





Designing Development Policies for the Social Security Retirement System with a Future Study Approach

Mohammad. Shamiri¹, Ghanbar. Amirnejad^{2*}, MohammadReza. Jaber Ansari³, Rostam. Derakhshan⁴

¹ PhD student, Public Administration, Shushtar Branch, Islamic Azad University, Shushtar, Iran


² Department of Management, Tehran Research Science Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran

³ Department of Management, Borujard Branch, Islamic Azad University, Borujard, Iran



⁴ Department of Management, Ramhormoz Branch, Islamic Azad University, Ramhormoz, Iran

* Corresponding author email address: g.amirnejad@yahoo.com

Editor

Khaliquzzaman Khan
Associate Professor, School of
Business Administration, Al Dar
University College, United Arab
Emirates
kaliquzzaman.khan@aue.ae

Reviewers

Reviewer 1: Manijeh Haghighinasab
Assistant Professor, Department of Management, Alzahra University, Tehran, Iran
Email: haghighinasab@srbiau.ac.ir
Reviewer 2: Lourdes Atiaja Atiaja
Universidad de las Fuerzas Armadas ESPE, Ecuador.
Email: natiaja@espe.edu.ec

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

The abstract should succinctly outline the key findings and their implications. The sentence "The study reveals a comprehensive set of governance, social, cultural, economic, and technological factors..." is broad. Please provide specific examples of these factors to better illustrate the findings.

The description of the meta-synthesis method (paragraph 2) is vague. Please provide more details about the criteria for selecting the 70 articles. What specific databases were used, and what were the inclusion and exclusion criteria?

In the expert survey section, it is mentioned that 15 managers and experts participated in the Delphi method. However, the criteria for selecting these experts are not clear. Please specify the qualifications and experience required for participants to ensure the validity of the findings.

The explanation of purposive sampling (paragraph 5) should include more detail about how initial participants were identified and what criteria were used to include subsequent participants in the snowball sampling process.

The process for categorizing codes into themes (paragraph 1) lacks detail. Describe how the codes were analyzed and provide an example of how specific codes were grouped into a theme.

The results section lists several themes (e.g., governance components, social and cultural components), but it is unclear how these themes emerged from the data. Include a more detailed explanation of how each theme was derived and its significance.

Authors revised the manuscript.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

The literature review mentions various studies (e.g., Alavi et al., 2021; Larisa et al., 2020), but it lacks a critical analysis of these works. For instance, how do the findings of Moss & Ghafoori (2020) contrast with those of Radl & Fernández (2021)? Including a comparison will strengthen the argument.

The introduction should clearly define the conceptual framework guiding the study. The sentence "Therefore, senior managers of social security organizations must duly consider the challenges..." can be expanded to detail the specific theoretical models or frameworks being applied.

The discussion should better integrate the study's findings with the existing literature. For instance, how do your findings on the importance of governance align with or differ from previous studies mentioned in the introduction?

While the study concludes that "a holistic and adaptive approach to policy design" is essential, it does not provide specific policy recommendations. Please elaborate on the strategic actions that should be taken by policymakers based on the study's findings.

Table 1, which summarizes the qualitative analysis, should include a brief explanation of each category and code. This will help readers understand the context and relevance of each item listed.

Authors revised the manuscript.

2. Revised

Editor's decision after revisions: Accepted.

Editor in Chief's decision: Accepted.