

## Evaluation of the Judicial Human Resources Productivity Model Using Structural Equations


Ali Mohamamd. Hosseini<sup>1</sup>, Rashid. Zolfaghari Zaferani<sup>1\*</sup>, Seyed Mahmoud. Hashemi<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Department of Management and Accounting, Roudehen Branch, Islamic Azad University, Roudehen, Iran



<sup>2</sup> Department of Business Management, North Tehran Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran

\* Corresponding author email address: Rashid\_zo@yahoo.com

### E d i t o r

Mehdi Rostami<sup>1</sup>  
Department of Psychology and  
Counseling, KMAN Research  
Institute, Richmond Hill, Ontario,  
Canada  
mehdirostami@kmanresce.ca

### R e v i e w e r s

**Reviewer 1:** Ali Choori<sup>1</sup>  
Assistant Professor of Sports Management, Faculty of Humanities and Sports  
Sciences, Gonbadkavos University, Gonbadkavos, Iran. Email: choori@gonbad.ac.ir  
**Reviewer 2:** Asghar Jafari<sup>1</sup>  
Associate Professor, Department of Psychology, Kashan University, Iran. Email:  
as\_jafari@sbu.ac.ir

## 1. Round 1

### 1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

The authors state that "the necessity of a strategic approach to human resources is undeniable and environmental changes further emphasize its importance." This statement would benefit from more specific examples of environmental changes that have influenced the strategic approach in recent years. Consider adding recent literature that outlines these changes.

The sentence "Organizations can cultivate and develop specific characteristics and behaviors in their employees through effective HRM strategies..." should include references to empirical studies that support this assertion. This would strengthen the argument by showing that these strategies have been successfully implemented elsewhere.

The factor loadings presented in Table 1 are appropriate, but the discussion lacks a clear interpretation of these loadings. It would be beneficial to include a brief explanation of what these loadings imply about the constructs measured and their internal consistency.

The results in Table 3 suggest adequate discriminant validity, but the paper should discuss potential issues if the square roots of AVE are close to the correlations with other constructs. Are there any concerns about multicollinearity, and how was this addressed?

The conclusion suggests focusing on organizational processes and information technology to enhance productivity. However, it does not specify what practical steps can be taken by judicial organizations to implement these recommendations. Consider adding actionable strategies or case studies where similar recommendations have been successfully implemented.

Authors revised the manuscripts.

### 1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

It is noted that the research instrument was a "researcher-made questionnaire." The process for developing this questionnaire should be elaborated upon, particularly how the qualitative findings informed its design. Including examples of the qualitative data that led to specific questionnaire items would improve transparency.

While the reliability of the instrument is confirmed with a Cronbach's alpha of 0.90, it is recommended to report the Cronbach's alpha values for each subscale individually to ensure that all constructs are reliably measured.

The literature review heavily relies on studies published before 2020. It is recommended to include more recent studies (from 2020 onwards) to ensure the review is current and reflects the latest research trends.

The limitation stating that mixed methods were not used due to time and financial constraints could be expanded. Specifically, discuss how the lack of qualitative data might have impacted the depth of understanding of the findings and suggest potential follow-up studies to address this gap.

The article mentions the GoF (Goodness of Fit) criterion but does not provide other model fit indices such as CFI, TLI, or RMSEA. Including these indices would provide a more comprehensive assessment of the model's fit.

Authors revised the manuscripts.

## 2. Revised

Editor's decision: Accepted.

Editor in Chief's decision: Accepted.