

---

**[GAMAICEB] ACCEPTANCE NOTIFICATION**

3 messages

---

**The 9th GamalCEB** <gamaiceb@ugm.ac.id>  
To: - Shanti - <shanti1794@gmail.com>

Tue, Sep 7, 2021 at 12:15 PM

Dear Shanti,

We are pleased to inform you that your paper has been conditionally accepted to be presented in the 9<sup>th</sup> Gadjah Mada International Conference on Economics and Business that will be held on 25<sup>th</sup> September 2021 in Universitas Gadjah Mada.

To get fully accepted, you need to re-write the paper by responding to the reviewer's comment, follow the abstract template and provide the table "Respond to the Reviewer" (attached) by **10<sup>th</sup> September 2021**.

Once you re-write your paper, please send the revised paper and "Respond to the Reviewer " to the email [gamaiceb@ugm.ac.id](mailto:gamaiceb@ugm.ac.id).

If you do not revise the paper (along with table "Respond to the Reviewer") and return it by **10<sup>th</sup> September 2021**, we assume that you are not interested in presenting your paper in our conference and your place will be substituted by other participants.

We are looking forward to hearing from you.

Best wishes,

The committee 9<sup>th</sup> Gadjah Mada International Conference on Economics and Business

---

 **REVISE\_SHANTI\_#64-300821.zip**  
502K

---

- Shanti - <shanti1794@gmail.com>

Sat, Sep 11, 2021 at 4:08 AM

To: The 9th GamalCEB &lt;gamaiceb@ugm.ac.id&gt;

Dear The 9th GAMAICEB 2021 Organizing Committee,

Bapak/Ibu, we hereby send The Revised of Our Paper and "Respond to The Reviewer."

Thank you for your attention and cooperation....

Best Regards,  
Shanti

[Quoted text hidden]

---

**4 attachments**

 **9th GAMAICEB 2021 (Full Paper - Eflim dan Shanti) Revisi.doc**  
214K

 **Table Response to Reviewer #64-300821.doc**  
63K

 **Appendix CG Measurements.pdf**  
143K

 **9th GAMAICEB 2021 (Full Paper - Eflim dan Shanti) Revisi.pdf**  
401K

---

**The 9th GamaICEB** <gamaiceb@ugm.ac.id>  
To: - Shanti - <shanti1794@gmail.com>

Sat, Sep 11, 2021 at 5:08 PM

Dear Shanti,

Thank you for the revised paper. We have sent the paper to the editors. We will inform you immediately after the editors issue the decision.

Regards,  
9th GAMAICEB Committee

[Quoted text hidden]

Paper number: #64-300821

Reviewer:

Conference's topic: Accounting

Title:

The Impact of Green Innovation on Corporate Performance with Corporate Governance as Moderator

#### A. Format Evaluation

Title word count	Maximum of 16 words	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Abstract	Complete and less than 400 words	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Word Count	4000 – 7000 words	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Manuscript Structure	Follow author guideline	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Reference & Citation	Complete & follow APA Style	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Turnitin Result	16%	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No

#### B. Manuscript Evaluation by Reviewer

Criteria & Explanation	Weighted	Scale (1-5)	Mark (Weighted X Scale)
1. <b>Originality:</b> Originality of contribution to knowledge with an emphasis on the paper innovation in one or more (i) theoretical development, (ii) empirical result or (iii) policy development	40%	3	1.2
2. <b>Quality of argument:</b> Quality of argument incorporating (i) critical analysis of concepts, theories and findings and (iii) consistency and coherency of debate	30%	3	0.9
3. <b>Positioning:</b> Clear positioning of paper in existing international literature with a conclusion that is both convincing and its significant potential	15%	2	0.3
4. <b>Writing style:</b> Quality of writing style in terms of accuracy, clarity, readability and organization of paper	15%	4	0.6

RESULT:  Accept  Revise  Reject

Reviewer's comment: [Reason to reject/ Point to revise]

1. Introduction should show recent "debate" in the literature so that the position of paper in the extant literature can be clearly defined. The introduction part of this paper is a bit lengthy but does not show how this paper contributes to the literature. The author may

consider to refer to papers published in top journals to see how introduction section, and other sections can be written.

2. Literature review should identify key issues and highlight conflicting evidence in previous literature (if any) as well as summarize what has been done and what needs to be done. These items have not been sufficiently written in the literature section of this paper. The author should consider to put the hypotheses development in a sub-sections after discussing the above-mentioned items.
3. I guess that the method will be content analysis of the published annual reports, however it has not been clearly written in methodology section. Additionally, measurement for Green process innovation, green product and Corporate governance variables is not so clear, can hardly understand how the scores come.
4. 2.5 Analysis → why should there be four regression models? Why it is not combined as follows:  
$$CFP = \beta_0 + \beta_1 PROC + \beta_2 PROD + \beta_3 PROC*CG + \beta_4 PROD*CG + \epsilon$$
5. The discussion part is missing in this paper, it should go beyond the findings themselves and show how the results relate to the theory/ literature review section.

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

***9<sup>th</sup> Gadjah Mada International Conference of  
Indonesian Economy and Business (GAMAICEB)  
RESPONSE TO THE REVIEWER***

**RESPONSE TO THE REVIEWER**

**Title : The Impact of Green Innovation on Corporate Performance with  
Corporate Governance as Moderator**

We kindly urge you to write your response to the reviewer in the following table as well as in the paper.

<b>No</b>	<b>Suggestion from Reviewer</b>	<b>Improvements Made in the Manuscript</b>	<b>Page</b>
-----------	---------------------------------	--	-------------

**9<sup>th</sup> Gadjah Mada International Conference of  
Indonesian Economy and Business (GAMAICEB)  
RESPONSE TO THE REVIEWER**

<b>1</b>	<p>Introduction should show <b>recent “debate” in the literature</b> so that the position of paper in the extant literature can be clearly defined. The introduction part of this paper is a bit lengthy but does not show <b>how this paper contributes to the literature</b>. The author may consider to refer to papers published in top journals to see how introduction section, and other sections can be written.</p>	<p>Considering the negative impact on the environment that can be caused by a manufacturing corporate going public in Indonesia, the topic of green innovation is very important to be researched. Some research related to green innovation, such as Ar (2012) which shows that there is a positive effect of green product innovation on the company's financial performance. Zahari and Ramayah (2017) which shows that both green product innovation and green process innovation have a positive influence on economic performance, environmental performance, and partial competitive advantage. Vivianita and Nafasati (2018) which shows that environmental performance has no significant effect on financial performance. Xie, Huo, and Zou (2019) which shows that there is a positive effect of green process innovation on the company's financial performance. Fitriyah, Tjahjadi, and Soewarno (2020) that also conducted research related to green product innovation conducted in Sidoarjo and Bangkalan but green product innovation in this study is a mediating variable. This paper adds moderating variable, namely corporate governance, as a form of contribution of this paper to the literature. Companies that have good corporate governance tend to manage the company well, including caring for the environment through green process innovation and green product innovation, so that it can amplify the impact of green process innovation and green product innovation to corporate's financial performance.</p>	Page 4
			2   Page

**9<sup>th</sup> Gadjah Mada International Conference of  
Indonesian Economy and Business (GAMAICEB)  
RESPONSE TO THE REVIEWER**

<b>2.</b>	<p>Literature review should <b>identify key issues and highlight conflicting evidence in previous literature</b> (if any) as well as summarize what has been done and what needs to be done. These items have not been sufficiently written in the literature section of this paper. The author should consider to put the hypotheses development in a sub-sections after discussing the above-mentioned items.</p>	<p>Key issues and highlights conflicting evidence in previous literature have been added and the hypotheses development has been presented in a sub-sections.</p>	Page 4-5
<b>3</b>	<p>I guess that the method will be content analysis of the published annual reports, however it has not been clearly written in methodology section. Additionally, <b>measurement for Green process innovation, Green product and Corporate governance variables</b> is not so clear, can hardly understand how the scores come.</p>	<p>Measurement for Green process innovation, Green product and Corporate governance variables have been further clarified.</p>	Page 8-10
<b>4</b>	<p>2.5 Analysis → why should there be four regression models? Why it is not combined as follows:  <math>CFP = \beta_0 + \beta_1 PROC + \beta_2 PROD + \beta_3 PROC*CG + \beta_4 PROD*CG + \varepsilon</math>  <b>The discussion part is missing</b> in this paper, it should go beyond the findings themselves and show how the results relate to the theory/ literature review section.</p>	<p>The research model has been improved as:  <math>CFP = \beta_0 + \beta_1 PROC + \beta_2 PROD + \beta_3 PROC*CG + \beta_4 PROD*CG + \varepsilon</math>  The discussion part has been added.</p>	Page 10  Page 14-15