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26-Sep-2023

Dear Orly Ganany Dagan:

I write you in regards to manuscript # SO-22-1897 entitled "Discourse between yesterday and tomorrow: New communes in twenty-first-century Israel" which you submitted to Sage Open.

While we noted some positive aspects of your article, we have chosen to reject it from Sage Open in view of the research quality concerns raised by your review team. Some of these concerns are listed at the bottom of this letter.

Thank you for considering Sage Open for the publication of your research.  I hope the outcome of this specific submission will not discourage you from the submission of future manuscripts.

Sincerely,
Sage Open Editorial Office

Article Editor's Comments to Author:

The lack of an easily identifiable contribution is the main reason for my rejection decision. Theory development needs to be strengthened. Although there were many positive points with respect to your work, I am sorry that the result is unfavourable at this time.

Reviewer(s)' Comments to Author:

Reviewer: 1

Comments to the Author
The major issue is the use of I in the research paper on pages 1, 4,8, 15,16 of 30 which should be substituted by "the researcher". Secondly, the impact of social processes and covid 19 could have been included in the findings to make the paper more meaningful.

Reviewer: 2

Comments to the Author
After carefully reading your paper, I must say that it is an excellent piece of research that uses sound theory and methodology. Creating a model based on field research concerning intentional communities is difficult. Intentional communities vary in origin, purpose, and goals globally rather than being uniform. Your findings clarify why generational effects can't erase collectivism's core—the cornerstone of intentional communities. I hope your future work goes well for you.

Reviewer: 3

Comments to the Author
Dear authors, congratulation on completing the study and manuscript. My comments are as follows:

Abstract: Overall is ok. However, the method info in this section is limited. Please consider adding one sentence about the number of respondents and study area. The main issue of this section is unclear. Why is this study needed?

Introduction: This section is clear.

Methodology: The sampling technique is not precise. I think purposive sampling is applied in this study. The protocol of the interview also is not clear. The author needs to explain the interview technique adopted in this study. Besides that, the analysis technique for the transcript is not discussed. I believe the researchers applied thematic/content analysis.

Results & Discussion: The results section is ok. The proposed model is excellence. However, it suggested that the authors validate the model.

Conclusion: Ok.

Reviewer: 4

Comments to the Author
\* There are critical comments, and they are the following:
1/ An abstract must be rewritten, and the author should mention the main points of each abstract, including the main objective of the study, the statement of the problem, if any, the methodology, the main results, and the main recommendations based on the main results.
2/The introductory section is too long, running about five pages. It should be short and focused, emphasizing the importance of the title of the paper and its justifications.
3/The Research Questions are  fine.
4/ method paper is okay
5/ The method part is good, but it should be explained how the main goals will be achieved.
6/I do not see the main objective of this study, I think it is a very important part of the work, because it would drown the paper outline.
7/ In terms of methodology, the researcher stated that the total number of respondents was 28 out of a total of 64 members, but he did not specify the instruments he relied on for data collection: questionnaire, focus group,...... etc.
8/ References must contain valid DOIs. As soon as possible, or when the site likes the references.
9/ The paper should provide a creative, balanced, and carefully considered thesis.
10/ The paper should provide quality research design, data statistics, and data collection as well. I think the clarity of the data analyses, techniques used, novelty, methodology, and research questions are not sufficient.
11. The conclusion part, the added value to the study, the implication of the results, and the main recommendations are not incorporated inside the paper.