






# Identification and Prioritization of Indicators for the Annual Performance Evaluation of the President

Soroosh. Sotoodeh<sup>1</sup>, Aliasghar. Pourezzat<sup>2\*</sup>, Marjan. Fayyazi<sup>3</sup>, NourMohammad. Yaghoubi<sup>4</sup>, Bahareh. Mahbanooei<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> PhD Student, Department of Public Administration, Kish Campus, University of Tehran, Kish, Iran

<sup>2</sup> Professor, Department of Public Administration, Faculty of Management, University of Tehran, Tehran, Iran

<sup>3</sup> Associate Professor, Department of Business Administration, Faculty of Management, University of Tehran, Tehran, Iran

<sup>4</sup> Professor, Department of Management, University of Sistan and Baluchestan, Zahedan, Iran

<sup>5</sup> Assistant Professor, Department of Public Administration, Faculty of Management, University of Tehran, Tehran, Iran

\* Corresponding author email address: pourezzat@ut.ac.ir

| E d i t o r  | R e v i e w e r s   |
|--|---|
| Rezvan Hosseingholizadeh <br>Associate Professor, Department of Educational Management and Human Resource Development, Ferdowsi University of Mashhad, Mashhad, Iran<br>rhgholizadeh@um.ac.ir | <b>Reviewer 1:</b> Lourdes Atiaja Atiaja <br>Universidad de las Fuerzas Armadas ESPE, Ecuador.<br>Email: natiaja@espe.edu.ec<br><b>Reviewer 2:</b> Mohammad Esmaeil Fadaeinejad <br>Associate Prof., Department of Financial Management and Insurance, Shahid Beheshti University, Tehran, Iran.<br>Email: m-fadaei@sbu.ac.ir |

## 1. Round 1

### 1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

This paragraph relies heavily on general textbook statements. To improve scholarly depth, integrate recent empirical works on public sector evaluation (e.g., post-2020 governance studies) to anchor the argument in updated literature.

Several references are listed without critical evaluation (e.g., “Momeni Mofrad et al., 2023” and “Hosseinzadeh et al., 2022”). Please expand by discussing methodological strengths or limitations of these works to justify your own methodological choices.

The description of thematic analysis appears inconsistent with later references to coding phases resembling grounded theory (open, axial, selective). Please clarify whether grounded theory coding was applied under a thematic umbrella, or whether it is better described as grounded theory methodology.

The methodological rigor would be improved by stating which software (e.g., NVivo, MAXQDA) was used to manage and code qualitative data.

Please justify the adequacy of 15 interviews with reference to qualitative methodological literature on sample sufficiency and theoretical saturation. This would enhance credibility.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the new document.

## 1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

Please cite the specific constitutional or statutory article. Without this precision, the statement lacks legal rigor and may appear anecdotal.

The discussion of “lack of continuity” is important but underdeveloped. Please provide concrete historical examples of past fragmented evaluation attempts in Iran to contextualize the argument.

The literature review is presented as a list. For academic coherence, synthesize these studies thematically (e.g., quantitative efficiency models, sentiment analysis approaches, sectoral performance evaluations) rather than enumerating them.

While Kendall’s coefficients are reported, no thresholds are cited. Please add justification from methodological sources on what constitutes “satisfactory” agreement.

This table is excessively long and difficult to interpret. Consider splitting into sub-tables (e.g., competency, outcomes, processes, satisfaction) or moving detailed indicators to an appendix.

This appears inconsistent: the study concerns presidential performance evaluation, not petrochemical industry culture. This may be a copy-editing oversight and must be corrected.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the new document.

## 2. Revised

Editor’s decision after revisions: Accepted.

Editor in Chief’s decision: Accepted.