





Identification of Effective Factors on Public Oversight of Public Policies with a Crowdsourcing Approach Using Thematic Analysis and DEMATEL Techniques

Zeinolabedin. Keramatinia¹, Karamollah. Daneshfard^{2*}, Marzieh. Mohammadi³, Nazanin. Pilevari⁴

¹ PhD student, Department of Public Administration, Faculty of Management and Economics, Science and Research Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran


² Professor, Department of Public Administration, Faculty of Management and Economics, Science and Research Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran

³ Assistant Professor, Department of Management, North Tehran Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran



⁴ Professor, Department of Industrial Management, Faculty of Management, West Tehran Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran

* Corresponding author email address: daneshfard@srbiau.ac.ir

Editor

Mohammed Abdul Imran Khan
Department of Financial
Management and Economics,
Dhofar University, Oman
mimran@du.edu.om

Reviewers

Reviewer 1: Mohammad Esmail Fadaeinejad
Associate Prof., Department of Financial Management
and Insurance, Shahid Beheshti University, Tehran, Iran.
Email: m-fadaei@sbu.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 article would benefit from a clearer explanation of the DEMATEL technique, particularly how it discriminates between influential and influenced factors. This should include specific mathematical or statistical procedures used in the analysis to enhance replicability.

The paper should address potential biases introduced by the purposive sampling method. Consider discussing how the selection of participants might influence the results and suggest strategies for mitigating these biases.

While the manuscript mentions that theoretical saturation was achieved after 16 interviews, it lacks a detailed explanation of how saturation was determined. Including specific indicators or criteria used to assess saturation would strengthen this claim.

Increase the robustness of the thematic analysis by incorporating additional validation techniques such as triangulation with other data sources or methodological triangulation.

To enhance the credibility of the thematic analysis, discuss the inter-rater reliability process in more detail. Specify who the additional researchers were, their qualifications, and the agreement rates achieved.

Expand the discussion on the limitations of the study. This should not only cover the inherent limitations of the methods used but also potential confounding factors and the generalizability of the results.

Authors revised the manuscripts.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

Clarify how the findings contribute to existing theories of public policy and crowdsourcing. Make connections to the relevant literature and discuss whether the results support or contradict existing theories.

The practical implications section could be strengthened by providing specific examples of how public administrators can apply the findings to enhance public oversight.

Provide a detailed set of recommendations for future research, including potential new research questions that arise from your findings.

Include a more comprehensive comparison with previous studies, highlighting what this research adds to the existing body of knowledge.

While ethical considerations are mentioned, expanding on any ethical dilemmas encountered during the research and how they were resolved could enhance the transparency of the research process.

Deepen the discussion on the role of crowdsourcing within public policy oversight, focusing on both the opportunities and challenges it presents.

Ensure that technical terms and jargon are well-defined for readers who may not be familiar with specific methods or concepts used in public administration research.

Authors revised the manuscripts.

2. Revised

Editor's decision: Accepted.

Editor in Chief's decision: Accepted.