

Designing an Appropriate Model for Assessing the Performance of Enterprises at Various Stages of the Organizational Life Cycle

Mehdi. Darini¹^(b), Mohsen. Moradi²*^(b), Ahmad. Nateq Golestan³^(b), Vahid. Sanavi Grosian⁴^(b)

¹ Ph.D. student, Department of governmental Management, Bojnourd Branch, Islamic Azad University, Bojnourd, Iran

² Associate Professor, Department of Management, Mashhad, Imam Reza International University (AS), Mashhad, Iran

³ Assistant Professor, Department of Management, Mashhad Branch, Islamic Azad University, Mashhad, Iran

⁴ Assistant Professor, Department of Management, Bojnourd Branch, Islamic Azad University, Bojnourd, Iran

* Corresponding author email address: Momoradi2010@yahoo.com

| Editor | R eviewers |
|--|---|
| Mehdi Rostami [®] | Reviewer 1: Mehrdad Bayat 💿 |
| | Assistant Professor, Department of Management, Payam Noor University, Tehran, |
| Counseling, KMAN Research Institute, Richmond Hill, Ontario, Canada mehdirostami@kmanresce.ca | Iran. |
| | Email: bayatmehrdad60@pnu.ac.ir |
| | Reviewer 2: Alireza Rajabipoor Meybodi 🗓 |
| | Associate Professor, Department of Business Administration, Yazd University, |
| | Yazd, Iran |
| | Email: Rajabipoor@yazd.ac.ir |

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

Provide a detailed description of the model, including the operational definition of variables, the theoretical basis for linking these variables to different life cycle stages, and the expected relationships between variables. Diagrams or conceptual frameworks could significantly aid in illustrating the model's components and their interactions.

While the manuscript mentions several organizational theories, it does not sufficiently integrate these theories into the development or justification of the proposed model. Deepen the theoretical integration by discussing how the proposed model synthesizes key concepts from the cited organizational theories. Explicitly address how the model addresses gaps or challenges identified in the literature on organizational life cycles and performance assessment.

The literature review covers a range of sources but lacks a critical analysis of how previous studies have approached the assessment of enterprise performance across organizational life cycle stages. Expand the literature review to include a more

critical analysis of existing models and frameworks for assessing enterprise performance. Highlight the limitations of these models in the context of the organizational life cycle and articulate how the proposed model seeks to overcome these limitations.

Authors revised the manuscripts.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

Elaborate on the empirical validation process, including the research design, sampling strategy, data collection methods, and statistical analyses planned or conducted. Detail how this validation process tests the model's hypotheses and its predictive or explanatory power.

The practical implications of the proposed model for organizational leaders and managers are mentioned but not fully developed in the manuscript. Offer a detailed discussion of how the model can be used by managers to assess and improve enterprise performance at different stages of the organizational life cycle. Include case examples or hypothetical scenarios that illustrate the model's application in real-world settings.

The manuscript does not adequately address the limitations of the proposed model or outline clear directions for future research. Identify potential limitations of the model, including assumptions made in its development and challenges in its empirical validation. Propose specific areas for future research to refine and extend the model, such as cross-industry comparisons or longitudinal studies.

The manuscript's contribution to the broader field of organizational studies and management literature needs to be more clearly stated. Explicitly state the manuscript's contributions to the literature on organizational life cycles and performance assessment. Discuss how the findings add new insights or provide a basis for reevaluating existing theories and models.

Authors revised the manuscripts.

2. Revised

Editor's decision: Accepted. Editor in Chief's decision: Accepted.

