Round 1

Reviewer 1

Introduction:
- Author(s) need to clarify the aim and contribution of their study

Theoretical framework:
- The first and second paragraph is copy-paste from the second and third paragraph of introduction !!

Methodology:
- Research Model should be a part of theoretical framework
- How did you approach companies. Did they respond to your email immediately?
- In the abstract you highlighted the role of HR managers in data collection, in the methodology part I don’t see that!

Reviewer 2

Thank you for the opportunity to review this paper. I would like to commend you on the relevance and significance of your research paper. The study presents valuable insights. Your work has the potential to make a meaningful impact in the field. However, I have a few comments I hope will improve the quality and contribution of the paper.

1. The paper mentions the resource-based view theory, contingency theory, dynamic capabilities theory, and the upper echelon theory as the basis for investigating the effect of market and technological changes on innovation performance in nascent enterprises. This theoretical framework aligns well with the research objectives. However, it would be helpful to provide further explanation or rationale for selecting these specific theories and their particular applicability to the context of the study.

Also, while it is not inherently problematic to incorporate multiple theories in a research paper, there are certain dangers or challenges associated with doing so. In this paper, some of the challenges are:

- Lack of Focus: These multiple theories potentially dilute the theoretical focus of the paper. It becomes important to clearly articulate the inter-relationships and back-and-forth influences among these theories and how they collectively contribute to the research objectives. Without a clear and coherent integration of theories, this paper may lack a genuine theoretically unified framework and appear theoretically disjointed.

- Theoretical Inconsistencies: These theories have different assumptions, perspectives, and implications. This paper has combined these multiple theories without carefully addressing their potential conflicts or inconsistencies which seems to weaken the overall theoretical foundation of the paper. It is crucial to critically evaluate the compatibility and coherence of the selected theories and provide a cohesive theoretical framework that justifies their integration.
- **Complexity and Depth**: Incorporating multiple theories can significantly increase the complexity of the paper. Although this may not be the case in the paper, it is largely because the theories have not been properly integrated into the research's conceptualization.

- **Finally, clarity for Readers**: As a reader, I struggled to see in what bits of the relationships and conceptualization each theory fits. I imagined it would be more difficult for readers who are not familiar with all the theories involved. I suggest the authors must provide clear explanations and connections between the theories to guide readers through the paper. The presentation of the theories should be organized and structured in a way that aids comprehension and avoids confusion.

In a nutshell, to mitigate these dangers, it is essential to thoroughly justify the selection of multiple theories, demonstrate their relevance to the research problem, and provide a clear theoretical framework that integrates and aligns the theories. The paper should establish connections and synergies among the theories, while also acknowledging any tensions or conflicts. Additionally, the authors should carefully manage the depth and scope of each theory, ensuring that the paper maintains coherence, clarity, and rigor throughout.

2. While the paper mentions the theoretical foundations but lacks an in-depth and breadth of literature review that connects the concepts of market and technological changes, innovation performance, and entrepreneurial courage. It is important to provide a more comprehensive review of relevant literature to establish a strong theoretical foundation for the study. Include key studies, frameworks, and models that support the hypotheses and research objectives. Consider incorporating recent scholarly articles and empirical research to strengthen the paper's contribution to the existing body of knowledge. For example:

3. The discussion and finding section can be improved. In addition to specific implications, the findings of the study also have broader implications for understanding how entrepreneurs can respond to environmental changes. As the findings suggest, courage is an important factor that can help entrepreneurs to succeed in a changing environment. This finding has implications for research on entrepreneurship and innovation, as well as for the practice of entrepreneurship.

Here are some specific questions that could be further explored in the discussion of the implications of the findings:

- What are the specific mechanisms by which courage leads to increased innovation performance?
- How can courage be measured and developed?
- What are the challenges and opportunities for entrepreneurs, managers, and policymakers in promoting courage?

By discussing the implications of the findings in more depth, the authors can help to make their study more relevant and useful to a wider audience. They can also help to generate new ideas for research and practice.

4. As I reviewed your paper, I noticed that there are areas where the quality of English could be further improved. Clear and concise language is essential for effectively communicating your research findings to a wider audience and ensuring that your work is well-received by the academic community. Therefore, I would like to encourage you to consider seeking professional English editing and proofreading services. I genuinely believe that your research has tremendous potential, and refining the quality of your English will further amplify its impact.
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Reviewer 3
Overall, I believe it addresses a very interesting and important topic, and I appreciate the positive changes you've made to it. However, I'd like to suggest that it would be even more beneficial to your readers if you could consider adding both theoretical and practical implications to your paper. This addition would further enhance the paper's value and applicability.

Reviewer 4
* The attempt to establish theoretical connections and foundations within the abstract should be elucidated with greater clarity.

* The theoretical foundation explanations in the introduction section should be relocated to the Theoretical Framework section. I believe that providing a brief overview of the significance, necessity, and process of the study in the introduction would be more effective. This is because redundancy should be avoided between the Introduction and Theoretical Framework sections.

* The hypothesis regarding the mediating role of technological turbulence in the relationship between market turbulence and innovative performance needs to be assessed with greater precision.

* The moderating role of courage should be substantiated with illustrative case studies.

* Considering that market and technological turbulence can occur independently, I posit that separately examining the moderating effects could differentiate the study's outcomes. I believe that associating and presenting the outcomes of the variable under consideration (technological turbulence) independently from the independent variable and in relation to other variables could contribute to the study.