

Article history: Received 13 September 2023 Accepted 25 November 2023 Published online 01 December 2023

International Journal of Innovation Management and Organizational Behavior

Open Peer-Review Report



E-ISSN: 3041-8992

The Role of Organizational Behavior of the Ministry of Sports and Youth in International Military Sports Events

Hooman. Ordookhani¹, Farshad. Tojari¹, Zinat. Nikaeen¹

* Corresponding author email address: ar.tojari@iauctb.ac.ir

Editor	Reviewers
Aliakbar Aminbeidokhti [®] Educational Administration, Faculty of Psychology and Educational Sciences, Semnan University, Semnan, Iran kafashpor@um.ac.ir	Reviewer 1: Lourdes Atiaja Atiaja Universidad de las Fuerzas Armadas ESPE, Ecuador. Email: natiaja@espe.edu.ec Reviewer 2: Marco Yamba-Yugsi Unidad Académica de Posgrado, Universidad Católica de Cuenca, Azuay 010101, Ecuador Email: marco.yamba@ucacue.edu.ec

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

In the introduction, while the significance of the study is outlined, the research gap is not explicitly identified. The sentence "The purpose of this study was to investigate the role of the organizational behavior of the Ministry of Sports and Youth in international military sports events" (Introduction) could be followed by a clear statement of the existing gap in the literature that this study aims to address.

The process of coding and categorization is outlined, but there is a lack of detail on how inter-coder reliability was ensured. The sentence "the main research categories were selected using the Delphi method until theoretical saturation and consensus were achieved" (Methods and Materials) should include more information on the measures taken to ensure consistency in coding.

The term "organizational behavior" is central to the study, yet it lacks a precise operational definition. The phrase "the role of organizational behavior of the Ministry of Sports and Youth in international military sports events" (Objective) should be followed by a clear definition of what constitutes "organizational behavior" in this context.

Authors revised the manuscripts.

¹ Department of Sport Management, Centeral Tehran Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran



1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

The literature review in the introduction section is extensive but could benefit from more explicit connections to the current study. For example, after mentioning Giulianotti & Klauser (2010), the relevance of their findings to your research should be explicitly stated. How does their work inform your study's focus on the Ministry of Sports and Youth?

The study references a paradigmatic model, but it is not clear how this model was developed or selected. The phrase "These were placed within the six dimensions of the paradigmatic model" (Methods and Materials) needs to be expanded to explain the origin of the model and why it is appropriate for this study.

The article mentions that "ethical standards including obtaining informed consent ensuring privacy and confidentiality were observed" (Ethical Considerations), but it does not specify how these were implemented in practice, especially considering the sensitive nature of military-related topics. Provide more details on how these ethical issues were addressed.

The discussion does not fully explore the implications of the findings. For instance, the statement "enhancing the quality of hosting CISM events faces many limitations" (Discussion and Conclusion) should be expanded to discuss what specific limitations were identified and how they might be mitigated.

The discussion section should more explicitly link the study's findings back to the literature reviewed in the introduction. How do your findings compare to previous studies on similar topics? Are there any contradictions or confirmations?

The conclusion is somewhat brief and does not fully encapsulate the contributions of the study. The sentence "This positive role directly leads to the development of sports among the armed forces and strengthens Iran's position in international sports arenas" (Discussion and Conclusion) should be expanded to include a summary of the key findings and their broader implications.

Authors revised the manuscripts.

2. Revised

Editor's decision: Accepted.

Editor in Chief's decision: Accepted.