Journal Website

Article history:
Received 26 July 2026
Revised 05 November 2026
Accepted 13 November 2026
Initial Publication 16 November 2026
Final Publication 01 November 2027

International Journal of Innovation Management and Organizational Behavior

Open Peer-Review Report

E-ISSN: 3041-8992

# Design and Validation of a Strategic Management Model for Digital Transformation with Emphasis on Organizational Dynamic Capabilities and Competitive Agility in Business Enterprises

Mojtaba. Asili[1*], Mohammad. Akbari Arekamari[2]

[1] MA Student, Department of Business Management, Payame Noor University, Mashhad, Iran
[2] Faculty of Management and Economics, Payame Noor University, Tehran, Iran

*** Corresponding author email address**: mojtabaasili@student.pnu.ac.ir

| Editor | Reviewers |
|---|---|
| Azar Kafashpoor<br>Professor, Department of Educational Management and Human Resource Development, Ferdowsi University of Mashhad, Mashhad, Iran<br>kafashpor@um.ac.ir | **Reviewer 1:** Abbas Monavarian<br>Professor, Management Department, Tehran University, Tehran, Iran.<br>Email: amonavar@ut.ac.ir<br>**Reviewer 2:** Rezvan Hosseingholizadeh<br>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 the Introduction paragraph beginning with “Digital transformation has become one of the most consequential strategic challenges,” the discussion combines technological disruption, artificial intelligence, analytics, cloud infrastructure, digital platforms, automation, strategic alignment, and organizational capability within a single broad conceptual frame. While comprehensive, the paragraph risks conceptual diffusion. The authors should provide a formal definition of “strategic management of digital transformation” early in the Introduction and explicitly distinguish this construct from digital transformation capability, digital orientation, digital strategy, digital leadership, and digital maturity. These concepts are related but theoretically non-equivalent, and insufficient differentiation may later create construct overlap in the empirical model.

The quantitative sampling paragraph states that “a total of 384 participants were included in the quantitative phase” and that “participants were selected using a stratified random sampling procedure.” This requires greater methodological precision. The

manuscript should specify the sampling frame, the strata used, the number of organizations approached, the number of respondents allocated to each stratum, the basis for proportional or disproportional allocation, the number of questionnaires distributed, the number returned, and the final valid response rate. Without these details, the claim of stratified random sampling cannot be independently evaluated and may appear closer to stratified convenience or organizationally mediated sampling.

In the Methods section, the manuscript reports that the quantitative sample comprised employees from "manufacturing, service, technology, commercial, financial, and knowledge-intensive sectors." This sectoral heterogeneity is potentially important because digital transformation maturity and agility may differ systematically across industries. The authors should report the sectoral distribution of the 384 respondents and consider testing whether major structural relationships are stable across broad sector categories. Even if subgroup SEM is not feasible because of sample-size constraints, sector should at minimum be examined as a control variable or discussed as a source of unobserved heterogeneity.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the new document.

### *1.2. Reviewer 2*

Reviewer:

The paragraph discussing dynamic capabilities states that "the dynamic capabilities perspective focuses on the ability of organizations to sense environmental changes, seize emerging opportunities, and reconfigure internal and external resources." This theoretical foundation is central to the model, yet the manuscript should explain more explicitly why dynamic capabilities function as mediating mechanisms rather than antecedents, moderators, or dimensions of digital transformation itself. The causal ordering adopted in the structural model requires stronger theoretical justification. In particular, the authors should explain why strategic digital transformation management is expected to generate sensing, seizing, and reconfiguration capabilities and why these capabilities subsequently produce competitive agility.

In the Introduction paragraph stating that "agility is both a product of digital transformation and an enabling condition for its continued development," the manuscript introduces a potentially reciprocal relationship but subsequently tests only a unidirectional pathway from digital transformation management to dynamic capabilities and competitive agility. This creates a discrepancy between the theoretical argument and the empirical specification. The authors should either revise the theoretical discussion to maintain a clearly directional causal logic or explicitly acknowledge reciprocal relationships while explaining why the present cross-sectional model tests only one theoretically prioritized direction.

In the Methods section under Study Design and Participants, the manuscript reports an "exploratory sequential mixed-method design consisting of qualitative and quantitative phases." The authors should clarify the integration procedure between these two phases. It is insufficient to state that qualitative findings informed questionnaire construction; the manuscript should describe how qualitative codes were transformed into dimensions, how dimensions were converted into questionnaire items, whether existing validated scales were consulted during item construction, how disagreements among experts were resolved, and at what stage the qualitative and quantitative results were formally integrated. Mixed-method research quality depends substantially on transparent integration rather than merely conducting two sequential phases.

In the Study Design and Participants paragraph, the qualitative phase included "18 experts" and sampling continued until theoretical saturation was achieved. The manuscript should report how saturation was operationally assessed. The authors should indicate after which interview no substantively new codes or categories emerged and whether additional interviews were conducted to confirm saturation. It would also strengthen methodological transparency to report the range, mean, or median interview duration, the setting or modality of interviews, the period during which interviews were conducted, and whether transcripts were returned to participants for verification.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the new document.

## 2. Revised



IJIMOB
E-ISSN: 3041-8992

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



IJIMOB
E-ISSN: 3041-8992