

## **OPEN PEER REVIEW**

# Validation Model of Water Crisis Management Policy in Iran

Seyed Hasan. Mahdavifar<sup>1</sup>, Baharak. Shirzad Kebria<sup>2\*</sup>, Fateme. Hamidifar<sup>2</sup>, Abbas. Khorshidi<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> PhD student, Department of Educational Management and Higher Education, Central Tehran Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran

<sup>2</sup> Associate Professor, Department of Educational Management and Higher Education, Central Tehran Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran

<sup>3</sup> Professor, Department of Educational Management, Islamshahr Branch, Islamic Azad University, Islamshahr, Iran

#### \* Corresponding author email address: bsherzad86@yahoo.com

Received: 2024-02-13	Revised: 2024-03-22	Accepted: 2024-03-27	<b>Published:</b> 2024-04-01
EDITOR:			
Yuyu Zheng🕩			
School of International Relations, University of St Andrews, St Andrews, London, United Kingdom			
yuyuzheng@gmail.com			
REVIEWER 1:			
Shehzad Raj <sup>®</sup>			
School of Law, Universiti Geomatika Malaysia, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia			
shehzadraj@geomatika.edu.my			
REVIEWER 2:			
Pinar Reisoğlu <sup>(1)</sup>			
Faculty of Social Sciences, Recep Tayyip Erdogan University, Rize, Turkey pinarreisoglu@erdogan.edu.tr			

## 1. Round 1

#### 1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

The sentence "This approach, however, has led to significant challenges, particularly when the knowledge driving these decisions is based on imported models that may not be well-calibrated to local conditions." could benefit from further explanation. Please elaborate on what specific challenges have arisen due to reliance on imported models, providing examples or referencing relevant studies.

The introduction would benefit from a more explicit statement of the research questions or hypotheses. Consider adding a sentence or two at the end of the introduction to clearly outline the specific questions this study seeks to answer.

The choice of a "quantitative descriptive cross-sectional survey design" is appropriate, but the rationale for choosing this design over others is not sufficiently discussed. Please expand on why this design was the most suitable for the study's objectives, particularly in the context of the complexity of water crisis management.

In the findings section, while the relationships between constructs are well-explained, the discussion of the implications of these relationships could be more detailed. For example, the interpretation of the path coefficient between strategies and outcomes ( $\beta = 0.947$ ) could benefit from a discussion of what this strong relationship implies for policy interventions.

The discussion on "contextual factors" influencing strategies ( $\beta = 0.879$ ) is insightful but could be enhanced by providing specific examples of these factors from the Iranian context. How do these factors manifest in practical terms, and what are their implications for policy?

The phrase "Intervening conditions, while generally positive, presented a nuanced effect on strategies" is somewhat vague. Consider specifying what is meant by "nuanced" effects—are there instances where intervening conditions negatively impacted strategies, and if so, what were these?

The discussion could be improved by linking the need for strategies to be "closely aligned with the central issues of the water crisis" with specific examples from the study or literature. What specific strategies could be more closely aligned with these issues?

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

## 1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

ISSL

The claim that "Evidence suggests that this inability is not due to a lack of awareness" could be strengthened by citing specific evidence or studies that support this statement. Consider referencing specific reports or historical analyses that document awareness among Iranian policymakers.

The sentence "This sample size was deemed sufficient to ensure the reliability and validity of the study's findings" needs justification. Please provide more detail on how the sufficiency of the sample size was determined beyond referencing the Morgan table, perhaps by discussing power analysis or the representativeness of the sample.

The description of the questionnaire development process is thorough, but the validation process could be expanded. Specifically, how was the factor analysis conducted, and what were the criteria for retaining items? Including details about the eigenvalues or the percentage of variance explained would strengthen this section.

It is stated that "Confidentiality and anonymity were emphasized to encourage honest and accurate responses." Consider elaborating on the specific steps taken to ensure confidentiality and anonymity, such as how data was stored or how identifiers were handled.

The path coefficients and significance levels presented are critical to the study's conclusions. However, the table could be enhanced by including confidence intervals for the path coefficients, which would provide a clearer sense of the precision of these estimates.

While the conclusion effectively summarizes the study, the policy recommendations could be more actionable. Consider specifying what specific steps policymakers should take based on the findings, rather than general statements about the need for holistic approaches.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

## 2. Revised

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

