

# Scientific Authority Indicators in Sport Management Journals: A Comparative Analysis with International Standards

Hajar Naderinasab<sup>1</sup>, Mostafa Soltani<sup>2\*</sup>, Arefeh Jamshidi<sup>3</sup>, Salman Rasooli Doost<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> M.A. in Sport Management, Department of Sport Sciences, Qa.C., Islamic Azad University, Qazvin, Iran

<sup>2</sup> Assistant Professor, Department of Sports Sciences, Faculty of Social Sciences, Imam Khomeini International University, Qazvin, Iran

<sup>3</sup> Assistant Professor, Department of Sport Sciences, Qa.C., Islamic Azad University, Qazvin, Iran

<sup>4</sup> PhD in Sport Management, Department of Sport Sciences, Qa.C., Islamic Azad University, Qazvin, Iran

\* Corresponding author email address: mostafasoltani553@yahoo.com

E d i t o r	R e v i e w e r s
Leila Youzbashi Department of sport science, Faculty of Humanities, University of Zanjan, Zanjan, Iran l.youzbashi@znu.ac.ir	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: Kamdin Parsakia Department of Psychology and Counseling, KMAN Research Institute, Richmond Hill, Ontario, Canada. Email: kamdinparsakia@kmanresce.ca

## 1. Round 1

### 1.1 Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

In the Introduction, the concept of “scientific authority” is used extensively but not formally defined. The sentence “Scientific authority, however, extends beyond citation counts” suggests multidimensionality, yet no conceptual framework is presented. A clear operational definition with theoretical grounding is necessary before proceeding to empirical measurement.

The final sentence of the Introduction states: “What is the status of scientific authority indicators in Iranian sport management journals, and how do they compare with international standards?” Consider breaking this into two formally stated research questions or hypotheses to align with the mixed-method design.

You indicate that saturation was reached after the twelfth interview but proceeded to conduct three more interviews. Please provide justification for the decision rule applied to determine saturation (e.g., conceptual density, repetition of themes).

Author revised the manuscript and uploaded the updated document.

### 1.2 Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

In section 2.1, the discussion of Impact Factor and H-index repeats well-established definitions (Garfield, Hirsch) without critical synthesis. I recommend deepening the analytical discussion by highlighting known methodological criticisms (e.g., field normalization, citation window bias) and connecting them explicitly to sport management as a discipline.

In section 2.2, the statement “International collaboration correlates positively with citation impact” would benefit from inclusion of effect size ranges or empirical magnitude from prior studies to contextualize its practical importance.

You report an intercoder agreement of 75% and state that it exceeds the acceptable 60% threshold. However, percentage agreement is a weak reliability measure. Cohen’s Kappa or Krippendorff’s Alpha would provide stronger methodological justification. Please clarify whether reliability was adjusted for chance agreement.

Author revised the manuscript and uploaded the updated document.

## 2. Revised

Editor’s decision after revisions: Accepted.

Editor in Chief’s decision: Accepted.