




Presenting a Model for Innovation in Online Advertising and Its Implications in Digital Marketing

Mohammad. Enayati Shabkolaei¹, Shahrbanoo. Gholipour Freydouni^{2*}, Mehdi. Rouholamini²

¹ PhD student, Department of Business Management, Babol Branch, Islamic Azad University, Babol, Iran

² Assistant Professor, Department of Business Management, Babol Branch, Islamic Azad University, Babol, Iran

* Corresponding author email address: shb.gholipour@gmail.com

E d i t o r

Rey Segundo Guerrero-Proenza^{id}
Departamento de Inteligencia
Computacional, Facultad 4,
Universidad de las Ciencias
Informáticas, La Habana, Cuba
reysgp@uci.cu

R e v i e w e r s

Reviewer 1: Masoud Hoseinchari^{id}
Associate Professor, Department of Educational Sciences, Shiraz University, Shiraz,
Iran. Email: hchari@shirazu.ac.ir
Reviewer 2: Rezvan Hosseingholizadeh^{id}
Associate Professor, Department of Educational Management and Human Resource
Development, Ferdowsi University of Mashhad, Mashhad, Iran. Email:
rhgholizadeh@um.ac.ir

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

The manuscript is generally well-structured, following a clear trajectory from introduction to conclusion. However, the transition between sections can be improved for smoother flow. Specifically, the transition from the methodology to findings sections appears abrupt. Providing a brief summary or overview at the end of each section could guide the reader through the paper more effectively.

The methodology section is detailed, explaining the selection of participants and the data analysis process comprehensively. To strengthen this section, the authors could briefly discuss the rationale behind choosing grounded theory over other qualitative methods, given the study's objectives.

The findings are rich and informative, but the presentation of these findings, particularly in the tables and the model, could be enhanced for better readability. For instance, visual enhancements or simplification of the model illustrated in Figure 1 could aid in understanding at a glance.

The discussion provides valuable insights into the implications of the study's findings. It would be beneficial to include a more explicit comparison with existing literature, highlighting what this study adds to the current understanding of organizational myths.

While the manuscript is generally well-written, there are minor typographical and grammatical errors that need addressing. A thorough proofreading and language editing will polish the manuscript for publication readiness.

The manuscript mentions adhering to ethical considerations, which is commendable. Expanding this section to describe how confidentiality and participant consent were handled could enhance the manuscript's ethical transparency.

Authors revised the manuscripts.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

The study presents an intricate model derived from grounded theory analysis. However, the connection between the identified categories, sub-categories, and their impact on the central phenomenon lacks clarity. A more detailed explanation or a revised model that clearly outlines these relationships would strengthen the manuscript's core argument.

The literature review provides a suitable foundation but lacks depth in critically analyzing previous studies. Engaging more critically with existing literature on organizational myths, including counterarguments or supporting theories, would enrich the context of this research.

While the methodological approach is detailed, there is a need for a stronger justification for the sample size and selection criteria. Additionally, addressing potential biases in purposive sampling and the steps taken to mitigate these biases would solidify the research methodology's reliability and validity.

The analysis yields a comprehensive set of categories and concepts. However, the interpretation of these findings in relation to existing theories and research is somewhat superficial. A deeper analysis, possibly incorporating quantitative measures to complement the qualitative findings, could provide a more robust understanding of the phenomena.

The conclusions drawn are insightful but lack specific, actionable recommendations for practitioners within the healthcare sector. Expanding this section to offer clear, evidence-based strategies for managing the dark aspects of organizational myths would greatly enhance the manuscript's practical value.

The study acknowledges its qualitative nature but does not thoroughly discuss its limitations. A more detailed discussion on the limitations, including the study's generalizability and the implications of its methodological choices, would provide a balanced view of the research conducted.

Authors revised the manuscripts.

2. Revised

Editor's decision: Accepted.

Editor in Chief's decision: Accepted.