Journal Website

Article history:
Received 11 July 2026
Revised 17 October 2026
Accepted 25 October 2026
Initial Publication 26 October 2026
Final Publication 01 March 2027

International Journal of Innovation Management and Organizational Behavior

Open Peer-Review Report

E-ISSN: 3041-8992

Examining the Effects of Quality and Psychological Dimensions on Industrial Customers' Acceptance of Emerging Nanotechnology

Kamal. Ghalandari[1*]

[1] Assistant Professor, Department of Business Management, Payame Noor University, Tehran, Iran

*** Corresponding author email address**: kamal.ghalandari@pnu.ac.ir

Editor	Reviewers
Mohammed Abdul Imran Khan Department of Financial Management and Economics, Dhofar University, Oman mimran@du.edu.om	**Reviewer 1:** Abbas Monavarian Professor, Management Department, Tehran University, Tehran, Iran. Email: amonavar@ut.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:

In Section 3.4, the paragraph defining ACC using Items 11, 38, and 40 and trust using only Items 37 and 39 needs additional construct-validity justification. The three ACC indicators appear to reflect somewhat different behavioral tendencies—continued purchasing, purchasing other nanotechnology products, and recommending purchase to others—which may not necessarily form a unidimensional reflective construct. Please explain the theoretical basis for modeling these indicators reflectively and report evidence supporting their dimensional coherence. Similarly, a two-item trust construct can be acceptable, but the manuscript should justify why two indicators sufficiently capture the intended domain of trust.

In Section 3.4, the sentence "Perceived risk was measured using reverse-coded items; consequently, a higher score indicates lower perceived risk" creates a labeling inconsistency throughout the manuscript. A construct labeled "perceived risk" would ordinarily be expected to increase when risk perceptions increase, whereas the operationalized score represents "risk reduction" or "low perceived risk." Please either reverse the indicators before modeling and rename the construct to reflect low perceived

risk, or explicitly relabel the construct as "perceived risk reduction" to avoid interpreting a positive β as though higher risk increases acceptance.

In Section 3.5, the manuscript states that "reliability and validity ... were examined within the PLS-SEM measurement-model assessment framework," yet the reported evidence is limited primarily to indicator loadings, Cronbach's alpha, ρA, CR, and AVE. Discriminant validity is not reported. Please include HTMT ratios for all construct pairs and indicate the threshold used, preferably .85 or .90 depending on conceptual similarity. Given the conceptual overlap among performance, reliability, conformance, perceived quality, and durability, demonstrating discriminant validity is essential before interpreting the structural paths.

In Section 4.4, the manuscript uses one-way ANOVA and Tukey HSD despite the fact that each owner, sales manager, and quality manager appears to be nested within the same firms. The sentence "results of the one-way ANOVAs showed significant differences among owners, sales managers, and quality managers" therefore treats the groups as independent when the sampling design suggests matched or clustered observations by company. Please reconsider the analysis using a repeated-measures, mixed-effects, or multilevel framework with company as a clustering factor, or provide a clear justification for why independent-group ANOVA remains appropriate despite within-company dependence.

In Table 4, the interpretation of η^2 should be revised because the manuscript adopts Cohen-type cutoffs of .01, .06, and .14 without discussing whether these conventional thresholds are appropriate for this substantive context. More importantly, because ten separate ANOVAs were conducted, the statement that nine dimensions differed significantly should address multiplicity at the omnibus-test level. Please report whether the findings remain significant under a familywise or false-discovery-rate correction across the ten ANOVAs, rather than noting only that Tukey HSD controls pairwise comparisons within each dimension.

In Section 4.5A, the statement "all criteria satisfy the commonly accepted PLS-SEM thresholds" is too broad because the measurement-model assessment is incomplete without discriminant validity and potentially indicator-level significance. Please report bootstrapped significance for outer loadings and include HTMT confidence intervals if available. In addition, the lowest loading of .66 for perceived quality should be discussed in relation to content validity rather than accepted solely because CR and AVE exceed minimum thresholds.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the new document.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

In Section 3.6, the sentence "Common method bias was assessed using Harman's single-factor test and full collinearity VIF" should be treated more cautiously. Harman's single-factor test has limited diagnostic value and cannot establish the absence of common method variance. Please report the actual percentage of variance explained by the first unrotated factor and all full-collinearity VIF values, and frame these procedures as diagnostic checks rather than definitive tests. Because all variables were collected using a single self-report questionnaire at the same time, procedural remedies used during questionnaire design should also be described.

In Table 2 and the accompanying paragraph, the interpretation of the "percentage of maximum" measure may be misleading because converting Likert-scale sums to percentages can imply ratio-scale properties that the measure does not strictly possess. For example, the statement "aesthetics ... 81.1% of the maximum score" is descriptively understandable but should not be interpreted as 81.1% of an absolute underlying quality level. Please clarify that this percentage is only a rescaled descriptive index based on the observed Likert score range and does not imply a ratio-scale interpretation.

In Section 4.3, the sentence "The mean scores for all 10 dimensions were significantly higher than 12 ... indicating that industrial customers hold positive perceptions across all dimensions" should be moderated. A mean above the mathematical midpoint indicates responses above a neutral or midpoint reference only if the response anchors and questionnaire structure support that interpretation. Please explain why 12 is substantively meaningful as the benchmark and specify whether the

IJIMOB
E-ISSN: 3041-8992

midpoint corresponds exactly to the summed value of "neutral" responses across four items. This is particularly important because statistical significance against a midpoint does not necessarily establish managerial importance.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the new document.

2. Revised

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

IJIMOB
E-ISSN: 3041-8992