

# Developing a Knowledge Management Model for Intergenerational Entrepreneurs in Science and Technology Parks

Ali. Bakhti Arani<sup>1</sup>, Parvaneh. Gelard<sup>2</sup>, Mojtaba. Rafiei<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Department of Public Administration, K.I.C., Islamic Azad University, Kish, Iran

<sup>2</sup> Department of Public Administration, NT.C., Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran

<sup>3</sup> Department of Public Administration, Payame Noor University (PNU), Tehran, Iran

\* Corresponding author email address: p\_gelard@iau.ac.ir

| E d i t o r                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                            | R e v i e w e r s                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                            |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Azar Kafashpoor <br>Professor, Department of<br>Educational Management and<br>Human Resource Development,<br>Ferdowsi University of Mashhad,<br>Mashhad, Iran<br>kafashpor@um.ac.ir | <b>Reviewer 1:</b> Abbas Monavarian <br>Professor, Management Department, Tehran University, Tehran, Iran.<br>Email: amonavar@ut.ac.ir<br><b>Reviewer 2:</b> Rezvan Hosseingholizadeh <br>Associate Professor, Department of Educational Management and Human Resource<br>Development, Ferdowsi University of Mashhad, Mashhad, Iran. Email:<br>rhgholizadeh@um.ac.ir |

## 1. Round 1

### 1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

In the Introduction, the statement that “One increasingly important characteristic of contemporary knowledge ecosystems is generational diversity” provides an appropriate transition to the focal issue, but the theoretical basis for distinguishing generations remains underdeveloped. The manuscript should specify whether generational differences are conceptualized through chronological age, career stage, organizational tenure, sociocultural cohort membership, or technology-related experience. These dimensions should not be treated as interchangeable. Because the findings later attribute “technological agility” to younger generations and “managerial experience” to older generations, the authors should explicitly discuss the risk of generational stereotyping and explain how these categories were analytically derived rather than assumed a priori.

The paragraph beginning with “The strategic relevance of knowledge management becomes particularly evident in entrepreneurship” presents a strong general rationale, but the manuscript needs a more explicit theoretical bridge between

conventional knowledge management and entrepreneurial knowledge management. The authors should clarify which knowledge-management processes are most relevant to entrepreneurial contexts—for example, knowledge creation, acquisition, sharing, storage, application, retention, and recombination—and explain how these processes differ in entrepreneurial ecosystems characterized by uncertainty, experimentation, rapid technological change, and interorganizational collaboration. This would strengthen the conceptual foundation of the study and provide a clearer basis for interpreting the eight themes identified later.

In the analytical procedure, the manuscript states that “basic codes were classified according to their conceptual similarity and relatedness into constituent codes and organizing themes, and overarching themes were ultimately identified.” This coding hierarchy requires conceptual clarification. The current terminology appears to combine several thematic-analysis traditions, particularly “basic,” “organizing,” and “global” themes, while also introducing “constituent codes.” The authors should identify the specific thematic-analysis framework that guided the procedure and apply its terminology consistently. They should also explain how initial codes were generated, how codes were merged or separated, how themes were reviewed, how theme boundaries were established, and whether analysis was primarily inductive, deductive, or hybrid.

The Methods section states that “To enhance the credibility of the findings, purposive selection of experts with relevant expertise and experience, diversity of participants’ perspectives, complete transcription of the interviews, systematic data analysis, and continued data collection until theoretical saturation was achieved were employed.” This paragraph conflates general procedural rigor with specific criteria for qualitative trustworthiness. The authors should organize methodological rigor according to established dimensions such as credibility, dependability, confirmability, and transferability. For instance, they should report whether member checking, peer debriefing, analyst triangulation, audit trails, reflexive notes, negative-case analysis, or external review of coding was performed. If these procedures were not used, this should be acknowledged rather than implying that participant expertise and verbatim transcription alone establish credibility.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the new document.

## 1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

The Introduction states that “Science and technology parks therefore constitute knowledge ecosystems in which competitive advantage is generated not only through the possession of specialized knowledge but through the capacity to exchange, integrate, and renew knowledge across organizational and generational boundaries.” This is a critical proposition, but it requires stronger contextualization specifically for science and technology parks. The authors should explain the institutional characteristics that distinguish these environments from ordinary firms, incubators, universities, and industrial clusters. Particular attention should be given to the coexistence of startups, mature technology firms, universities, mentors, investors, support institutions, and policy actors, because these characteristics appear to underpin the proposed ecosystem-level model but are not sufficiently established before the empirical analysis.

In the Methods section, the manuscript reports that “The participant population consisted of experts and scholars in the fields of knowledge management, entrepreneurship, innovation, science and technology parks, and knowledge-based companies.” This description is broad and should be supplemented with explicit inclusion and exclusion criteria. The authors should report the minimum required years of professional experience, whether direct experience with intergenerational knowledge transfer was mandatory, whether participants needed current or previous employment in a science and technology park, and how expertise was verified. Since several participants had different primary areas of specialization, the manuscript should also clarify how the research team ensured that all interviewees possessed sufficient knowledge of the focal phenomenon rather than merely adjacent expertise.

The sentence “Participants were selected purposively based on their academic expertise and executive experience relevant to the research topic” should be methodologically elaborated. The authors need to identify the exact purposive sampling strategy used—for example, criterion sampling, maximum-variation sampling, expert sampling, or a combination of these approaches.

The demographic profile suggests considerable heterogeneity in role, educational background, scientific publication history, and years of experience, which may indicate maximum-variation sampling, but this is not explicitly stated. Clarifying the sampling logic would improve methodological transparency and demonstrate how participant diversity contributed to the breadth and credibility of the thematic findings.

The manuscript states that “The interview process continued until theoretical saturation was reached (16 participants), defined as the point at which no new and meaningful codes or concepts emerged.” Because the study uses thematic analysis rather than grounded theory, the terminology “theoretical saturation” requires reconsideration or justification. “Data saturation,” “code saturation,” or “meaning saturation” may be more methodologically appropriate unless the authors explicitly adopted a theory-building form of thematic analysis with theoretical sampling. The manuscript should also explain how saturation was assessed, after which interview no substantially new codes emerged, whether additional interviews were conducted to confirm saturation, and whether saturation was documented through a coding matrix or saturation table.

The description “Data were collected through in-depth semi-structured interviews conducted both face-to-face and online” is incomplete from the perspective of qualitative methodological reproducibility. The manuscript should provide the main interview questions or at least the principal domains covered by the interview guide. It should also explain whether the same interview protocol was used across face-to-face and online interviews, whether pilot interviews were conducted, how probes were used, whether interviews were audio-recorded, and who conducted them. Because the study addresses potentially sensitive issues such as generational conflict, knowledge hiding, competition, and resistance to change, the authors should also describe how interviewer neutrality and participant openness were facilitated.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the new document.

## 2. Revised

Editor’s decision after revisions: Accepted.

Editor in Chief’s decision: Accepted.