




# Presenting a Framework of Drivers and Strategic Factors in the Comprehensive Model of Intellectual Capital and Competitive Advantage in Startup Companies

Mahdi Shafaat Tokaldan<sup>1</sup>, Azita Jahanshad<sup>1\*</sup>, Zahra Pourzamani<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Department of Accounting, Central Tehran Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran

\* Corresponding author email address: az\_jahanshad@yahoo.com

E d i t o r	R e v i e w e r s
Cain C. T. Clark  Faculty of Health, Education, and Life Sciences, Birmingham City University, Birmingham, B15 3TN, U.K. scain.clark@coventry.ac.uk	Reviewer 1: Masoud Mirmoezi  Department of Physical Education and Sport Sciences, Islamic Azad University, Central Tehran Branch, Tehran, Iran. Email: massoudmirmoezi@live.com Reviewer 2: Seyed Mohammad Hosseini  Assistant Professor, Department of Health and Rehabilitation in Sports, Shahid Beheshti University, Tehran, Iran. Email: moh_hosseini@sbu.ac.ir

## 1. Round 1

### 1.1 Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

The second paragraph introduces the key concepts but lacks clarity on how these concepts are specifically related to the research objectives. Please expand on how the theoretical framework ties into the study's aims. A brief explanation of the study's hypothesis would strengthen the narrative and provide clearer context for the reader.

You mention the significance of the research in general terms, but I suggest including specific statistics or examples to substantiate the claim of its relevance in the field. For instance, citing recent studies on the topic would provide a stronger foundation for your argument.

The explanation of your data analysis method is somewhat vague. Please elaborate on how you ensured the reliability and validity of the data analysis. If software was used for coding or statistical analysis, kindly specify the version and any settings used.

While you present your findings clearly, the interpretation of statistical results could be enhanced. For example, you state that there was a "significant correlation" but do not specify the strength of this relationship or provide effect sizes. Please include such information to provide a more comprehensive view of the results.

Table 1 presents descriptive statistics, but it would be helpful to include measures of variability (e.g., standard deviation, range) for each variable to give a better sense of the data distribution. Additionally, consider adding confidence intervals for the mean values to enhance statistical rigor.

The conclusion effectively summarizes the key findings but lacks a discussion on the limitations of the study. Please add a sentence or two that acknowledges potential limitations (e.g., sample size, methodology, generalizability) and how these could impact the study's conclusions.

Author revised the manuscript and uploaded the updated document.

## 1.2 Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

In this section, you discuss several studies, but there is a lack of critical analysis regarding how these studies align or conflict with each other. Please consider integrating a more detailed comparative analysis to highlight gaps in the existing literature, making it clearer how your study contributes to the field.

The literature cited in this paragraph appears somewhat outdated. To strengthen the review, please incorporate more recent studies (from the last 3-5 years) that address the same or similar topics. This will reflect the current state of research in the area.

The description of your sampling method is brief. It would be helpful to include more detail on the specific inclusion and exclusion criteria for participants. Furthermore, the rationale for your sample size should be clarified, especially if it is a small or convenience sample.

You state that data collection was conducted using a survey, but it would benefit the manuscript to specify the types of questions used (e.g., Likert scale, open-ended) and the reasons for selecting these particular question formats. This would enhance transparency regarding your methodological choices.

In this paragraph, you discuss the implications of your findings but fail to fully link them to the broader literature. Please elaborate on how your results compare with similar studies and suggest possible explanations for any discrepancies. A more in-depth integration of the literature would improve this section.

You conclude that your results support the hypothesis, but I suggest you offer more nuanced interpretations. Could there be alternative explanations for the observed outcomes? Address potential confounding factors or biases that may have influenced the results, even if they were controlled for in the study.

Author revised the manuscript and uploaded the updated document.

## 2. Revised

Editor's decision after revisions: Accepted.

Editor in Chief's decision: Accepted.