

Article history: Received 15 October 2023 Revised 11 November 2023 Accepted 19 November 2023 Published online 01 January 2024

International Journal of Innovation Management and Organizational Behavior



Open Peer-Review Report

Designing and offering a customer trust model in the marketing ecosystem based on blockchain technology

Mahbubeh. Ghavidast Kouhpayeh¹, Esfandiar. Doshman Ziari^{2*}, Alireza. Rousta³

- ¹ PhD.Candidate Department of Business Management, Shahr- e- Qods Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran
- ² Assistant Professor, Department of Business Management, Islamshahr Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran
- ³ Assistant Professor, Department of Business Management, Shahr -e- Qods Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran

* Corresponding author email address: doshmanziari@gmail.com

Editor	Reviewers
Azar Kafashpoor 📵	Reviewer 1: Rezvan Hosseingholizadeh®
Professor, Department of	Associate Professor, Department of Educational Management and Human Resource
Educational Management and	Development, Ferdowsi University of Mashhad, Mashhad, Iran.
Human Resource Development,	Email: rhgholizadeh@um.ac.ir
Ferdowsi University of Mashhad,	Reviewer 2: Mohsen Akbari
Mashhad, Iran	Associate Professor, Department of Management, University of Gilan, Gilan, Iran
kafashpor@um.ac.ir	Email: akbarimohsen@guilan.ac.ir

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

The manuscript would benefit from a thorough proofreading to correct occasional grammatical errors and improve sentence structure for better readability.

Ensure all references are up-to-date and consider incorporating more recent studies that might have been published on the topic since the manuscript's preparation.

Some key terms and concepts, particularly those related to blockchain technology, could be defined more clearly to ensure accessibility to readers less familiar with the subject matter.

While the discussion connects findings to existing literature, it could be enriched by offering deeper insights into the implications of these findings for marketers and blockchain technology providers.

The conclusion succinctly summarizes the study's findings but could be enhanced by emphasizing the novel contributions of the study more strongly.



Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the new document.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

The research question's formulation could be clearer. The current statement might benefit from a more precise delineation of the scope and specific objectives within the broader topic of blockchain technology and customer trust.

The manuscript occasionally struggles with coherence, particularly in linking the thematic analysis findings directly to the research question. Consider structuring the discussion section to more explicitly connect these findings to the initial research objectives.

While the manuscript covers a range of relevant literature, there seems to be a gap in critically analyzing the limitations and contradictions within the existing research. A more nuanced discussion could enhance the paper's contribution to the field.

The presentation of thematic analysis results could be improved for readability and clarity. Consider using more visual aids, such as charts or graphs, to succinctly convey the main themes and their interrelations.

The methodology section would benefit from a more detailed explanation of the choice of thematic analysis and the criteria for selecting expert participants. Additionally, elaborating on the process of theme generation and code frequency analysis could add to the transparency and reproducibility of the study.

The analysis would be strengthened by a more critical examination of how the identified antecedents and consequences of blockchain technology compare with traditional trust-building mechanisms in marketing ecosystems.

The discussion on the practical applications of the research findings is somewhat brief. Expanding on how these findings can inform specific marketing strategies or blockchain implementation practices would be valuable.

The limitations section could be expanded to acknowledge potential biases in expert selection and the generalizability of the findings. Furthermore, outlining concrete directions for future research based on the study's findings and limitations would provide a clearer pathway for advancing the field.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the new document.

2. Revised

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

