

Definition, Classification, and Characteristics of Indicator Systems: A Systematic Review

Sepehr. Rahimian¹, Keyvan. Salehi^{2*}

¹ PhD Candidates in Psychology, University of Tehran, Tehran, Iran

² Associate Professor, Faculty of Psychology and Educational Sciences, University of Tehran, Tehran, Iran

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

E d i t o r	R e v i e w e r s
Mohammed Abdul Imran Khan Department of Financial Management and Economics, Dhofar University, Oman mimran@du.edu.om	Reviewer 1: Manijeh Haghighinasab Assistant Professor, Department of Management, Alzahra University, Tehran, Iran Email: haghighinasab@srbiau.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:

The opening sentence is strong but general. Consider providing a concrete example (e.g., OECD performance frameworks) to anchor the reader.

The statement mixes descriptive and prescriptive roles of indicators but lacks a reference to contested debates. Including contrasting views (e.g., critiques of over-reliance on indicators) would balance the discussion.

The inclusion/exclusion criteria are quite restrictive (e.g., “only open-access and freely available documents”). This may introduce bias, which should be acknowledged in the limitations.

This is a critical insight. However, it could be strengthened by discussing why researchers neglect definitions (e.g., pragmatic focus, policy-driven pressures).

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the new document.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

The paragraph effectively lists challenges but could be more structured. Consider categorizing them into methodological, conceptual, and contextual challenges for clearer reader orientation.

This paragraph would be stronger if it explicitly stated the research gap. At present, it describes the aim but not why existing reviews are insufficient.

The claim of “paradigm shift” is strong. Provide empirical evidence (e.g., citation trends, policy adoption) to substantiate this statement.

The paper highlights Delphi and MICMAC methods but does not explain how these methods ensure validity. Adding a short explanation or example would improve methodological transparency.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the new document.

2. Revised

Editor’s decision after revisions: Accepted.

Editor in Chief’s decision: Accepted.