

Peer Review

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

Sevias Guvuriro¹

1. University of the Free State, Bloemfontein, South Africa

Qeios manuscript review

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

This manuscript explores the relationship between universalism and innovation, employing data collected across different countries. Specifically, the authors use data collected by the Gallup World Poll 2020 and provided by Cappelen et al. (2022). The manuscript provides a short but strong introduction that touches on the importance of innovative capacity to a country's economic development and then the importance of institutional, cultural, and moral factors, specifically focusing on how individuals treat ingroup versus outgroup members. The second-to-last paragraph in the introduction highlights that national cultures differ and this may lead to accusations against different cultures in intercultural cooperation. This is important. The main concern I have is that the authors then just state the aim of the paper "examining the effects of universalism of a country in the national capacity to innovate" without giving strong justification for their research idea. I think the introduction may benefit from a revision that identifies the research idea, develops it in line with the key concepts provided already, and then clearly opens the gap that then leads to the aim.

The last paragraph of the introduction intends to signpost the reader, and that is a good thing. However, the authors speak of chapters instead of sections, and they do not indicate to the reader what all the sections in the manuscript are. I was wondering whether the manuscript has or does not have results and

discussion sections. I only saw that when I got to those sections, and yet this signposting paragraph jumps from methods to conclusion.

I enjoyed reading the section on universalism that takes the reader to the genesis of the concept. Perhaps the authors have to end the section by contextualising it to their situation/manuscript/project specifically.

The section on universalism in cultural theories is also interesting to read. However, other than Schwartz's cultural model, I do not seem to see other specific cultural theories.

There is a strong point made by the authors that "Innovations are usually characterised by properties such as complexity and uncertainty which result from the central criterium of novelty. Therefore," This point is very important, and I commend them for that.

The research method section seems to give high-level information without providing specific regression functions, for example. Perhaps that is for brevity, but the reader may want to see even the control variables, if any.

In the discussion of the results, the authors cited Enke et al. arguing that universalism has a negative consequence on social networks. This may need further clarity and support.

Minor comment: Where the authors use inverted commas, there seem to be cases where they are not inserted properly, e.g., in the second paragraph of the discussion of results section.

Overall, this is a very good read, and I recommend publication after the suggested corrections.

Declarations

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.