

Review of: "Sustaining Gender Parity in Corporate Leadership Roles by Means of Random Selection"

Elmar Puntaier¹

¹ Coventry University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

This is a timely and relevant article that attempts to resolve an important societal challenge. The abstract presents the key message, but is vague in terms of findings and omits relevant methodological and theoretical aspects. Having these approaches included would make it easier for the reader to understand the rationale behind the items presented in the graphical abstract. For example, it is not entirely clear why the expectations of traditional in-group selection differ from those in a random selection scenario.

The introduction provides a good motivation and states the position the paper takes with insights into the findings. Although this article takes the format of a research note, it would still be beneficial to understand what the current state of the literature is, where the research gaps are and how this article addresses them. The motivational statement is too broad and too general and it should, for instance, be made clear which types of diversity are addressed. There is reference to surface characteristics and 'other major categories', but would that, for instance, include educational background? Hence, more clarity is desirable.

The method section draws on references that are rather dated and it contains few justifications for the variables used to construct the cost-benefit model and the rationale behind it.

The results section provides new insights and it is good to see reference to issues discussed in the literature, such as the 'glass ceiling'. The section does, however, present some aspects that would be better placed in the method section (e.g., the justification of the proposed method in paragraph 3). Paragraph 5 refers to probabilities that can be estimated and 'circumstances'. Being more specific with an evaluation of the desirable probability distribution would be beneficial.

The discussion section is engaging to read, but I would encourage more independent thought and evaluation when closing an argument. Among the discussion points are arguments that weakly relate to the aims of the article (e.g., groupthink, agency problems). Some of the arguments are underdeveloped and could be expanded (e.g., the quantification of outcomes of hiring decisions).

I would recommend opening the conclusion with a statement that reminds the reader of the aim of the article. The section introduces new aspects of diversity (e.g., credit history), which have not been discussed previously and give the impression of a superficial definition of diversity. It would make sense to reduce the argument to groups of diversity characteristics (e.g., surface characteristics) that are nonetheless comprehensive enough to give a holistic overview of the various categories. I appreciate that the model is generic, but for a scientific article readers would value such

classifications to test the model presented herein. Limitations and directions for future research are missing and the aforementioned point could be integrated.

Overall, the article puts forward an interesting approach to achieve more diversity in corporate boards. Some of the sections could be expanded further and streamlining the arguments to align them with the scope of the article is recommended.