





Conceptualizing "Job Leadership in the Marketing Mix" for Success and Knowledge Transfer in Small Businesses Distant from Consumer Markets (Case Study: Employment Projects of Imam Khomeini Relief Foundation, Ilam Province)




Ali Mohammad. Parsamehr¹, Seyed Reza. Hassani^{2*}, Farshid. Namamian³, Parisa. Bahmani³

¹ PhD Student, Department of Industrial- Business Management, Marketing Major, Faculty of Humanities, Kermanshah Branch, Islamic Azad University, Kermanshah, Iran

² Assistant Professor, Department of Business Management, Faculty of Management, Kermanshah Branch, Islamic Azad University, Kermanshah, Iran

³ Assistant Professor of Business Administration, Department of Management, Faculty of Humanities, Kermanshah Branch, Islamic Azad University, Kermanshah, Iran

* Corresponding author email address: srezahni@gmail.com

E d i t o r	R e v i e w e r s
Parthasarathy Karthikeyan  Associate Professor, School of Management Studies, Kongu Engineering College, Tamil Nadu, India ptp_karhi@proton.me	Reviewer 1: Manijeh Haghighinasab  Assistant Professor, Department of Management, Alzahra University, Tehran, Iran Email: haghighinasab@srbiau.ac.ir Reviewer 2: Mehrdad Bayat  Assistant Professor, Department of Management, Payam Noor University, Tehran, Iran. Email: bayatmehrdad60@pnu.ac.ir

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

The explanation “participants were selected using two non-probability sampling methods: purposive (judgmental) sampling and snowball sampling” would benefit from elaboration. How were initial participants identified, and what criteria determined judgmental inclusion?

While the steps of open, axial, and selective coding are described well, no actual examples of raw data coding (e.g., sample codes or categories) are given. Please include a coding matrix or sample quotes in an appendix.

“Expert review included non-participant experts...” is insufficient. Specify their fields, roles, and the feedback mechanism (e.g., checklist, review session, etc.).

There is inconsistency between “contextual conditions” and “context or background” used in the model diagram. Please use consistent terminology throughout to avoid confusion.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the new document.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

The authors mention several previous studies in a list-like manner. Please improve synthesis by comparing and contrasting findings or showing progression of knowledge (e.g., “Building on Zeinali’s focus on adaptability, we further investigate how...”).

Although Strauss & Corbin's grounded theory is cited, no justification is provided for choosing this over other models such as Charmaz’s constructivist GT. Please explain why Strauss & Corbin’s paradigm was selected.

Some strategy components (e.g., “designing intelligent information systems” vs. “intelligent management”) are conceptually overlapping. Clarify how these are distinct and justify their classification as separate categories.

The section promises a theory but fails to articulate core propositions or a storyline. Please explicitly state the resulting theoretical model and its core assumptions.

When referring to “Zeinali (2023), Safari and Moghli (2022)...,” citations should be fully integrated with interpretive commentary. For instance, explain how their findings directly support your intervening condition constructs.

The phrase “broad range of actions” is too general. Consider specifying the types (e.g., tactical, structural, behavioral) and aligning them more directly with strategy outcomes identified earlier.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the new document.

2. Revised

Editor’s decision after revisions: Accepted.

Editor in Chief’s decision: Accepted.