

Identification of the Fundamental Dimensions of Corporate Entrepreneurship and Corporate Governance: A Delphi Study in Entrepreneurial Companies

Shahriar. Fatehi¹, Jahangir. Yadollahi Farsi^{2*}, Seyed Mostafa. Razavi³

¹ PhD Candidate, Department of Entrepreneurship, Kish international Campus, University of Tehran, Tehran, Iran

² Professor, Department of New Business, College of Management, University of Tehran, Tehran, Iran

³ Associate Professor, Department of Technology and Innovation Management, Faculty of Industrial Management, University of Tehran, Tehran, Iran

* Corresponding author email address: Jfarsi@ut.ac.ir

E d i t o r

Mohammed Abdul Imran Khan
Department of Financial
Management and Economics,
Dhofar University, Oman
mimran@du.edu.om

R e v i e w e r s

Reviewer 1: Mehrdad Bayat
Assistant Professor, Department of Management, Payam Noor University, Tehran,
Iran.
Email: bayatmehrdad60@pnu.ac.ir
Reviewer 2: Abbas Monavarian
Professor, Management Department, Tehran University, Tehran, Iran.
Email: amonavar@ut.ac.ir

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

Across these paragraphs, several studies are cited to demonstrate governance influence on innovation. However, the arguments are conceptually repetitive. Please synthesize the literature into thematic clusters (e.g., monitoring role, enabling role, institutional mediation) to improve theoretical coherence.

The manuscript identifies a research gap but does not sufficiently justify why entrepreneurial companies constitute a distinct analytical context. Please explain whether institutional, ownership, or lifecycle characteristics differentiate these firms from conventional corporations.

The text claims “strong statistical significance” for Kendall’s $W = 0.413$. Statistical significance does not equal strength of agreement. Please revise interpretation to distinguish statistical significance from consensus magnitude.

The justification for ending the Delphi rounds appears post hoc. Please clarify whether stopping criteria were predefined or derived after observing results, as retrospective justification may weaken methodological rigor.

The statement “corporate entrepreneurship was conceptualized through five key dimensions” requires elaboration of the coding process (number of codes, coder agreement, validation procedures). Consider adding a coding example.

Some subcategories such as “organizational dynamism” and “managerial competencies” appear conceptually overlapping. Please justify dimensional distinctiveness or provide operational boundaries separating categories.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the new document.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

The sentence “Accordingly, the aim of this study is to identify and conceptualize...” would benefit from specifying unit of analysis (firm level, governance system level, or managerial perception level). This clarification strengthens methodological alignment.

The manuscript states that the research follows an “interpretivist philosophical paradigm.” Please justify this choice by explaining why interpretivism is more appropriate than constructivist or pragmatic qualitative traditions for Delphi-based conceptual development.

You mention “semi-structured interviews and focus group discussions”, yet later only interviews and Delphi rounds are described. Please clarify whether focus groups were actually conducted or remove this reference to avoid methodological ambiguity.

The phrase “a systematic review of the relevant scholarly literature” is used, but no systematic protocol (PRISMA, search strategy, inclusion criteria) is described. Please provide explicit procedural details or replace the term “systematic” with “narrative review.”

The manuscript notes purposive and snowball sampling but does not define expert selection criteria. Please specify minimum managerial experience, governance expertise, or academic qualifications used to determine eligibility.

You state that “twelve experts were selected as members of the Delphi panel.” Provide methodological justification referencing Delphi standards demonstrating why $n = 12$ ensures credibility and saturation.

The manuscript indicates “several iterative rounds” but ultimately reports two rounds only. Please clarify whether additional rounds were planned but terminated, and explain decision rules established before data collection.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the new document.

2. Revised

Editor’s decision after revisions: Accepted.

Editor in Chief’s decision: Accepted.