Qeios

Peer Review

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

**Stefano Poponi**[1]

1. Viterbo State University, Italy

The topic addressed is particularly interesting, as it connects social aspects, which are increasingly important today, with innovation, a well-known driver of growth for any country. However, in its current form, the manuscript requires substantial revision before it can be considered for publication. In particular, the methodology should be expanded and described in greater detail, the results should be presented more clearly and in a manner consistent with the methodological framework, and the discussion should be grounded in the actual findings, avoiding digressions that are not strictly relevant. The conclusions should summarise the main findings and the contribution of the study. Furthermore, the following points should be noted.

The introduction currently appears somewhat diffuse. It could be made clearer if sections 1 to 4 were condensed into a single paragraph, possibly structured into subsections to facilitate readability.

The introduction lacks important bibliographic references. For instance, it would be useful to indicate which studies support the claim that a country's innovative capacity constitutes a prerequisite for its development, and which works discuss the main determining factors.

Sections 2 and 3 provide an extensive overview of the terminology used, but some passages appear to deviate from the main objective of the paper, namely the analysis of the effect of a country's degree of



doi.org/10.32388/ILGD56

universalism on its national innovation capacity. It is therefore recommended to revise this section, explicitly clarifying the link between the theoretical discussion and the study's objective, or to focus more closely on topics that are strictly relevant.

The connection between the themes addressed in the introduction and the hypothesis that the degree of universalism in a society positively influences national innovativeness is not clearly and immediately evident. It is recommended to revise the introduction to explicitly clarify this link. It would also be useful to briefly mention the GII, as it is employed in the methodology.

The results are presented in a different order from that described in the methodology. To improve readability, it would be preferable to maintain the same sequence of presentation.

The Pearson correlation between Trompenaars' degree of universalism and the average GII shows a high level of significance; however, the $R^2$ value of 55% indicates that the model explains only slightly more than half of the variability of the GII. It is recommended to discuss the implications and limitations of this finding.

The results based on Schwartz's model are not entirely clear. The methodology refers to a score ranging from 0 to 4, whereas the figure reports only two values ("low" and "high"). It is necessary to provide a more precise explanation of the steps that led to the creation of the figure. Moreover, the method may be limited, as the significance of the difference in mean GII between the two groups (low and high) is not tested.

In Table 2, it would be useful to remove the values above the diagonal to avoid redundancy and facilitate readability.

The discussion contains some references that are unclear or not directly linked to the results obtained (e.g., Cappelen et al. and Deckert et al. [44]). It is recommended to better contextualise these references or, if they are not relevant, to consider removing them. In general, the discussion tends to expand into topics

beyond the empirical results; it is suggested to restructure it, starting from the findings and developing any further insights in a targeted manner.

The conclusions introduce new topics and do not sufficiently recall the main findings of the study. This section should be revised to clearly summarise the evidence emerging from the research.

## Declarations

**Potential competing interests:** No potential competing interests to declare.


doi.org/10.32388/ILGD56