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

Rodolfo Quiros[1]

1 Organization for Tropical Studies

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

In this paper, Kuhn and Margellos aim to explore the interconnection between megatrends analysis, future research, and the role of think tanks. They say that Think Tanks "are presumed to drive megatrends discourses and make significant contributions to future research and strategic foresight." However, the paper falls short on offering a more comprehensive view of the subjects and their interconnection.

If there is relatively limited academic literature reflecting on the role and challenges of think tanks, a comprehensive summary of it could be a good part of the introduction, or a section on itself, providing a strong base for a discussion and analysis of what is missing in relation to the proposed objectives of the paper.

The methodology used is not completely clear. Apparently, there are three paragraphs on this subsection, but it is not clear what was done in paragraphs 1 and 2. Especially, paragraph 2 starts saying what the rankings are based upon, but it is not clear to what rankings it is referring. Furthermore, I was expecting to read some results based on the analysis of the TTCSP data, but did not really find them. I was also expecting to read something about the rising attention to megatrends analysis and future research and, particularly, about the growing number and diversity of think tanks in various parts of the world, but this is not clear in the corresponding section of the paper.

Having a subsection in the introduction/methodology with particular definitions might be a valuable resource to understand main concepts. It is somewhat done in the paper, but appear dispersed. To understand those key concepts, information on similarities, differences, tools used, outcomes or partitioning on who uses them would enrich the definitions and contribute to the discussion the paper aims for.

Evolution denotes a set of changes that occur through time. Section three attempts to show this for megatrends, but the sequence is not in a chronological order and, when reorganized, it seems that there are gaps of time. Is it possible to know whom, when and where started using the term? Besides, do we know how a megatrend originates?

The Pentagon Model for the analysis of megatrends applied by Kuhn and Margellos in their 2022 book is an interesting approach for looking at the criteria to prioritize big trends. Repeating the criteria in the figure only shows the relation in the pentagon, but neither the text nor the figure show how they interact with the trend and among themselves. Furthermore, there are twelve megatrends identified in the mentioned book that I think are worth to highlight in the text and not as a footnote. A quick exercise to bring more information relevant to the discussion is perhaps a graph showing the weight each of the criteria may have on each of the trends. This picture will bring light to understand the influence of

the criteria and how any of the trends is skewed towards any criteria and what this means.

The trend on the increasing number of academic publications on megatrends and the organizations using foresight and scenario planning should he highlighted with more data showing this, based on the information found in the Web of Science and other current sources. In addition, some examples of this trend might be appropriate as to show tendencies and to illustrate the interests shown by the think tanks, academic and research institutions, etc. On the other hand, the differences in the increasing number of publications from 2010 to 2021 illustrated with visual aids in the text, such as a table and a graph, would be useful to understand that fact and to provide temporal perspective on the development and evolution of megatrends.

Section 4 includes a mix of definitions, evolution and descriptions of the role of the think tanks. Separating them into three subsections would make better statements of how those details describe them. Accordingly, the GGTTI of the TTCSP provides information that, with a simple analysis, can help understand the landscaping of the think thanks through time, as there is information on the geography of the think thanks and the subjects they are working on compiled for a good number of years. This is particularly important to understand differences on the interests between the developed side of the World and the Global South (provided the Global South include the rest of the world), and will help visualize the guilds of think thanks there might be.

Section 5 is longer than the rest of the previous sections in relation to the whole document. Maybe condensing each of the think thanks described by having the two-line introduction and the describing paragraphs together will enhance the flow of the information.

If this paper wants to clarify, as it is said in the introduction, it would benefit from using a few visual aids as mentioned before. An improvement on the information will be attained by including comparative or descriptive tables and graphs to illustrate the history, trends, differences and increases through several years, and showing a map to illustrate the landscaping, understood as the distribution, of the think thanks and the tendencies for megatrends in the world. Details on whether the studies are global or not, or if the subjects studied are of interest for many or just some of the actors, would capitalize on understanding the role the think thanks have on megatrends analysis.