

Peer Review

Review of: "Reimagining Research Gaps"

Vassiliki Grougiou¹

1. University of Macedonia, Greece

The manuscript presents an overview of existing classifications and then offers a simplified reconfiguration without engaging in sufficient theoretical depth or critical analysis that would justify publication in a peer-reviewed venue at this stage.

Originality and Contribution:

The manuscript aims to contribute to ongoing conversations about how researchers define and approach research gaps. While the topic is undoubtedly valuable, the novelty of the proposed reclassification is limited. Merging overlapping categories and adding a new one (geographical) is not a particularly innovative scholarly act unless it is supported by either a robust conceptual framework or empirical evidence demonstrating why this reframing is necessary or more effective.

For the manuscript to stand out, it would need to engage more rigorously with existing debates in research methodology, offer critical insights that challenge dominant models, or demonstrate the applicability of the new framework through illustrative cases or data.

Structure and Clarity:

While the structure is well-organised, several sections feel redundant. The first few pages repeat similar information about overlapping research gap classifications without delving deeper into why those overlaps matter in practice or theory. The figures could benefit from more explicit labelling and explanatory detail.

The conclusion recapitulates earlier points without offering substantial new insights or practical directions for implementation.

Strengthen Theoretical Grounding:

Consider engaging more directly with foundational literature on knowledge production, research epistemology, and methodological design. Referencing broader theoretical discussions (e.g., critical

realism, constructivist epistemology) could deepen the paper's conceptual base.

Empirical or Illustrative Anchoring:

Including one or two brief illustrative cases could demonstrate how the proposed taxonomy functions in practice.

Clarify Audience and Purpose:

Is this framework meant to guide PhD students, interdisciplinary research centres, or policy-making bodies? Clarifying this will help sharpen the positioning of your research.

Reduce Redundancy:

Several segments reiterate the same critiques of overlap (especially regarding empirical/evidence and knowledge/practical knowledge) without adding new layers of analysis. Streamlining this could improve the manuscript's focus.

Declarations

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.