




Structural Equation Modeling of the Relationships Between Intellectual Capital, Psychological Capital, and Human Resource Productivity

Morteza. Robatmili^{1*} 

¹ M.A., Department of Accounting, Kharazmi University, Tehran, Iran

* Corresponding author email address: mortezarobatmili@gmail.com

E d i t o r	R e v i e w e r s
Aliakbar Aminbeidokhti ¹  Educational Administration, Faculty of Psychology and Educational Sciences, Semnan University, Semnan, Iran kafashpor@um.ac.ir	Reviewer 1: Manijeh Haghighinasab ¹  Assistant Professor, Department of Management, Alzahra University, Tehran, Iran Email: haghighinasab@srbiau.ac.ir Reviewer 2: Abbas Monavarian ¹  Professor, Management Department, Tehran University, Tehran, Iran. Email: amonavar@ut.ac.ir

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

The sentence “We live in an era known as the battle of talent...” could be more precise. Consider integrating more recent references on talent management (post-2020) to strengthen contemporary relevance.

The sentence “This new approach which is also called positive psychology has recently attracted the attention...” conflates Positive Psychology with Positive Organizational Behavior. Clarify that Positive Organizational Behavior is an applied branch drawing on Positive Psychology, not identical to it.

When stating “Psychological capital can be managed and invested on similar to human capital and social capital”, provide empirical examples (e.g., interventions, training programs) to support the claim.

The population is described as “all managers of parsian bank in Tehran, Iran”. Please clarify whether this includes assistant managers, department heads, or only branch managers. This precision is important for replication.

The text says “Statistical population in this study is approximately equal to 382 managers based on Cochran formula”. This is inconsistent: the population should be an actual census size, while Cochran’s formula estimates sample size. Clarify the basis of the 382 figure.

The sentence “Productivity of organizational resources is affected by human capital with the ration of 0.37” has a typographical error (“ration” instead of “ratio” or “path coefficient”). Revise for accuracy.

The conclusion states: “...wich is in line with the results of Saengcheng (2007), Mohammad et al (2014).” Ensure consistent citation formatting (e.g., check spelling of “which,” and provide full bibliographic details in references).

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the new document.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

The wording “Human resources are the most important resources using whom managers can achieve organizational goals” is awkward. It needs revision for readability (e.g., “Human resources constitute the most critical asset through which managers achieve organizational goals”).

The statement “level of its development is rapidly becoming a standard for level of development of countries” is vague. Specify whether this refers to intellectual capital indicators at the national level (e.g., innovation indexes, knowledge economy indexes).

The last line “Base on the above, main purpose of this research is evaluation of relationship among Intellectual capital, Psychological capital and Productivity of human resources” should clearly articulate the research gap. Currently, it reads as a general aim rather than a problem statement.

When describing Malone & Scullion (2007) and Stewart (1995, 1997), the literature review lists definitions but does not critically compare them. A synthesis highlighting how different conceptualizations overlap or diverge would strengthen this section.

The text notes: “Customer capital is a subset of intellectual capital which includes group knowledge and knowledge network which coexist and are derived from a communication network (Bounfour, 2002).” This sentence could be expanded to explain why customer/relational capital is critical in service organizations such as banks.

The claim “Questionnaires of intellectual capital and psychological capital were standard so there are no need to evaluate reliability and validity for them” is problematic. Even standardized instruments require reliability confirmation in the current context. Report Cronbach’s alpha or composite reliability for these scales.

The section notes: “Cronbach’s alpha coefficient was used to confirm its reliability (0.796)”. Provide subscale reliabilities as well, and mention whether exploratory/confirmatory factor analysis was conducted.

Table 4 shows fit indices (CFI = 0.88, AGFI = 0.89). According to SEM standards, CFI below 0.90 and AGFI below 0.90 are marginal fits. Discuss these limitations and justify the adequacy of model fit more critically.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the new document.

2. Revised

Editor’s decision after revisions: Accepted.

Editor in Chief’s decision: Accepted.