

## Review of: "Leveraging Social Network Utilization to Attain Competitive Advantage in Digital Multi-Sided Platforms"

Ted Saarikko<sup>1</sup>

1 Umea University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

I am not at all familiar with this review format, so I'm going to keep this (very) brief and just point to a few this that struck me when reading the manuscript for "Leveraging Social Network Utilization to Attain Competitive Advantage in Digital Multi-Sided Platforms".

First, the abstract does not seem to actually summarize the paper. Rather it provides a very brief introduction to the paper's area of concern (platforms) with no mention of the social networks to which most of the manuscript is dedicated. This is, of course, a minor issue that can be easily rectified.

Second, and a bit more relevant, the introduction does not seem to identify a particular problem, provide a research question, or state practical- or academic contributions. I realize that a fully developed RQ or list of contributions might be a bit optimistic for a first draft, but even a tentative statement regarding research gap or practical problem would help me as a reader see what the paper is trying to convey.

Third, section 2 covers a lot of ground relating to social network theory on multiple levels: individual, team, organization, and ecosystem. I am sure that there is much to be said regarding social networks in relation to platforms, but I struggle to see what the intended scope is for this particular paper. In the final paragraph, I read that "this research aims to measure the determinants of competitive advantage from a social network perspective within a specific digital multi-sided platform firm." Is the firm/organization the level of analysis? If so, I would suggest that this should be made clear in the introduction. Also, the focus on organizations of the unit of analysis should guide the scope of related research presented in section 2.

Finally, there is mention of a social network utilization framework towards the end of the manuscript, but I fail to see any framework in this manuscript. Again, I realize that this is an early draft, but even so – providing your reader with even a rough, explicit outline of a framework would help peers/reviewers provide better feedback on your work. As it stands, there are simply too many question marks for me to really see where this is going.

I hope my comments are of some use in your efforts to develop the paper.

Qeios ID: 3KBFOD · https://doi.org/10.32388/3KBFOD