International Journal of Innovation Management and Organizational Behavior

Open Peer-Review Report

Designing a Model for Improving Good Governance in Public Management with a Systemic Approach (Grounded Theory)

Ali. Moghaddamnezhad[1], Shahram. Mirzaei Daryani[1]*, Majid. Ahmadlu[1], Farzad. Sattari Ardebili[1]

[1] Department of Management, Ardabil Branch, Islamic Azad University, Ardabil, Iran

* **Corresponding author email address**: m.daryani@yahoo.com

E d i t o r	R e v i e w e r s
Asghar Moshabaki	**Reviewer 1:** Abbas Monavarian
Professor., Department of Business Administration, Tarbiat Modarres University, Tehran, Iran. moshabak@modares.ac.ir	Professor, Management Department, Tehran University, Tehran, Iran. Email: amonavar@ut.ac.ir
	Reviewer 2: Mahnaz Hajalian
	Department of Management, Faculty of Social and Economic Sciences, AlZahra University, Tehran, Iran. Email: mhajalian@alzahra.ac.ir

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

The objective of the study is briefly mentioned but could be expanded for clarity. It would be beneficial to provide more detailed information on how the study aims to contribute to the existing body of knowledge and any specific hypotheses or questions guiding the research.

While the methodology section mentions grounded theory and qualitative research, it lacks detailed explanations of how data was analyzed and how the theoretical saturation was determined. Including more specifics about the coding process, the number of iterations in data collection and analysis, and how categories were formed would strengthen this section.

The discussion section could be enhanced by more directly connecting the findings to the literature review and theoretical framework. Highlighting how the results contribute to or differ from existing studies in the field of public management and governance would offer more insight into the study's significance.

While the conclusion suggests training workshops and reforms, it would be helpful to provide more concrete examples of how these recommendations can be implemented in practice. Discussing potential challenges and strategies for overcoming them in the application of the study's findings would be valuable for practitioners.

The article does not explicitly state the limitations of the study, which is a critical aspect of research. Acknowledging the limitations and suggesting areas for future research would provide a more balanced view of the study's contributions and areas for further exploration.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the new document.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

The article provides a demographic breakdown of the sample population but does not sufficiently justify the criteria for participant selection. Expanding on why these particular individuals were chosen and how they contribute to achieving theoretical saturation would add depth to the research methodology.

The study would benefit from a more detailed explanation of the systemic approach and grounded theory in the context of public management and good governance. Linking the research methodology more explicitly to the theoretical underpinnings would provide a stronger foundation for the study.

The article could be enhanced by including diagrams or models that visually represent the findings or the proposed model for improving good governance. Visual aids can help readers better understand complex processes and relationships.

There are sections in the article that could benefit from technical editing for grammar, punctuation, and consistency in terminology. Ensuring that the article is free from typographical errors would improve its readability and professional quality.

The transparency statement mentions that data are available upon request, but providing more details on the data repository or how the data can be accessed would improve the article's transparency and reproducibility. Including information on any ethical considerations related to data sharing would also be beneficial.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the new document.

2. Revised

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