. If you find that the overall meaning of your table is lost when the graphics are removed from the table, please convert the table into a figure, and upload as an EPS, TIFF or PDF file.
- Double-spaced list of figure captions. Please provide a double-spaced list of figure captions with your submission. This can be at the end of your manuscript text or uploaded as a separate Word file. Also, please make sure if you have figures labeled as Figure 1a, 1b, etc. that the captions for these parts of the figure are included in your Figure Caption List.

Please make sure your figure caption list is in MS Word.

Also, please note in order to clarify math for copyeditors, please ensure that you use boldface for matrices, vectors, and tensors; italics for all variables and lowercase Greek letters; and roman for all numerals, uppercase Greek characters, and mathematical operators.

ASCE is now encouraging authors to add a Practical Applications section to their paper. The Practical Applications section is a concise plain-language summary (150-200 words) of the paper written for non-academic or practitioner audiences to identify the results, relevance, or potential applications the research describes. You can read more about requirements for the Practical Applications section in the Peer Review Process section of the [ASCE Author Guide](#).

When your changes are complete, please upload two versions of your revised manuscript:

(1) a tracked-changes or marked-up version of the paper that indicates all changes made to the text with either highlighting, colored text, or tracked changes, and (2) a "clean", un-marked copy. Please upload the marked-up copy as a "tracked changes version" item type. Only the clean copy of your manuscript should be uploaded as the "Manuscript" item type.

Please submit the revised manuscript and a detailed response to the reviewers' criticisms by logging onto the editorial management system at <https://www.editorialmanager.com/jrnaeng/> and clicking on the "Submissions Needing Revision" link.

For your convenience, there is a calendar entry item attached that works with electronic calendars in the iCalendar format (e.g. Outlook, iCal, Google). To use, click to open the attachment, and then save it to your calendar.

Be advised that the editor may request further revision or decline your revised version if all of the reviewers' comments have not been adequately addressed.

Comments from the Editor and Reviewers can be found below.

We look forward to receiving your revised manuscript.

Sincerely,

Candice Gooch
Peer Review Manager

Reviewer Questions and Answers:
Reviewer's Responses to Questions

This manuscript was submitted as a Technical Paper. Does the reviewer think this is the appropriate article type? To see descriptions of the article types, [Click Here](#).

Reviewer #1:

- Yes. The author is using the correct article type.

Reviewer #2:

- Yes. The author is using the correct article type.

Reviewer #3:

- Yes. The author is using the correct article type.

Reviewer comments:

Reviewer #1: 1. First of all, the title of the paper could be improved, I don't think the "why" has been discussed, it was more like opinions of the people involved in the VE projects.

2. "with figures predicted to reach 9.8 billion by 2050." Line 28 - Reference??
3. Nevertheless, constructing additional floorspace in urban areas can be challenging, especially given that many brownfield sites are already developed. Line 45-46 - Reference??
4. therefore contributing to waste and additional embodied carbon. Line 61-62 - Reference??
5. "&" Line 63 - Please use 'and' instead of &.
6. Source: Ibelings van Tilburg architecten and Goettsch Partners - fig 1 - is there permission accessed from the architect, if yes, the information should be there.
7. One of the most significant suggested is extra structural capacity in existing buildings to support the weight of additional stories
- Line 105-106 - Reference??
8. Regardless of the benefits and prospects, the drivers and decision-making processes that inform why VE are chosen as a building solution have not been analyzed in detail. Line 111-112 - Reference??
9. Most existing research frames the sustainable potential of VE to improve existing building stocks and support urban densification.
- Line 112-113 - Reference??
10. much broader array of stakeholders - Line 123 - how is it decided?? Also, does the people from different regions having different bylaws can affect the opinions??
11. "There is no real need to demolish to make space for a new building, it was just not a sustainable way to go and not a cost-effective way to go." - Line 216-217 - is this also cited by any interviewee??
12. CLT - Line 347 - Although it can be understood by concern readers, still the full form first time should be written.
13. The existing structure supports the extension in its entirety in six projects (33%), because the existing buildings were significantly robust and oversized (n=5), or the extension was pre-planned and the structure was pre-designed accordingly (n=1). Hence, VE could be constructed while the buildings were occupied in most cases (except in one project where refurbishment was performed alongside VE). - Line 446-450 - Is this can be counted as strategy, I doubt??
14. Fig. 4. The three identified structural support strategies for VE. - Maybe few more details in the figure could be better.
15. "All new services, the original building was stripped back to just its facades and its structural frame, and everything else is new in there." - Line 503-504 - Does this strategy recommends economic benefits which is the main driver quoted by authors.
16. "They put a cafeteria on the 30th floor, so that people [construction workers] didn't need to leave the building to get their meals."
- Line 535-537 - Again, this can be a strategy??
17. Interviewees' responses comparing VE with building on the ground (top), and comparing VE with demolish and rebuild (bottom).
- Fig 6. - The results are very contrasting showing not too much benefits, however the text written in the paper is different?? Please clarify??
18. that economic profit was the main driver of commercial VE projects - Line 585- In fig 6, it says VE cost a lot, how does this statement is justified in this case??
19. Did the occupants remain in the building while the construction process? What were some strategies applied to minimize the disturbance? - Q5 - There are no answers to this questions in the paper.

Reviewer #2: Review comments for
Vertical Extensions: Stakeholder Perspectives on Why and How They Are Built

1. Does the manuscript present a specific, easily identifiable advance in knowledge? Is it applicable and useful to the profession?

This is hard to decide, although there is much information in the result chapter, the problem is not well defined in the introduction, therefore results become overwhelming and the contributions very unclear. It is unclear for whom it is useful and the urgency and needs for the research findings.

2. Has the information already been published elsewhere, either wholly or in part?

No, not according to the authors.

3. Is the subject matter within the scope of the journal? Or is it better suited to another journal?

The context seems to fit well into the scope and aim of the journal, VE-projects. However, I am unsure if the methods align with the journal's typical research approaches. See also my additional comments about the methods.

4. Do the title and abstract accurately describe the contents? Does the abstract include all of the main findings of the study?

Yes, the abstract promises many different kinds of results, which is also what the result chapter provides. However, I think the research results could benefit from being more focused. See more about this in later comments.

5. Is the review of literature limited to that framing the new knowledge? Are all references pertinent and complete?

I do not understand the purpose of the chapter "VERTICAL EXTENSIONS (VE): A BRIEF OVERVIEW" is it a background explaining the context of VE projects, or why is the review needed? I would like to see parts of this review in the introduction of the paper, because this is where the background to VE-projects is provided and should therefore be the background to the problem. The current introduction is on a too zoomed out level to pave a logical and convenient way for your study. 1 to 3 sentences from the current introduction is enough to put VE project in the context of sustainable development. The text under the literature is good but needs to outline some sort of problem that you intend to contribute to with your research. Right now, it is missing direction.

In relation to this, the study's purpose is not motivated enough. The current motive for your research is that there are not yet enough studies of this type, but that is not a strong argument for why your study is needed. So, the text needs to be restructured and reformulated to position your research in relation to it, not just as "the missing puzzle piece" but as the answer to a current problem within VE-projects, scientific or industrial. This problem, which I do not yet see, would preferably best be solved by a holistic approach, which is how you formulate your approach to "solve" the problem. Although, the problem, as I argued, is not apparent.

I recognize much of the findings in at least one other article, but these references are not mentioned in the literature review. Since the method for carrying out the review is not explained, it is unclear why some literature is "missing". Should the review examine all existing literature on VE? Or how was the selection carried out?

6. Is the methodology sufficiently well explained that someone else knowledgeable about the field could repeat the study?

Why present the methods for the literature review after presenting the results from the literature review? -And in relation to that, how was the literature review conducted? That is not clear now.

The study is framed as qualitative, but I see elements of quantitative approaches. Furthermore, the combination between open and closed interview questions is not

motivated.

Why random selection of respondents worldwide? - The only selection is projects finished between 0-15 years ago. No motivation for the selection of projects/stakeholders is given in relation to what you aim to draw conclusions about.

Thematic analysis is motivated as an analysis method for qualitative data, but as mentioned, quantitative data is also included. Furthermore, on the analysis, -What is reflexive thematic analysis? This needs to be developed. What role does this approach play in the outcome/ambition to "solve" the problem? (When you have specified a problem). Are you familiar with the term reflexivity? Because I do not see any reflexive discussion in relation to the analysis, instead, I see the opposite, you make nontransparent assumptions which makes the analysis process hard to grasp and therefore hard to "replete" - which is requested by the journal. You also state that you are not interested in the underlying meaning of the data by saying that you follow a semantic approach. By this means, the method described contradicts itself.

Although the steps in thematic coding are displayed, I do not understand with what perspective or aim the interpretation of the text has been made (if it was interpreted). The method chapter does not give me a clue of what kind of result I can expect since it is quite narrowly described. It does not explain the underlying operations and interpretations behind the "steps" or what has been done.

Also, a literature review is part of the three step-research design (figure 2). Even so, you state that the study is inductive. The role of the literature in analyzing the data should be better explained.

All results, especially Part two of the interview, is analyzed partly quantitative, why? No motive is given in the method section. Also, what is the reason for comparing VE with other projects with yes and no questions? this is not explained.

7. Is each figure and table necessary to the understanding of the conclusions? Can any be omitted without compromising the paper's message?

I don't see the need for figure 1. Figure 2 gives a good overview, but you should think carefully about what it signals when you rewrite the method chapter with more detail. Does figure 2 still represent what you did? E.g., If the literature review was the starting point, then you should be careful to call the study inductive. Figure 2 could be extended to include more details of the procedure if needed. Were there any iterative procedures? Then include that in figure 2. Figure 3 of the decision-making process is very good and what I would prefer this paper to be about. So, my recommendation is to develop this contribution and frame the problem accordingly.

8. Are the results soundly interpreted and related to existing knowledge on the topic?

The numbers (%) in the result section are not commented on/analyzed, why are they needed? I do not understand why I need all the information presented in the result chapter. This has to do with the unstated problem, as earlier mentioned. The results are delivered in four extensive chapters, Decision-making process, Challenges of Vertical Extensions, Vertical Extension Strategies, and Comparison between VE and conventional development. Why do you need all these? How are all relevant for the study's purpose? How do they relate to each other? For example, Is the paper's main contribution suggest a generic decision-making process or to provide lessons learned? You either need to choose one or make clear why they all are needed, because now the results are difficult to interpret. You might need to make a choice, where do you want to contribute? For whom is this a contribution? And then, based on that, what would be your one specific aim? It feels like the result chapter is basically the result of the whole thematic coding, you need to be more selective -what do you want to say? -what point do you want to make?

9. Are the conclusions sound and justified? Do they follow logically from data presented?

This chapter suffers from wanting to say too much, ending up saying nothing of specific

interest. Here you need to discuss why your results are important in relation to the specific problem. So, you need to define the problem first.

10. Do all elements of the manuscript relate logically to the study's statement of purpose? The research gap is not so well explained in the introduction. Focus is on, e.g., Paris Agreement and increased population and urbanization. So, the sustainability aspect of VE is explained well, but not what the problem is and why this research is needed. There is no reference to earlier studies of VE in the introduction, which could support this research by positioning itself to the existing literature (See earlier comment). On rows 16-17, the following "gap" is presented: "However, despite a growing number of projects and emerging academic literature, limited research has documented the lessons learned from VE projects, from stakeholders involved in their development and construction." This gap is not well supported by existing literature on VE projects. That literature is presented first in the next section (row 72). I would like to be introduced to this literature earlier and see you reduce the information in rows (27-57) so that the gap is presented and supported earlier in the article.

11. Can the paper be shortened without compromising its message?
Yes, see other comments.

Reviewer #3: This paper presents the results of a literature review and subsequent semi-structured interviews to answer two main questions: what are the drivers and decision-making processes that inform vertical extensions? What are the architectural, structural, and constructional challenges and strategies of vertical extensions in practice?

The paper is clearly written, appears methodologically sound, and succinctly highlights important takeaways. It effectively blends the numerical results (percentages of respondents) with specific quotes that go deeper into design influences. Although limited to a small number of buildings in a few countries, the paper nevertheless consolidates and presents practitioner knowledge on vertical extensions in a useful way.

The following comments are mostly minor but aim to help the authors revise the paper.

69: The first research question asks what are the "drivers" and "decision-making processes" that inform VEs. However, later on, the terms "drivers" and "pressures" are both used as parallel components of the whole decision-making "process". Would it help to revise one or the other to clarify the relationship of these three terms and be consistent throughout?

92-94: Check grammar: "energy savings" [have been studied]?

111-124: There is some redundancy in how the gaps and previous studies are described, especially as several key studies are mentioned repeatedly. Consider revising.

162-169: It would be helpful to have more detail on the coding scheme and initial themes here, for example what terminology was used to categorize the responses

406-407: Consider revising grammar ("found crucial")

651: Check grammar: "While this research finds..."

Fig 3: Since Figure 3 only shows the overall pattern, it would be helpful to have the

numerical results (the percentage of respondents who identified drivers, pressures, opportunities, etc.) consolidated in an additional figure or set of figures, rather than just in the text. This additional set of figures could refer back to Figure 3, but be simple bar graphs (or similar) showing the magnitude of response for each part of the process.

Fig 4: Labels on all three strategies in the figure would help, so it can stand alone without the text. These labels could be on the figures (like what was done for Fig. 5), in the caption, or simply by labeling the different components as existing or new.

Fig 6: Most of these responses have clearly dominant answers, but what do you make of the several questions that are near ~50%? What other factors may control?

Table 1: There might not be enough data for this, but are you able to segment answers/priorities by role? For example, did developers or contractors have noticeably different priorities on average compared to architects?

In compliance with data protection regulations, you may request that we remove your personal registration details at any time. ([Remove my information/details](#)). Please contact the publication office if you have any questions.

4. Konfirmasi submit revisi paper 1 - 23 Sep 2022

From: em.jrnaeng.0.7e33ee.3c1647e1@editorialmanager.com on behalf of [Journal of Architectural Engineering](#)
To: [Eunike Kristi Julistiono](#)
Subject: Revised submission confirmation - [EMID:67b22aa98a516402]
Date: Friday, 23 September 2022 2:41:37 PM

CC: "Philip Oldfield" p.oldfield@unsw.edu.au, "Luciano Cardellicchio" luciano.cardellicchio@unsw.edu.au

Ref.: Ms. No. AEENG-1474R1
Technical Paper

Dear Eunike Kristi Julistiono,

Your revised manuscript, listed above, has been received by the Journal of Architectural Engineering.

You may check the status of your manuscript by logging onto the editorial management system at <https://www.editorialmanager.com/jrnaeng/>

Sincerely,

Journal of Architectural Engineering

In compliance with data protection regulations, you may request that we remove your personal registration details at any time. (Use the following URL: <https://www.editorialmanager.com/jrnaeng/login.asp?a=r>). Please contact the publication office if you have any questions.

5. Notifikasi hasil review 2, permintaan minor revision - 6 Des 2022

From: em.jrnaeng.0.7fd15a.6a4c3427@editorialmanager.com on behalf of [Journal of Architectural Engineering](#)
To: [Eunike Kristi Julistiono](#)
Subject: Revise for Editor Only - [EMID:70840de9b23f8cdb]
Date: Tuesday, 6 December 2022 4:37:43 AM
Attachments: [Review comments_Reviewer 2_On Revision 1.docx](#)
[Revision_Due.ics](#)

Ref.: Ms. No. AEENG-1474R1

Vertical Extensions: Stakeholder Perspectives on Development Decisions and Construction Strategies

Eunike Kristi Julistiono; Philip Oldfield; Luciano Cardellicchio

Dear Eunike Kristi Julistiono,

Your Technical Paper, listed above, has completed a review for publication in ASCE's Journal of Architectural Engineering. The editor has requested that minor revisions be made based on the reviewers' comments and submitted for re-review by 12/19/2022. This revision will only be seen again by the editor and will not undergo the entire review process.

You can view any reviewers' attachments by opening the attachments on this email OR by clicking on this link to see them in the system: [View Attachments](#). Please note, this link will only work one time.

When preparing the revised manuscript in accordance with the reviewers' concerns and suggestions, be sure to address the following additional corrections:

Also, please note in order to clarify math for copyeditors, please ensure that you use boldface for matrices, vectors, and tensors; italics for all variables and lowercase Greek letters; and roman for all numerals, uppercase Greek characters, and mathematical operators.

ASCE is now encouraging authors to add a Practical Applications section to their paper. The Practical Applications section is a concise plain-language summary (150-200 words) of the paper written for non-academic or practitioner audiences to identify the results, relevance, or potential applications the research describes. You can read more about requirements for the Practical Applications section in the Peer Review Process section of the [ASCE Author Guide](#).

When your changes are complete, please upload two versions of your revised manuscript: (1) a tracked-changes or marked-up version of the paper that indicates all changes made to the text with either highlighting, colored text, or tracked changes, and (2) a "clean", unmarked copy. Please upload the marked-up copy as a "tracked changes version" item type. Only the clean copy of your manuscript should be uploaded as the "Manuscript" item type.

Please submit the revised manuscript and a detailed response to the reviewers' criticisms by logging onto the editorial management system at <https://www.editorialmanager.com/jrnaeng/> and clicking on the "Submissions Needing Revision" link.

For your convenience, there is a calendar entry item attached that works with electronic calendars in the iCalendar format (e.g. Outlook, iCal, Google). To use, click to open the attachment, and then save it to your calendar.

Be advised that the editor may request further revision or decline your revised version if all of the reviewers' comments have not been adequately addressed.

Comments from the Editor and Reviewers can be found below.

We look forward to receiving your revised manuscript.

Sincerely,

Victoria Willis
Editorial Coordinator

Reviewer Questions and Answers:
Reviewer's Responses to Questions

This manuscript was submitted as a Technical Paper. Does the reviewer think this is the appropriate article type? To see descriptions of the article types, [Click Here](#).

Reviewer #2:

- Yes. The author is using the correct article type.

Reviewer comments:

Reviewer #2: See word file.

Clarify what is meant by "grey literature;" what sources, specifically, do the authors reference and why is this more informative for the purposes of this paper than traditional academic and or professional publications?

In compliance with data protection regulations, you may request that we remove your personal registration details at any time. ([Remove my information/details](#)). Please contact the publication office if you have any questions.

Thank you for meeting my previous comments. My impression of the new version is that it is clearer and more focused, which was my main concerns in the first version. I still have some questions and concerns that I think would improve the manuscript if considered and resolved.

Introduction:

The introduction is improved and more logically structured to support the “gap” and research questions, thank you. However, you mention that most existing research focuses on the opportunities of VE and that research about the challenges is lacking (Ln 101). Furthermore, you mention that previous research has only focused on one technical aspect or one project, which is not true. One example is Norell et al. (2020), an article based on lesson learnt from more than one project and focuses on why VE can be seen as complex i.e., it focuses on challenges as well.

Regarding the gap that research of VE that considers stakeholders such as engineers and architects in EU, this seems to be true. Then I would like to see you argue why research from EU cannot be used “worldwide”. The gap “no research that interviews developers and contractors” is good, this gap is corresponding to your research aim and results, since you focus on decision making. I would then like you to develop why architects and engineers are needed in your study too? How active are these stakeholders in decision making? And what kind of decision making are we talking about? VE or conventional building? Is it the broader array of stakeholders that your gaps point towards? Or are decision-making stakeholders, with early involvement? And in relation to that, why is worldwide representation needed? Are there contextual or cultural differences in The United States, and Australia compared to EU that motivates this?

Research question 1 is well argued for. I do not see the relationship between rq 1 and 2. Why are both needed? This could easily be one article each. If both are needed, when why are they needed to be answered in the same article? Could these instead be illustrating examples of previous decisions? Challenges + solution involves some kind of decision making?

Method:

Ln 141: Why do you want to prevent generalizations? And why can a quantitative analysis of data prevent generalizations and increase the replicability of the study? This is unclear.

Table 2: I like the clarity in table 2, my interpretation is that you have had one interview per project (so either with an architect, contractor, developer, or engineer) is this correct? What do you think about the numbers? Are you pleased that 21 of 30 stakeholders are not contractors or developer? (The gap that you intended to fill?) This is yet an example of why you need to argue how these stakeholders in different ways contribute to decision making. Furthermore, do you see any patterns in the empirical material that has to do with what stakeholder the respondent represent? And lastly, what do the contractors and developers contribute that others do not? This would be the unique contribution of your paper since you argue that this research does not exist.

I like the column VE planned/unplanned** in table 3. This plays an important role in your research, why did they change their decision? Is the discussion of differences between countries included in your findings? Or is the decision making process similar? This would give arguments for why research is needed worldwide and previous research in EU is not enough.

Ln 171: Was the analysis really inductive? Did you not have a specific focus on decision making by then? Did you not formulate the questions in the interview to be able to say something about decision making?

Ln 178: I still do not understand why “evidence is included in the results in terms of numbers/percentages of interviewees who mentioned specific responses”. This is the qualitative part of your interview, right? With open questions? So why do you need numerical evidence by counting their answers? It is irrelevant in qualitative research. Mixed methods, as you say you use, means combining results from quantitative research (numbers) with findings from the qualitative study (narratives) (e.g., Williams, 2007 or Flick, 2014), not to analyze qualitative data with quantitative analysis methods (quantify qualitative data)?

Figure 2: What is the difference between the soft and hard arrows?

Results:

Part 1 (Decision-making Processes) of this chapter is ok and meets the expectation created though the first research question. Same for 3&4 that meets rq. 2. Please remind the reader again why rq2 is needed in relation to rq1, this is well explained in the introduction, but can be repeated in the results-chapter.

Part 2: (Comparison) An argument why comparison between other alternatives is valuable to provide decision making information would be good. It seems like rq 1 is already answered. If this has to do with the decision making, why not include it in that chapter?

Discussion:

You motivate the contribution to the industry but what is the academic contribution. To what field of knowledge do you contribute?

I miss a methodological discussion regarding the selected respondents, as I mentioned above, how does the disposition of respondents effect the results?

You spend much effort to clarify the gaps, I would like to see an explanation of how these were filled in your study, what where you able to see that other did not by including US and Austalia? What where you able to see that other did not by including contractors and developers?

General comment:

I would like you to define what you mean by decision making. This is central in your article, yet you do not theoretically explain what decision making is or how you interpret the concept. Since you find the patterns of themes by (as I interpret) relating them to decision making this is important to understand what informed your analysis. This relates to my earlier comment, is the study really inductive? It seems that you were already focused on decision making when the study began, formulation of interview questions and the selection of respondents (stakeholders involved in decision making?). If inductive, then decision making should rather be one of many themes that emerged from an open coding (and not be the common determinant between the themes) if you had no special interest in anything then the questions in the interview should not at all be related to decision making or formulated to support you to draw conclusions about decision making. It might be that it is deductive, understanding decision making in VE by using established concepts like decision making (the phenomenon of interest, e.g., Williams (2007)).

References:

Flick, U., 2014. *An Introduction to Qualitative Research* 5th Edition, Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications.

Norell, M., Stehn, L. and Engström, D., 2020. Architectural Design of Vertical Extensions of Buildings: A Risk Perspective on Complexity. In *36th Annual ARCOM Conference, 7-8 September, 2020, Virtual* (pp. 625-634). Association of Researchers in Construction Management (ARCOM).

Williams, C., 2007. Research methods. *Journal of Business & Economics Research (JBER)*, 5(3).

6. Konfirmasi submit revisi paper 2 - 19 Des 2022

From: em.jrnaeng.0.801d33.738e2434@editorialmanager.com on behalf of [Journal of Architectural Engineering](#)
To: [Eunike Kristi Julistiono](#)
Subject: Revised submission confirmation - [EMID:12ca49babd263450]
Date: Monday, 19 December 2022 4:12:55 PM

CC: "Philip Oldfield" p.oldfield@unsw.edu.au, "Luciano Cardellicchio" luciano.cardellicchio@unsw.edu.au

Ref.: Ms. No. AEENG-1474R2
Technical Paper

Dear Eunike Kristi Julistiono,

Your revised manuscript, listed above, has been received by the Journal of Architectural Engineering.

You may check the status of your manuscript by logging onto the editorial management system at <https://www.editorialmanager.com/jrnaeng/>

Sincerely,

Journal of Architectural Engineering

In compliance with data protection regulations, you may request that we remove your personal registration details at any time. (Use the following URL: <https://www.editorialmanager.com/jrnaeng/login.asp?a=r>). Please contact the publication office if you have any questions.

7. Notifikasi paper 'accepted for publication' - 11 Jan 2023

From: em.jrnaeng.0.809bb1.3ed5490e@editorialmanager.com on behalf of [Journal of Architectural Engineering](#)
To: [Eunike Kristi Julistiono](mailto:Eunike.Kristi.Julistiono)
Subject: Decision on Manuscript MS AEENG-1474R2 - [EMID:37a3d041bad0d131]
Date: Wednesday, 11 January 2023 3:55:10 AM

CC: "Philip Oldfield" p.oldfield@unsw.edu.au, "Luciano Cardellicchio" luciano.cardellicchio@unsw.edu.au

Ref.: Ms. No. AEENG-1474R2

Vertical Extensions: Stakeholder Perspectives on Development Decisions and Construction Strategies

Eunike Kristi Julistiono; Philip Oldfield; Luciano Cardellicchio

Dear Eunike Kristi Julistiono,

Congratulations! Your Technical Paper has been accepted for publication in ASCE's Journal of Architectural Engineering. Your manuscript will now be forwarded to a Production Editor who will prepare it for publication and you will be notified of a publication date once your Technical Paper has been scheduled for an issue.

Our editors have requested that all accepted authors serve as reviewers for the Journal of Architectural Engineering. If you are not already a reviewer for the journal and are willing to serve as one, please reply to this email and let me know.

Also, please be sure to read the following important info for newly accepted authors:

- Your accepted paper is fully citable using its DOI. The DOI for your accepted paper can be found in the "Submissions in Production" folder in your Editorial Manager account. Note that this DOI will not be activated until the paper is published online in the ASCE Library. The paper may be cited before publication as: [Authors]. Forthcoming. "[Article title]." [Journal Name]. [DOI].
- Following your article: Please note that registered users to the [ASCE Library](#) can sign up for a citation alert for any paper. This alert will send you an email anytime your manuscript is cited by another journal in the CrossRef indexed publications. These citations will also appear on the abstract page for your article.
- Authors who are ASCE younger members are encouraged to apply for the [Collingwood Prize](#). Authors may nominate their own paper, and nominations are accepted on a rolling basis.

Your paper is now being transferred to ASCE's Production department. Production staff will perform a quality check upon receipt of your paper, and may contact you to resolve queries or address any issues with files or format before copyediting and page composition begins. Please be aware that your paper will be withdrawn if production queries are not addressed and page proofs are not reviewed and returned in a timely manner.

Thank you so much for submitting your work to ASCE's Journal of Architectural Engineering and please let us know if you have any further questions.

Sincerely,

Victoria Willis

Editorial Coordinator

In compliance with data protection regulations, you may request that we remove your personal registration details at any time. [\(Remove my information/details\)](#). Please contact the publication office if you have any questions.

8. Permintaan untuk perubahan format pada paper - 10 Feb 2023

From: em.jrnaeng.2bd5.8145cf.52f5c66e@editorialmanager.com on behalf of [Bailey Hanna](#)
To: [Eunike Kristi Julistiono](#)
Subject: ASCE AEENG-1474R2—query to corresponding author - [EMID:163081019644bc92]
Date: Friday, 10 February 2023 9:45:35 AM

Date: 02/09/2023

Manuscript #: AEENG-1474R2

Title: Vertical Extensions: Stakeholder Perspectives on Development Decisions and Construction Strategies

Publication: Journal of Architectural Engineering

Dear Eunike Kristi Julistiono,

To prepare your manuscript for publication, ASCE's Production Department has assessed it for matters such as format and style. Before your manuscript can move forward in the publication queue, the following must be addressed:

**Please only make changes to the most recent version of the manuscript file found in your Assignment Files: AE1474_p.docx

1. As of January 3, 2023, ASCE has changed the way we collect fees for Open Access (\$2,500) and color printing (\$800). Please let us know if you would like either of these options and, if so, we will send you the link to our payment site. This is your FINAL OPPORTUNITY to make this choice. You will not have the option to choose to publish with an Open Access license or to print in color later in the process.

Please note that your paper is on hold until we receive your response, so please reply as soon as possible to prevent delays in the publication of your paper.

2. Due to ASCE journal guidelines, Appendixes I and II require reformatting. Please choose between the following 2 options for your Appendixes:

(a) In order to keep the format of the questionnaire in Appendix I you must make it a figure. Please send us a figure file and add a sentence in the appendix that explicitly mentions the figure by number (this is how our system knows where to place the figure).

The same issue applies to the tables in Appendix II. These will have to be saved as figures, with sentences added referring to the figures by number. The figures already in Appendix II must be numbered and mentioned in the appendix by figure number.

Please note that tables and figures included in the Appendixes should be numbered to follow the tables and figures in the text sequentially (i.e., no Table. A1, Fig. A1, 1Aright, 1Aleft, 2aR, 2aL, etc.).

Please remove your figures from your Appendixes and instead upload them as separate files to the file inventory.

(b) An alternative is to make Appendixes I and II Supplemental Materials, in which case they would not need to be changed at all. Please note that Supplemental Materials will appear online only. If you choose this option, please revise the notes in Fig. 3 and Tables 1 and 4.

3. Please provide the missing column heading in Table 2.

4. Please include a note beneath Table 4 indicating the meaning of bolded font.

5. Please go back to Ibelings van Tilburg architecten and Goettsch Partners and confirm that they hold the copyright to the images in Fig. 1. If the photos are indeed copyrighted by the photographers as indicted in the figure, you must get the photographers permission to republish the photos online and in print.

To resolve these queries and access the task that has been assigned to you, please click this link: <https://www.editorialmanager.com/jrnaeeng/l.asp?i=151283&l=JEN7S1S6>. From there, you will be able to access your manuscript files, upload revised files if needed, and contact the ASCE Production Department with any questions you may have. Please complete this task by 02/16/2023 to avoid any delays in processing your manuscript.

**For security reasons, please note that the link above can only be used once, and will expire three (3) days after this email has been sent. If you need to access your manuscript files after the link has expired, please log on to Editorial Manager at <https://www.editorialmanager.com/jrnaeeng//login.asp> and enter the username and password you used when submitting your manuscript.

Instructions for completing the Author Query task may be downloaded from: http://ascelibrary.org/userimages/ContentEditor/1415288237934/Author_Query_Instructions.pdf. If at any point you need to communicate with the production editor assigned to this manuscript, please do so by clicking the "Send E-mail" link and selecting the letter "Ad Hoc—From Author to ASCE Production Staff". Using a different letter will cause a delay.

After all of these queries have been resolved, your manuscript will be moved forward in the publication queue. Then you will receive instructions on downloading page proofs, answering copyeditor queries, and submitting corrections.

We are very pleased to be publishing your paper, and we look forward to receiving manuscripts from you in the future.

Sincerely,

Bailey Hanna
Production Editor
Journal of Architectural Engineering

In compliance with data protection regulations, you may request that we remove your personal registration details at any time. (Use the following URL: <https://www.editorialmanager.com/jrnaeeng/login.asp?a=r>). Please contact the publication office if you have any questions.

9. Permintaan untuk mereview paper proof - 9 Mar 2023

From: ascejournals@novatechset.com
To: [Eunike Kristi Julistiono](mailto:Eunike.Kristi.Julistiono)
Cc: ascejournals@novatechset.com
Subject: AE - AEENG-1474 - First review
Date: Thursday, 9 March 2023 12:35:43 PM

You don't often get email from ascejournals@novatechset.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

AEENG-1474

Article Title: Vertical Extensions: Stakeholder Perspectives on Development Decisions and Construction Strategies

Manuscript DOI: 10.1061/JAEIED.AEENG-1474

Journal: Journal of Architectural Engineering

Dear Eunike Kristi Julistiono,

We are pleased to inform you that your proofs are now available for review.

Please click on the download proof link to take to you the link. If you are experiencing any difficulty in this regard, please copy and paste the below link in your browser .

<https://sesame.novatechset.com/sesame2/EPTLink/Proofing/15597>

Please use only sticky notes or PDF proofing tools to answer the queries/make suggestion. Do not use a professional PDF editing software to edit the PDF as it will not be possible to discern the corrections. Alternatively, you can supply a word document with line numbers for us to take things forward. Corrections must be limited to answers to the Author Queries, typographical and essential corrections only

Please return your corrections by 14-Mar-2023 to ensure swift publication.

If you have any questions, please contact us at ascejournals@novatechset.com and we will be pleased to assist.

[DOWNLOAD PROOF](#)

Thanks,
On behalf of AE production team

10. Permintaan approval final paper untuk dipublish - 22 Mar 2023

From: [ascejournals](#)
To: [Eunike Kristi Julistiono](#)
Cc: [ascejournals](#)
Subject: PRIORITY : AEENG-1474 Approval to Publish Required
Date: Wednesday, 22 March 2023 1:30:22 AM
Attachments: [AEENG-1474_final file.pdf](#)
Importance: High

You don't often get email from ascejournals@novatechset.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Eunike Kristi Julistiono,

Reference some key corrections in your article, please find attached a copy of the correction-incorporated revised proof for your approval.

However, we wish to stress that this is only a chance to review your corrections and no NEW corrections should be made. Please respond to us within one working day to ensure that there is no delay in the publication process.

Thanks!

Best regards,
Narayani

Disclaimer

This electronic mail transmission contains confidential information intended only for the person(s) named. Any use, distribution, copying or disclosure by any other person is strictly prohibited. If you received this transmission in error, please notify the sender by reply e-mail and then destroy the message. Opinions, conclusions, and other information in this message that do not relate to the official business of NovaTechset (P) Ltd shall understood to be neither given nor endorsed by NovaTechset (P) Ltd. When addressed to NovaTechset (P) Ltd clients, any information contained in this e-mail is subject to the terms and conditions in the governing client contract.

[NovaTechset \(P\) Ltd](#)

11. Notifikasi bahwa paper telah terpublish - 4 Apr 2023

From: [ASCE Library](#)
To: [Eunike Kristi Julistiono](#)
Subject: Your ASCE Paper Has Been Published
Date: Tuesday, 4 April 2023 3:17:33 PM

You don't often get email from ascelibrary@asce.org. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Eunike Kristi Julistiono,

Thank you for publishing your recent paper in the Journal of Architectural Engineering.

We appreciate that you chose ASCE for your work. If you published your paper as Open Access, your paper is freely available in the ASCE Library. If you did not publish as Open Access, please accept three complimentary downloads of your paper. As the corresponding author, you are the only author receiving the token and as such, you may want to share the download tokens with any co-authors.

In order to support ASCE's mission of a sustainable environment, we are no longer providing complimentary print copies. Authors may purchase print copies by contacting ascelibrary@asce.org

Accessing your article

Your article is available at:

<https://ascelibrary.org/token/NSU2WDHGX29GUWEAA7UX/Eprints?activationRedirect=/doi/full/10.1061/JAEIED.AEENG-1474>

Access is based on the following email address: e.julistiono@unsw.edu.au

- If you have previously registered at asce.org or ascelibrary.org using an email different to what is displayed above, please contact ascelibrary@asce.org.
- If you have not registered then please follow steps 1 and 2 to access your article.
- If you have previously registered using the email displayed above, then please follow step 2 to access your article.

Step 1

To access your article, you will need to register using the email address displayed above. Please visit ascelibrary.org, click on "Register" at the top of the page, and enter the required information.

Step 2

Corresponding authors may view articles recently published with us. You will need to go to ascelibrary.org and click on "Log In" at the top of the page.

You can retrieve more information about your publications from your Author Services panel (registration is required): <https://ascelibrary.org/my/authorservices>.

Now that your paper has been published online, make the most of social media to get the word out. Here are some tips for raising the profile of your article:

- Use the Share feature above the abstract. You can easily share a link to your article on Facebook, Twitter, and other sites to let your community see your latest work.

- Use specialty groups within Facebook, Twitter, Google+, and LinkedIn by mentioning your work and providing a link to it in the ASCE Library.
- Add Publications to your LinkedIn profile by adding the article URL (DOI Permalink) and title to the publications tab.

Please Note: ASCE permits authors to post the peer-reviewed accepted manuscript on any website provided that you include a full citation to the ASCE Journal and a link to the abstract in ascelibrary.org. Authors are not permitted to post the final, published PDF on the internet, digital sharing sites, listserves, peer-to-peer networks, etc. More information can be found in the Journal Author Guide: (<http://dx.doi.org/10.1061/9780784479018>)

Thank you for trusting ASCE with your work.
Sincerely,

American Society of Civil Engineers