

Review of: "The antithetical relationship of Entrepreneurship and Corruption on Radicalization among the Moroccan Youths: An Empirical study"

Miguel Ángel Montañés-Del-Río¹

¹ Universidad de Cádiz

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

In the abstract, I find a concise reference to the statistical methodology used for result extraction missing, as well as more information about the sample characteristics (age, education, collection period, valid response count, etc.).

In the article introduction, the following statement is made: 'Entrepreneurship in economic development and inequality remains a relatively under-researched phenomenon,' citing an author from 2005. Using this citation to make an assertion seems excessively outdated and, aside from risking categorical claims, is supported by only a few authors' assertions made over 18 years ago. Enumerating the works that have addressed this phenomenon since 2005 would be overly detailed.

Given this, I am particularly struck, within the introductory section, by the distant bibliographic references used to support the research question posed in that section. In the introduction, authors are quoted who have addressed the issue of key actions undertaken by entrepreneurs. While accurate, this seems unrelated to the assertion that most of these authors (as referred to in the second paragraph of the aforementioned introduction as '[...] most of the above contributors [...] have not covered the research linking business with corruption, terrorism, and radicalization. To my understanding, there is no fault on the part of these authors because they precisely do not address this matter. Therefore, they cannot be presented as examples of authors not addressing a subject that the authors of this paper do address.

Continuing the argument, I believe that to assert that there is no previous literature regarding the establishment of companies, corruption, radicalization, and terrorism, a prior systematic literature review should have been conducted, which incidentally is not referred to at all in this paper.

Consequently, in light of what has been presented so far, the wording of the research question to be addressed is not clear.

In the Literature Review section, there is a serious error in citing the following work: Douglass North (2005) and Baumol. Firstly, Douglass does not appear as an author in the list of references for this article, so the three names indicated here seem to suggest that these names should be co-authors of a single work, perhaps from the year 2005. However, returning to the list of references, there is no mention of such a work.

Devoting only one section to discussing entrepreneurship in Morocco should have entailed more effort on the part of the

authors of this article. The subsequent section, Section 6, concerning corruption and patronage in that country, does not explain why it has greater length.

The title given to Section 7 is not appropriate for a rigorous research article, as there is no need to specify within the title what will be read about the followed methodology.

Regarding the methodology, the rationale for the chosen questionnaire type is not justified, nor is the existence of any previous questionnaire that could have been used as a basis for its construction. In this same section, it is not clear how mentioning the attire of the pollsters contributes to the study.

It is only upon reading the methodology section that I am surprised to begin understanding why I found the literature cited in this article outdated. The questionnaires were collected between 2015 and 2016. Thus, this is the reason for the reviewer's comment concerning the necessity of including the survey dates in the abstract, to avoid confusion. However, considering this, it is not explained how this article incorporates citations from works in 2018, 2019, or 2020, making it seem as if the work had been neglected for four years (counted from the survey completion date) to incorporate more recent works.

In the methodology, on the other hand, it is not indicated why analysis of variance and binary logistic regression were employed.