

Review of: "The Role of Think Tanks in Megatrends Analysis and Future Research"

Marco Bevolo¹

¹ World University of Design (WUD)

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

This paper has a very relevant topic at its heart, with adequate referencing to start with and a primary empirical body of insights. However, it suffers from editorial viewpoint, in terms of its articulation reading quite disorderly. As a consequence, the clarity and transparency required to structure and frame the topic seem still missing.

Practical steps to be considered by the authors:

1. divide the "Introduction" from the "Methodology" sections as these are two very distinctive chapters;
2. shift the direct quotes in "Introduction" to a later paragraph and offer your comment for each quote;
3. there is the tendency to provide insights in individual think tanks as lists of generic statements based on public information, whereas the interesting information would be how these different entities can be framed, e.g. through your Pentagon Model;
4. the Pentagon Model itself is just attached in the paper without any application or direct explanation: it seems worth to instead build your methodological framework around such tool and use it as a filter of acquired information and insights, to classify reviewed entities according to specific and actionable criteria;
5. there might be some attention to be devoted to the actual fit of investigated objects and actors with the actual definition of what think tanks are and do: for example, the APF is not a think tank and has never operated as such, therefore it is confusing to find it in the analysis flow;
6. It is totally unclear how the empirical research was conducted, how the qualitative data were analyzed, who was interviewed, and why: this is necessary information to be reported in the methodological section;
7. "Conclusions" read generic and rushed, not providing any actual answer to the research question that is intrinsically implicit in the title of the paper.

The final outcome of the review is an advise for "major revision", where the good historical and contextual information might provide the foundation for reframing and rewriting the article within a more structured framework.