


## Presenting a Model of Ambidextrous Human Resource Management in Project-Oriented Organizations

Mohammad Mahdi. Shafizadeh Beromi<sup>1</sup>, Farshad. Hajalian<sup>1\*</sup>, Majid. Jahangirfard<sup>1</sup>



<sup>1</sup> Department of Public Management, Fi.C., Islamic Azad University, Firoozkooh, Iran

\* Corresponding author email address: f.hajalian@iaufb.ac.ir

### Editor

Aliakbar Aminbeidokhti<sup>1</sup>  
Educational Administration,  
Faculty of Psychology and  
Educational Sciences, Semnan  
University, Semnan, Iran  
kafashpor@um.ac.ir

### Reviewers

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

## 1. Round 1

### 1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

“The opening sentence of the Abstract (‘This study aimed to examine the relationship between ethical climate...’) does not reflect the topic of ambidextrous HRM in project-oriented organizations described in the manuscript. Please revise the abstract to accurately present the study’s purpose, methods, sample, and results.”

“The abstract lacks quantitative indicators (e.g., key model fit statistics, major numerical findings, the strength of R<sup>2</sup> values, etc.). Please include specific numerical results to strengthen the informativeness of the abstract.”

“This is an important paragraph, but it should more clearly state what existing models fail to address specifically in project-oriented organizations (e.g., temporary structures, cross-project learning, dynamic staffing). This helps strengthen the logical justification for your model.”

“The aim is clearly stated, but consider rewriting it as a separate standalone paragraph for clarity and emphasis.”

“Please provide additional detail on the interview guide structure (e.g., number of questions, thematic domains) and coding reliability (e.g., inter-coder agreement). This strengthens the methodological transparency.”

“Although reliability metrics (CR, AVE, alpha) are presented, the manuscript does not clarify how initial item pools were developed for the researcher-made questionnaire. Please explain item generation and expert panel procedures.”

“If all variables were non-normal, please justify the use of SEM (particularly if PLS-SEM was not explicitly stated). Clarifying whether PLS-SEM or CB-SEM was used is essential given the distribution.”

“Figures 1 and 2 are referenced but not properly described. Please add full figure captions explaining what each figure represents, the threshold values, and interpretation guidance.”

“The discussion overlooks how opportunity-creating practices may differ in temporary project teams versus permanent organizational structures. Please address this contextual nuance.”

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the new document.

## 1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

“This opening paragraph provides a strong conceptual framing but lacks explicit linkage to HRM. You may enhance coherence by briefly stating how HRM specifically contributes to enabling ambidexterity.”

“Although the paragraph cites relevant literature, it would benefit from summarizing concrete mechanisms (e.g., dual-skill training, job enlargement, reward differentiation). Adding these mechanisms clarifies the HRM–ambidexterity nexus.”

“Leadership’s role is appropriately highlighted; however, the introduction would benefit from explaining how leadership is positioned relative to HRM practices in the proposed model.”

“The coverage of cultural and structural contingencies is strong, but the paragraph ends abruptly without synthesizing these factors to justify the need for a new HRM model. A final synthesizing sentence is recommended.”

“This paragraph cites relevant studies but does not explicitly compare your numerical results with those studies (e.g., effect sizes, relative magnitudes). Consider strengthening comparative analysis.”

“Please elaborate on how empowering practices interact with motivational practices in your model. Do these constructs reinforce each other? Are there complementarities?”

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the new document.

## 2. Revised

Editor’s decision after revisions: Accepted.

Editor in Chief’s decision: Accepted.