

Past, Present, and Future of Technological Business Development: A Bibliometric Study

Seyyed Amir Hossein. Shobeiri^{1*}

¹ Master's Degree in MBA, Department of Management, University of Tehran, Tehran, Iran

* Corresponding author email address: Amirmath2003@gmail.com

Editor

Azar Kafashpoor^{id}
Professor, Department of
Educational Management and
Human Resource Development,
Ferdowsi University of Mashhad,
Mashhad, Iran
kafashpor@um.ac.ir

Reviewers

Reviewer 1: Hamid Rezaiefar^{id}
Assistant Professor, Department of Management, Birjand Branch, Islamic Azad
University, Birjand, Iran.
Email: h.rezaiefar@iaubir.ac.ir
Reviewer 2: Masoud Hoseinchari^{id}
Associate Professor, Department of Educational Sciences, Shiraz University, Shiraz,
Iran. Email: hchari@shirazu.ac.ir

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

The paper mentions using the PRISMA protocol for document screening, but there is no detailed PRISMA flow diagram. Please include a PRISMA flowchart to enhance transparency and replicability of the study methodology.

Clarify why both R and VOSviewer were chosen for the analysis and describe any complementary functions they provided that justified using both. This could help in substantiating the methodological choices made in the study.

The keywords used in the search strategy seem broad. Consider specifying whether synonyms or related terms were included to ensure comprehensive coverage of the literature.

The manuscript briefly mentions the exclusion of duplicates and non-English studies but lacks detail on other inclusion or exclusion criteria. More precise criteria should be defined to assure the quality of the literature review.

Provide more detailed explanations of the statistical methods and metrics used in the bibliometric analysis, such as normalization techniques or the specific bibliometric indicators analyzed.

Some claims about the influence of journals and authors seem to rely solely on citation counts. Discuss other impact metrics, like journal impact factor or h-index, to provide a more nuanced evaluation of influence.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the new document.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

The manuscript should compare its findings with previous bibliometric analyses in the field. This comparison would provide a richer context and highlight what new insights this study contributes.

More analysis is needed on the significance of the collaborations between countries like China and Pakistan. How do these collaborations influence the field of technological business development?

The study acknowledges the exclusive use of Scopus but does not thoroughly discuss how this limitation might skew the results. Include a discussion on the potential biases introduced by database selection.

Elaborate on how the findings can be applied by policymakers and researchers in the field. This section should directly connect the bibliometric findings with practical steps for stakeholders.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the new document.

2. Revised

Editor's decision after revisions: Accepted.

Editor in Chief's decision: Accepted.