Qeios

Peer Review

Review of: "Universalism and Innovation: The Influence of Impartiality and Inclusiveness on National Innovativeness"

Xueyan Zhang[1]

1. School of Business Administration, Henan University of Economics and Law, Zhengzhou, Henan, Nanjing University of Finance and Economics, Nanjing, China

This paper explores the relationship between the cultural dimension of "Universalism" and national innovativeness, demonstrating strong theoretical significance and practical relevance. By integrating philosophical traditions, cultural theories, and empirical data, the study attempts to reveal the potential impact of universalism on innovation from multiple perspectives, exhibiting a valuable interdisciplinary approach. The overall structure is clear, and the logical reasoning is generally rigorous. However, several aspects require further revision and improvement.

1. Theoretical Contribution

The paper tests three different measurements of universalism but does not clearly answer the core question: which conceptualization of universalism better explains cross-national differences in innovative capacity? A more explicit comparative discussion would strengthen the theoretical contribution.

2. Research Sample

The author candidly acknowledges that the sample predominantly consists of developed countries, which may introduce selection bias. It is recommended that the conclusion section further elaborate on the implications of this limitation for future research, suggesting that subsequent studies expand the scope to include developing countries or conduct cross-regional comparisons.

3. Research Methodology

The analysis relies primarily on correlation methods and does not control for other variables that may

doi.org/10.32388/5M3CVY

influence national innovativeness. Future versions of the study should incorporate multiple regression analysis to control for relevant confounding factors and enhance the robustness of causal inferences.

4. Depth of Discussion

The discussion introduces the concepts of "social capital" and "moral capital," yet the relationship between these two constructs and their joint mechanisms in fostering innovation remains insufficiently articulated. A clearer conceptual model or explanatory framework would improve clarity.

5. Insufficient Explanation of Null Findings for Enke's Indicator

The universalism indicator developed by Enke et al. does not significantly predict national innovativeness. Although the author provides a brief explanation (e.g., referencing the "zero-sum structure of trust"), the discussion feels somewhat cursory. Further exploration of potential nonlinear relationships or mediating mechanisms involving this indicator is encouraged.

6. Language and Formatting Issues

The manuscript contains minor typographical errors and formatting inconsistencies (e.g., duplicate reference numbers, inconsistent use of italics). Some passages exhibit slightly awkward English expressions and would benefit from language polishing to enhance readability. Additionally, figure numbering and in-text citations (e.g., "Figure 1") should be standardized and explicitly referenced in the text.

Declarations

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.