

Article history:
Received 14 July 2024
Revised 24 September 2024
Accepted 30 September 2024
Published online 01 January 2025

# Designing a Model for Organizing Sports Events for Individuals with Disabilities and Veterans in Iran

Laleh Shafaghatian 10, Leila Saffari 20, Hossein Kalhor 30, Akram Hosseini Semnani 40

## \* Corresponding author email address: 1.saffari2000@gmail.com

Editor	Reviewers
Luis Felipe Reynoso-Sánchez®	Reviewer 1: Farhad Namjoo
Department of Social Sciences and	Department of Psychology and Counseling, KMAN Research Institute, Richmond
Humanities, Autonomous	Hill, Ontario, Canada. Email: farhadnamjoo@kmanresce.ca
University of Occident, Los	Reviewer 2: Kamdin Parsakia
Mochis, Sinaloa, Mexico	Department of Psychology and Counseling, KMAN Research Institute, Richmond
felipe.reynoso@uadeo.mx	Hill, Ontario, Canada. Email: kamdinparsakia@kmanresce.ca

## 1. Round 1

#### 1.1 Reviewer 1

#### Reviewer:

In the paragraph discussing the social model of disability, specifically where you state, "The social model of disability... emphasizes the need for inclusive practices," it would be beneficial to expand on how this model is specifically applied in the context of sports event organization in Iran. Consider including examples or case studies that illustrate the implementation of this model in similar settings.

In the section describing the sampling methods, it is mentioned that a purposive and snowball sampling technique was used. However, there is no detailed justification for why these methods were chosen over others. Please provide a rationale for these choices, especially in relation to the specific research context of Iran.

In the discussion regarding "organizing costs and determining financial resources," the statement that "adequate financial resources in overcoming barriers to participation in sports for individuals with disabilities" aligns with existing literature. However, this discussion could be enhanced by exploring specific financial challenges within the Iranian context and proposing tailored solutions.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Phd Student of Sport Management, Department of Physical Education and Sport Sciences, Qazvin Branch, Islamic Azad University, Qazvin, Iran

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Assistant Professor of Sport Management, Department of Physical Education and Sport Sciences, Karaj Branch, Islamic Azad University, Karaj, Iran
<sup>3</sup> Assistant Professor of Sport Physiology, Department of Physical Education and Sport Sciences, Qazvin Branch, Islamic Azad University, Qazvin, Iran

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> Assistant Professor of Sport Management, Department of Physical Education and Sport Sciences, Qazvin Branch, Islamic Azad University, Qazvin, Iran

AI and Tech in Behavioral and Social Sciences 3:1 (2025)

AITBSS PEER REVIEW REPORT

The conclusion offers several practical recommendations, which are helpful. However, it might be more impactful to prioritize these recommendations, suggesting which actions should be taken first based on feasibility or potential impact. This would provide clearer guidance for practitioners.

Author revised the manuscript and uploaded the updated document.

1.2 Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

The statement, "The positive impact of sports on the quality of life for individuals with disabilities underscores the importance of providing accessible and inclusive sports opportunities," requires stronger support from recent studies. Please consider citing more contemporary research (post-2020) to substantiate this claim.

The coding process described appears rigorous, yet the transition from open to axial coding lacks detail. Specifically, in the paragraph starting with "In the first stage of this research...", consider including more information on how the final codes were refined and what criteria were used to collapse initial codes into final categories.

The explanation of the sample size calculation for the quantitative section (n=384) is clear, but it could be strengthened by referencing specific guidelines or studies that justify the range of 5 to 10 participants per item. This would add robustness to your methodological approach.

The KMO value of 0.68 is reported as adequate. However, it would be useful to discuss why this value, which is on the lower end of the acceptable range, is still considered sufficient for factor analysis in this context. A brief comparison with recommended thresholds in the literature would be informative.

Author revised the manuscript and uploaded the updated document.

2. Revised

Editor's decision after revisions: Accepted.

Editor in Chief's decision: Accepted.

AITBSS
Al and Tech in Behavioral and Social Sciences
E-ISSN: 3041-9433