

Review of: "How Do Team Diversity Act to Exercise Effect on Team Performance: Looking through the Lens of Cultural Intelligence among Employees"

Laetitia Hauret

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

This article examines the link between diversity and team performance using data from an ad-hoc quantitative survey of care home employees in the UK.

Below are some comments with a view to improving the paper.

1. Some sentences are very long, which can make them difficult to read (e.g. the first 5 lines of the introduction or the second paragraph).
2. Authors should be careful about the words they use. They are studying w a simple relationship without a causal link but in different parts of the paper - summary, conclusion, etc. - words such as "impact", "inflence", "effect",, etc. are used. These terms should be changed.
3. Some references could be added to the literature review:

Wong, S.C., Selvadurai, S., Saxena, V. and Okal, M. (2017). Demographic diversity and salience of nationality on team effectiveness in information and communication technology (ICT) small and medium enterprises (SMES). *Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*, 12(2), 229-244.

Nyanachama Ayega, E. and Muathe S. (2018). Critical review of literature on cultural diversity in the work place and organizational performance: a research agenda. *Journal of Human Resource Management*, 16(1), 9-17.
4. Do the authors have other control variables in their survey to explain team performance, such as salary, remuneration method (fixed or variable), team size or personality traits?
5. In the conclusion, the authors highlight the fact that it might be useful to use supervisor rating as an explained variable, but they do not do so in their study, even though, if I have understood correctly, they would have the possibility of doing so since they survey team leaders. The authors could use supervisor rating as a robustness check.
6. Do the authors have objective and non-subjective data on the demographic composition of the team? This would make it possible to study whether the results are robust.
7. Typo: in section 3.2 in the 2nd paragraph: the number of respondents is 59.5?

