Ranking the Indicators of the Model for Enhancing the Quality of Virtual University Education with a Knowledge Management Approach

Amir. Sadeghi Samarjani[1], Ali. Maghool[2*], Mohammad. Karimi[2], Moslem. Cherabin[3]

[1] PhD Student of Educational Management, Neyshabur Branch, Islamic Azad University, Neyshabur, Iran
[2] Assistant Professor, Department of Management, Neyshabur Branch, Islamic Azad University, Neyshabur, Iran
[3] Assistant Professor, Department of Educational Management, Neyshabur Branch, Islamic Azad University, Neyshabur, Iran

* Corresponding author email address: Ali.maghool@yahoo.com

Editor	Reviewers
Aliakbar Aminbeidokhti	**Reviewer 1:** Masoud Hoseinchari
Educational Administration, Faculty of Psychology and Educational Sciences, Semnan University, Semnan, Iran kafashpor@um.ac.ir	Associate Professor, Department of Educational Sciences, Shiraz University, Shiraz, Iran. Email: hchari@shirazu.ac.ir
	Reviewer 2: Rezvan Hosseingholizadeh
	Associate Professor, Department of Educational Management and Human Resource Development, Ferdowsi University of Mashhad, Mashhad, Iran. Email: rhgholizadeh@um.ac.ir

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

The opening sentence could be more specific by defining "complex and multidimensional phenomenon" and providing a clear example of how societal development is measured.

While the role of universities in fostering intellectual exchange is emphasized, it would strengthen the argument to include a specific example or case study illustrating this impact.

The statement about the challenges faced by virtual organizations due to behavioral interventions could be elaborated. Including examples of these challenges would provide better clarity.

The distinction between fundamental and applied research could be clarified with examples or a brief explanation of why this study is categorized as applied.

While the use of exploratory mixed-methods design is well-explained, it would be helpful to briefly justify why this approach is particularly suited for the study's objectives.

The choice of interviews as a qualitative data collection method is appropriate but could be strengthened by detailing the type of interview questions or themes explored.

The explanation of the mixed-methods design could benefit from mentioning how the qualitative findings inform the quantitative phase.

The term "limited number of participants" is vague. Specify the exact number or range of participants to enhance transparency.

The coding process is described in detail, but it would be more robust if the software or tools used for coding were mentioned.

The use of the IPA method is appropriate; however, it would be beneficial to explain why this method was chosen over others.

Clarify whether the ISM method used for modeling also included validation techniques and, if so, describe them briefly.

The methodology references Glaser's approach, but it would be helpful to briefly explain how this approach enhances the reliability or depth of the coding process.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the new document.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

The phrase "fundamental qualitative and quantitative changes" is vague. Consider specifying examples of these changes to better contextualize their impact on societal growth.

The term "lifelong knowledge-based organizations" is used without a clear definition. Consider elaborating on what this entails and how it contrasts with traditional universities.

The assertion about users' perception of learning methods in Eastern societies like Iran would benefit from citing a study or survey data to substantiate the claim.

The transition from discussing global universities to focusing on knowledge management is abrupt. A linking sentence would improve flow and coherence.

The description of the knowledgeable manager's role could be expanded to include specific skills or attributes necessary for adapting to changes.

The explanation of open and axial coding is thorough, but it would add value to provide an example of a specific concept identified through this process.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the new document.

2. Revised

Editor's decision after revisions: Accepted.
Editor in Chief's decision: Accepted.