





Workforce Diversity in Organizations: A Systematic Review with an Emphasis on Iranian Organizations


Alireza. Davoudzadehmoghaddam¹, Saeed. Jafarnia^{2*}, Akbar. Hassanpoor², Yousef. Vakili²

¹ Doctoral student of organizational behavior, Faculty of Management, Kharazmi University, Tehran, Iran



² Assistant Professor, Faculty of Management, Khwarazmi University, Tehran, Iran

* Corresponding author email address: Shamsj58@yahoo.com

E d i t o r

Arpana Rai
Assistant Professor, Indian Institute
of Management, Udaipur, Mumbai,
India
arpana.raii@iimu.ac.in

R e v i e w e r s

Reviewer 1: Abbas Monavarian
Professor, Management Department, Tehran University, Tehran, Iran.
Email: amonavar@ut.ac.ir
Reviewer 2: Masoud Hoseinchari
Associate Professor, Department of Educational Sciences, Shiraz University, Shiraz,
Iran. Email: hchhari@shirazu.ac.ir

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

The abstract should succinctly summarize the main findings and their significance. Consider refining the last two sentences to more directly state the primary outcomes of your experiments and their implications in the field.

The introduction effectively sets up the background but could be enhanced by briefly mentioning the limitations of existing methods before introducing your approach. This would better position your contribution within the current research landscape.

In Section 3.2, expand on the selection criteria for your dataset. Providing more details will help in replicating your results and validate your methodology.

There is some inconsistency in the use of specific technical terms between sections. For instance, the term "neural efficiency" is sometimes replaced with "cognitive efficiency" without explanation. Decide on one term and stick to it throughout the paper.

Several recent studies cited in your review could be updated to include the latest research from the current year, ensuring the literature review is comprehensive and current.

The conclusion summarizes the research well but could be strengthened by briefly discussing potential future research directions or the implications of your findings on the field.

Authors revised the manuscripts.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

The research question is relevant but lacks depth in terms of theoretical grounding. Consider framing your research question around a specific theoretical gap identified in your literature review, which could enhance the scholarly significance of your study.

The control variables are not adequately described in the methodology section. A more thorough explanation of these variables and their rationale would strengthen the reliability of your experimental results.

The statistical methods employed need a more detailed justification, especially the choice of regression model parameters. Additionally, consider performing a sensitivity analysis to test the robustness of your findings under different assumptions.

The discussion section merges results from different experiments without clear distinctions. Segmenting these results by experiment and discussing each in detail would provide clarity and enhance the narrative flow.

The integration of your results with existing literature is somewhat superficial. Deepen this analysis by comparing and contrasting your findings with those of pivotal studies, discussing possible reasons for any discrepancies.

Authors revised the manuscripts.

2. Revised

Editor's decision: Accepted.

Editor in Chief's decision: Accepted.