



Peer Review Report


PEER REVIEW REPORT FOR:

Melo, N. C. M., & Dourado, D. C. P. (2022). Clues for the paradigmatic development of online qualitative methods. *Revista de Administração Contemporânea*, 26(4), e210015. <https://doi.org/10.1590/1982-7849rac2022210015.en>

HOW TO CITE THIS PEER REVIEW REPORT:

Melo, N. C. M., Dourado, D. C. P., & Marzionna, P. (2022). Peer review report for: Clues for the paradigmatic development of online qualitative methods. RAC. *Revista de Administração Contemporânea*. *Zenodo*. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.5825332>

REVIEWERS:

-  Paulo Marzionna (Fundação Getulio Vargas, EAESP, Brazil)
And one anonymous reviewer.

ROUND 1

Reviewer 1 report

Reviewer 1 for this round chose not to disclose his/her review report.

Authors' Responses

Dear Editors,

We appreciate your comments on our manuscript. We considered each one carefully and incorporated extensive changes to the paper.

Regarding the use of language, we inform that the text has been completely revised. This is evidenced by the fact that the version containing tracked changes is virtually unreadable (we submitted also a clean one, as per RAC's instructions).

You have also asked us to clarify how we got to the five topics featured in the paper and why they matter more than others. In this new

version we fully disclosed the systematic literature review in which we identified the discussed topics. We even updated the literature review during the revision process. Now the paper shows how its theses are related to previous concerns in the literature, including contemporary concerns regarding online qualitative research and the COVID-19 pandemic.

We are glad that you found our contributions relevant to RAC's special issue on qualitative research. With the incorporated revisions, we believe that these contributions are more evident and might hopefully serve our colleagues in the field.

Sincerely,

The authors.

ROUND 2

Reviewer 1 report

Reviewer: Paulo Marzionna

Date review returned: June 30, 2021

Recommendation: Minor Revision

Comments to the authors

The paper is well written and well organized.

The methodology for the systematic literature review is well explained and adequate to the goal of the paper.

Overall, this is a pleasant paper to read, with interesting insights regarding online qualitative research.

I have only three observations that might help the authors reach their goals with this paper.

1) Out of the five “clues” identified by the authors, there is one that is not as clear as the others: “Participants’ agency and power balance.” In this topic the authors bring intriguing arguments (e.g., “This would evolve into collaborative researches, in which participants become partners (Giaxoglou, 2017, p. 247) requiring scholars, professionals and lay people involved in the inquiry to be equally treated as co-researchers (Meredith, Galpin, & Robinson, 2020)”). However, those arguments are not properly developed, nor easy to understand. Using the other clues as model, I would recommend the authors to include examples to illustrate how the changes proposed to participants’ agency might actually be observed in online research.

2) Although this is not the goal of this paper, it would be important to at least cite how sampling is also transformed by online research methods. Given the increase importance of crowdsourcing using tools such as Amazon’s MTurk, those should be at least cited in the introduction. Although MTurk is more commonly used to collect quantitative data, there is room (and potential problems) for its use to conduct qualitative research as well.

3) Finally, I would suggest rethinking or at least expanding the conclusion. After the five clues are presented, it is missing an analysis on how the 5 clues combined can provide directions to online qualitative research. I would recommend using the “Concluding remarks” to actually link the five clues and provide suggestions for paths to the development of online qualitative research, instead of responding once again to older criticisms to those methods.

Additional Questions:

Does the manuscript contain new and significant information to justify publication?: Yes

Does the Abstract (Summary) clearly and accurately describe the content of the article?: Yes

Is the problem significant and concisely stated?: Yes

Are the methods described comprehensively?: Yes

Are the interpretations and conclusions justified by the results?: Yes

Is adequate reference made to other work in the field?: Yes

Is the language acceptable?: Yes

Does the article have data and / or materials that could be made publicly available by the authors?: Not applicable

Please state any conflict(s) of interest that you have in relation to the review of this paper (state “none” if this is not applicable).: None.

Rating:

Interest: 1. Excellent

Quality: 2. Good

Originality: 2. Good

Overall: 2. Good

Authors' Responses

Dear Dr. Evelyn Lanka, Dr. Sanjay Lanka, Dr. Ali Rostron, Dr. Pallavi Singh and Reviewers

We are glad to submit the revised manuscript titled “Clues for paradigmatic development of online qualitative methods” for your consideration. We appreciate your suggestions to improve our manuscript which were carefully considered. We believe that the paper gained clarity with these improvements.

The three minor revisions required in the last decision letter were addressed in this new version. As per RAC’s instructions, we present a version without tracked changes and one with tracked changes. We have also reproduced the responses below in a document called detailed responses, in order to follow RAC's instructions.

This is how we addressed each one of the minor revisions required:

- You recommended using examples to illustrate the point we make in the section named “participants’ agency and power balance”. We thank you for showing us that this point was not as clear as the others and we agree that a few examples would solve this problem. Now, the section features an example of how an online focus group might be used to foster and better capture participants’ active engagement and group interaction. We also illustrated how participants control researchers’ access to the field and also what they want to disclose. Finally, we also illustrated how participants may rise to the role of knowledge (co-)creators and how research interactions should be managed in order not to hinder participation.

- Regarding your comment on the use of crowdsourcing platforms for online qualitative research, we accepted your suggestion and adapted the introduction to accommodate for it. We agree that this is an important issue and that the use of crowdsourcing platforms (and also qualitative big data) is a topic that deserves another paper. Back to our text, it now mentions the crowdsourcing platforms in the context of discussing the different methodological worries of quantitative and qualitative research, a central point in our introduction that supports the whole paper.

- As per the conclusion, we are glad to say that we have included a whole paragraph regarding what we have called “methodological imagination”. In this paragraph we explored “how researchers’ practices would be immediately affected by the onto-epistemological shifts we propose” in the paper. That is, what can we envision in the intersection of these shifts that affect our immediate practices and that might lead to the paradigmatic development of online qualitative methods.

We are glad that you found our contributions potentially relevant to RAC’s special issue on qualitative research. With these improvements, we believe that these contributions are more evident and hopefully will serve our colleagues in the field.

Once again, thank you for your consideration of this manuscript.

Sincerely,

The authors.

ROUND 3**Reviewer 1 report**

Reviewer: Paulo Marzionna

Date review returned: August 24, 2021

Recommendation: Accept

Comments to the authors

The authors properly answered the minor revisions suggestions.

Additional Questions:

Does the manuscript contain new and significant information to justify publication?: Yes

Does the Abstract (Summary) clearly and accurately describe the content of the article?: Yes

Is the problem significant and concisely stated?: Yes

Are the methods described comprehensively?: Yes

Are the interpretations and conclusions justified by the results?: Yes

Is adequate reference made to other work in the field?: Yes

Is the language acceptable?: Yes

Does the article have data and / or materials that could be made publicly available by the authors?: Not applicable

Please state any conflict(s) of interest that you have in relation to the review of this paper (state “none” if this is not applicable).: none

Rating:

Interest: 1. Excellent

Quality: 2. Good

Originality: 2. Good

Overall: 2. Good

Disclaimer: The content of the Peer Review Report is the full copy of reviewers and authors' reports. Typing and punctuation errors are not edited. Only comments that violate the journal's ethical policies such as derogatory or defamatory comments will be edited (omitted) from the report. In these cases, it will be clearly stated that parts of the report were edited. Check [RAC's policies](#).