

Peer Review

Review of: "Strategic Synergies: The Untold Interactions Between Global Competitiveness and Logistics Performance in Sub-Saharan Africa"

Pei-Chun Lin¹

1. National Cheng Kung University, Tainan, Taiwan

The sentence "Giving credence to each of the 12 pillars opens up a discussion as to whether the pillars of GCI in the sub-Saharan region are connected" lacks clarity due to its ambiguous structure and imprecise phrasing. Firstly, the expression "giving credence" is vague in this context—does it imply empirical validation, theoretical acceptance, or policy prioritization? Secondly, the referent of "each of the 12 pillars" is unclear, particularly given the sudden shift to "the pillars of GCI in the sub-Saharan region," which may or may not refer to the same set. The causal link implied by "opens up a discussion" is also imprecise; it is unclear how acknowledging these pillars logically leads to questioning their interconnectivity. The sentence would benefit from greater specificity regarding the subject matter, the logical relationship between the concepts, and the intended scope of inquiry.

Initially, it asserts that the Global Competitiveness Index (GCI) is based on **12 pillars**, yet it subsequently emphasizes only **four pillars** under the category of "basic prerequisites," without clearly explaining the shift in analytical focus.

The discussion suffers from a notable inconsistency that compromises its overall coherence. While the theoretical framing initially delineates the structure of the Global Competitiveness Index (GCI) through three sub-indexes and their respective constituent pillars, the subsequent empirical narrative reverts to treating all **12 pillars** as equally relevant analytical units. This shift, however, is not sufficiently contextualized or justified. The lack of clarity regarding whether the analysis prioritizes the sub-index framework or treats the 12 pillars in isolation weakens the conceptual integrity of the study. Such inconsistency in the empirical focus undermines the internal alignment between the theoretical model

and the methodological execution, ultimately reducing the persuasiveness of the argument. For a more rigorous and methodologically sound approach, it is essential to maintain consistency in how the pillars are conceptualized and operationalized across the text.

2.1. Empirical Data

While the passage outlines the temporal scope and structure of the data—drawing on GCI and LPI indicators for the years 2007, 2010, 2012, 2014, 2016, and 2018—it fails to specify the actual number of observations used in the empirical analysis. This omission presents a significant limitation, as it leaves the reader unable to assess the robustness, representativeness, or generalizability of the findings.

A significant limitation of the study lies in its insufficient engagement with relevant theoretical frameworks. While the empirical analysis seeks to explore the relationship between the pillars of the Global Competitiveness Index (GCI) and logistics performance, the study lacks a clear articulation of the theoretical rationale that underpins this relationship. The absence of a guiding theory—whether from institutional economics, development theory, competitiveness literature, or logistics systems theory—renders the analytical framework largely descriptive and empirically driven. Without a robust theoretical foundation, the study is limited in its ability to explain *why* or *how* the selected variables are expected to interact, reducing the depth of interpretation and the broader relevance of the findings. A theoretically informed approach would not only strengthen the conceptual coherence of the study but also enhance its contribution to the scholarly discourse by situating it within established or emerging academic debates.

Declarations

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.