

Comments Addressed During Revision of Paper MS #1122

The following comments were provided by the three assigned reviewers upon initial submission of paper MS #1122. Each of the comments was addressed in the final revision of the paper submitted. Below are the notations stating the corrective action taken to address each comment.

Reviewer #1

The below comment was made as a text file in the Report page of Digital Commons.

Comment: *This paper is not really relevant to cybersecurity. It is better for the author to submit it to another more relevant conference.*

Corrective action: The feedback is appreciated; no action was taken. In reviewing the requirements for this conference the author feels that the information provided in the paper is relevant and beneficial to be presented at this conference.

Reviewer #2

Comments were made at the respective place of clarification needed within MS #1122. Page numbers and comments are detailed below.

Point of clarification needed on page 3: “If would not be necessary”

Comment: *Word is not clear*

Corrective action: Changed “If” to “It”; expanded the sentence to be more detailed.

Point of clarification needed on page 4: “parament”

Comment: *paramount?*

Corrective action: The intended word to be used is paramount. Changed word from “parament” to “paramount”.

Point of clarification needed on page 5: “- ∞”

Comment: *not sure if this means “infinity”*

Corrective action: The intention was for the symbol to signify negative infinity. Added “(negative infinity)” to the right of - ∞ .

Note on page 8: CONCLUSION

Comment: *This research covers an important topic; as an I.T. manager, the concepts of disaster recovery, contingency planning and continuity planning are at the forefront. A very relevant topic for businesses and schools today.*

Corrective action: The feedback is appreciated; no action was needed.

Reviewer #3

The below comments were made as a pdf file in the Report page of Digital Commons. No page numbers were included in the comments.

Comment: *Introduction: I would expect the introduction to have more than repeating the abstract.*

Corrective action: Edited and expanded the Introduction.

Comment: *COVID-19 was not unprecedented; it was preceded by SARS-CoV (2003), MERS-CoV (2012), and SARSCoV-2 (COVID-19). It was just another coronavirus.*

Corrective action: Unable to decipher intent of the comment as no specified suggestion was stated; no action was taken. Although COVID-19 is another coronavirus in comparison to the other viruses listed, its impact on society was unprecedented in nature and scope in comparison to the previous coronaviruses.

Comment: *It may be more correct to say that the pandemic had a unprecedented impact on the US.*

Corrective action: Revised how the term “unprecedented impact” is used throughout the paper.

Comment: *Many university instructors were already using online learning management systems (LMS) before COVID-19.*

Corrective action: Unable to decipher intent of the comment as no specified suggestion was stated; no action was taken. Although traditional universities (those with on-campus learning and not fully online) had LMS in place prior to COVID-19, the universities had not planned for nor used the systems to the scale needed for long-term campus closure. Such long-term closure would lead to the University moving all of its classes from either a traditional, on-campus class setting or blended format of instruction to a fully online format of instruction.

Comment: *Mitigation Approaches: top of Page 3 formatting issue: reference to Florida Dept. of Education not in ()'s*

Corrective action: Added an open parenthesis “(” before “Florida Dept. of Education)”.

Comment: *In the contingency planning section, it wasn't clear what the contingency plan was.*

Corrective action: The contingency plan has now been clearly specified as a plan to safely reopen the University to students in the fall semester.

Comment: *In the continuity planning section, it wasn't clear what the continuity planning was, nor was the conclusion that the "primary need of the university is to develop a contingency plan" ...*

Corrective action: It has been previously stated in the paper that for the purpose of the research, a contingency plan has been determined to be the best mitigation approach for the University. No continuity plan was created, nor was it intended to be created, as it was not the focus of the paper.

Comment: *Contingency Planning Strategy page 6 case Framework, Background, not a complete sentence: "The university ... is a regional university located [in] the southeastern United States."*
Corrective action: Added "in" between "located" and "the".

Comment: *It's not clear that this paper is concluding that a contingency plan is necessary or that it is documenting that a university task force was tasked with a developing contingency plan.*
Corrective action: Revised the Conclusion section to detail the benefits of a contingency plan and how the use of a linear programming model can be used to optimize resources and to determine the goal of the paper's contingency plan which is to determine the optimal number of students to be allowed to attend on-campus classes while ensuring social distancing guidelines are met.

Comment: *Are the numbers listed in the Model Components section consistent with the numbers listed in the Case Framework; e.g. under Model Components director of IT stated that they needed only 1/3 of the staff, but under Case Framework an "increased need of IT personnel" is mentioned.*
Corrective action: Revised the linear programming model; all constraints have been changed.

Comment: *Shouldn't there be more than 4 variables to consider in the linear programming model?*
Corrective action: Revised the linear programming model; constraints have been added.

Comment: *It's unclear what the non-negativity requirement is as it is not mentioned in the paper*
Corrective action: Non-negativity requirement is now clearly stated in the Problem Statement section.

Comment: *The conclusion is brief.*
Corrective action: Expanded the Conclusion section.

Comment: *The number of references is low.*
Correction action: As stated within the Citations section on page five of the Submission Guidelines "Authors should seek to limit the number of citations used in the paper, employing only those needed to validate the authors' assertions."; The author followed the required guidelines and wrote the paper based on the self-developed model while using limited references where needed.

Comment: *A Google Scholar search shows 46 results*
Corrective action: Unable to decipher intent of the comment as it was not specified for what the Google Scholar search researched; no action was taken.