

## PEER REVIEW REPORTS

### CONTENTS

#### Category status and its relational market ordering mechanisms.

Weber, T. B. B., Godri, L., Maciel, C. de O. Category status and its relational market ordering mechanisms. *RAE-Revista de Administração de Empresas*, 63(5), e2022-0224. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/S0034-759020230501>

To read the peer review report, click [here](#)

#### Diversity and inclusion programs in multinationals: Opportunity for reverse knowledge transfer.

Fonseca, L., Kogut, C. S. Diversity and inclusion programs in multinationals: Opportunity for reverse knowledge transfer. *RAE-Revista de Administração de Empresas*, 63(5), e2022-0007. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/S0034-759020230503>

To read the peer review report, click [here](#)

#### Requirements of collaborative and transformational leadership in digital ecosystems: Techno-orchestrating leaders in a VUCA world.

Begeç, S., Akyuz, G. A. Requirements of collaborative and transformational leadership in digital ecosystems: Techno-orchestrating leaders in a VUCA world. *RAE-Revista de Administração de Empresas*, 63(5), e2022-0155. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/S0034-759020230505>

To read the peer review report, click [here](#)

#### Non-frontline employees' emotional behavior during crises: A comparison between essential and non-essential industries.

Osorio, M. L., Madero, S., Castillo, E. del. Non-frontline employees' emotional behavior during crises: A comparison between essential and non-essential industries. *RAE-Revista de Administração de Empresas*, 63(5), e2022-0395. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/S0034-759020230506>

To read the peer review report, click [here](#)

## PEER REVIEW REPORT

### Peer review report for:

Weber, T. B. B., Godri, L., Maciel, C. de O. Category status and its relational market ordering mechanisms. *RAE-Revista de Administração de Empresas*, 63(5). e2022-0224. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/S0034-759020230501>

**Disclaimer:** The content of the Peer Review Report is the full copy of reviewers and authors' reports. Typing and punctuation errors are not edited.

### Reviewer:

Francisco Giovanni David Vieira , Departamento de Administração, Universidade Estadual de Maringá, Maringá, PR, Brazil

One of the reviewers did not authorize the disclosure of their identity and peer review report.

## ROUND 1

### Reviewer 1 Report

Reviewer 1 did not authorize the disclosure of his/her identity and peer review report.

### Reviewer 2 Report

**Reviewer:** Francisco Giovanni David Vieira

**Date review returned:** 19-Sep-2022

**Recomendation:** Minor revision

Please state any conflict(s) of interest that you have in relation to the review of this paper (state “none” if this is not applicable).

none

### Comments to the Author

*First of all, thank you for the opportunity of reading the manuscript. It addresses an important topic in market studies. The authors are to be congratulated for the way they conducted the study and I believe they managed to advance in the understanding of status and social order in markets. Despite these considerations, there are a few aspects that can, and should, be improved in the manuscript. They are listed below, as follows.*

- 1. explain more clearly and consistently the concept of peer producers used by White (2000). This concept is fundamental to understanding the process of deference in relation to status positions;*
- 2. the manuscript assumes that “the literature neglects the possibility of significant variations in showing deference”. However, the literature review presented in the manuscript does not include recent productions. The most recent reference used in the manuscript was published in 2018. Would it be possible to complement this review, in order to give more theoretical consistency to the manuscript?*

3. *explain more clearly and, above all, consistently, how the idea of mezzo mechanisms is made explicit or constituted. Furthermore, how do they differ from what is presented by Rivera, Soderstrom and Uzzi (2010) in their article?*
4. *the data collection process, as well as the description of the participants in the study, are not completely clear. It requires a little care in reading to understand who and how many market actors participated in the study. Is it possible to make the text clearer, more objective and direct?*
5. *the conclusions basically repeat what has been presented before in the manuscript. They should highlight, above all, observations about status and social order in markets, and their implications from a theoretical point of view;*
6. *last, but not least, it is noteworthy that the manuscript does not contain any academic production published in a Brazilian journal. Following the example of the authors of the manuscript, it is possible to consider that in the near future, and once the manuscript is published by RAE, it will be completely ignored by Brazilian academics that study markets and will not receive any citation!*

## ROUND 2

### Reviewer 1 Report

Reviewer: Francisco Giovanni David Vieira

Date review returned: 24-Nov-2022

Recommendation: Accept

Please state any conflict(s) of interest that you have in relation to the review of this paper (state “none” if this is not applicable).

Nenhum

### Comments to the Author

*As sugestões feitas foram seguidas/adotadas, bem como os ajustes indicados no primeiro round, com o propósito de aperfeiçoar o manuscrito, foram realizados. Nesse sentido, não tenho nenhuma observação adicional a fazer sobre o manuscrito e recomendo a sua publicação.*

### Reviewer 2 Report

Reviewer 2 did not authorize the disclosure of his/her identity and peer review report.

## PEER REVIEW REPORT

### Peer review report for:

Fonseca, L., Kogut, C. S. Diversity and inclusion programs in multinationals: Opportunity for reverse knowledge transfer. *RAE-Revista de Administração de Empresas*, 63(5), e2022-0007. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/S0034-759020230503>

**Disclaimer:** The content of the Peer Review Report is the full copy of reviewers and authors' reports. Typing and punctuation errors are not edited.

### Reviewer:

Bruno Felix , Fucape Business School, Vitória, ES, Brazil

One of the reviewers did not authorize the disclosure of their identity and peer review report.

## ROUND 1

### Reviewer 1 Report

**Reviewer:** Bruno Felix

**Date review returned:** 13-Apr-2022

**Recomendation:** Minor revision

Please state any conflict(s) of interest that you have in relation to the review of this paper (state “none” if this is not applicable).

None.

### Comments to the Author

*Thank you for the opportunity to evaluate the article “DIVERSITY AND INCLUSION PROGRAMS AND MULTINATIONALS: OPPORTUNITY FOR REVERSE KNOWLEDGE TRANSFER” for publication in the RAE. This is a qualitative study carried out with the objective of understanding how MNCs manage and transfer their diversity and inclusion (D&I) programs between units, identifying the transfer strategy chosen by the headquarters, the subsidiaries' motivation to internalize these practices, and addressing a subject that has been little discussed in the D&I literature so far: reverse knowledge transfer (CRT). The article, therefore, discusses a current and extremely important topic for the Diversity and International Human Resources Management literature. The introduction is clear in pointing out a research gap and the objective fills that gap. The presented propositions are relevant to the theory of International Human Resource Management and the article presents theoretical contributions. Next, I present feedbacks with the objective of indicating development points for the article, always in a constructive tone. The research was well performed and the results are interesting, so my comments are more related to some improvements that can be made for better selling the idea specially in the abstract and in the introduction. To facilitate communication, I divided the comments in major and minor issues.*

### Major issues

*In the abstract and in the introduction, the article suggests that the most relevant theorization presented is that, among the models explored, “the transnational approach may present higher chances of promoting RKT”. What is new or counterintuitive in this argument? I suggest better exploring in the introduction this tension between common sense/previous studies vs study findings in order to better sell the relevance of this paper. I suggest reading the following article so that the presentation of the theorizing made in this article is more attractive.*

Grant, A. M., & Pollock, T. G. (2011). Publishing in AMJ—Part 3: Setting the hook. *Academy of management journal*, 54(5), 873-879.

### Minor issues

- *Attractiveness of the abstract. The abstract could be more engaging, by presenting the reader with results that encourage the reading of the article as a whole. The phrase “Case findings highlight the importance of the host country context of subsidiaries and their motivations for successful international management of D&I practices and provide empirical evidence on the available transfer strategies, emphasizing that the transnational approach may present higher chances of promoting RKT”, the only part of the abstract to present results, it is not very elucidative in terms of the findings that were found. I suggest the authors to better explore this important result in the abstract. I know this is not an easy task, to space limitations, but I think that this abstract can be more catchy.*
- *In the abstract, the objective of the study is presented as to “understand how MNEs manage and transfer their diversity and inclusion (D&I) programs amongst units, identifying the transfer strategies chosen by headquarters, subsidiaries’ motivation to internalize such practices, and addressing an issue little discussed in the D&I literature to date: the reverse transfer of knowledge (RTK)”. I suggest that this same sentence is presented in the introduction*
- *In the abstract, the acronym RTK (reverse transfer of knowledge) is displayed. However, the acronym RTK is sometimes used in the text and in other times RKT (Reverse Knowledge transfer?) is used. I recommend standardizing this acronym.*
- *In the abstract, when introducing the acronym EMN for the first time, I suggest presenting the meaning of the acronym, as was done with D&I, RTK and TRC.*
- *In the abstract, the following literature gap is presented: “Although relevant conceptual frameworks exist (e.g. Nishii & Özbilgin, 2007; Syed & Özbilgin, 2009), they were not empirically derived or tested, and they do not present nor predict differences between cases employing global, multidomestic, or transnational approaches”. It would be interesting to clarify why exploring these differences between global, multidomestic, or transnational organizations would be relevant, and not just saying that this has not been done yet.*

## Reviewer 2 Report

Reviewer 2 did not authorize the disclosure of his/her identity and peer review report.

## Reviewer 3 Report

Reviewer 3 did not authorize the disclosure of his/her identity and peer review report.

## ROUND 2

### Reviewer 1 Report

Reviewer 1 did not authorize the disclosure of his/her identity and peer review report.

### Reviewer 2 Report

Reviewer 2 did not authorize the disclosure of his/her identity and peer review report.

### Reviewer 3 Report

Reviewer: Bruno Felix

Date review returned: 15-Feb-2023

Recomendation: Accept

Please state any conflict(s) of interest that you have in relation to the review of this paper (state “none” if this is not applicable).

None.

### Comments to the Author

*Parabéns pela revisão. Ao meu ver, o artigo alcançou um padrão mais elevado de qualidade e considero que está apto para ser publicado.*

## PEER REVIEW REPORT

### Peer review report for:

Begeç, S., Akyuz, G. A. Requirements of collaborative and transformational leadership in digital ecosystems: Techno-orchestrating leaders in a VUCA world. *RAE-Revista de Administração de Empresas*, 63(5), e2022-0155. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/S0034-759020230505>

**Disclaimer:** The content of the Peer Review Report is the full copy of reviewers and authors' reports. Typing and punctuation errors are not edited.

### Reviewer:

Cristiane Benedetti Chammas , Centro Universitário FEI, São Paulo, SP, Brazil.

Eduardo Guedes Villar , Instituto Federal de Santa Catarina, Florianópolis, SC, Brazil

One of the reviewers did not authorize the disclosure of their identity and peer review report.

## ROUND 1

### Reviewer 1 Report

Reviewer 1 did not authorize the disclosure of his/her identity and peer-review report.

### Reviewer 2 Report

**Reviewer:** Cristiane Benedetti Chammas

She did not authorize the disclosure of her peer-review report.

### Reviewer 3 Report

**Reviewer:** Eduardo Guedes Villar

**Date review returned:** 28-Oct-2022

**Recomendation:** Reject & Resubmit

Please state any conflict(s) of interest that you have in relation to the review of this paper (state “none” if this is not applicable).

None.

### Comments to the Author

*Thank you for the opportunity to review the manuscript “Requirements of Collaborative and Transformational Leadership in Digital Ecosystems: Techno-Orchestrating Leaders in VUCA World.” The study attempts to propose a framework for leadership in high-tech, complex, changing, and uncertain environments (VUCA World) through a comprehensive review.*

*The study is scientifically well-written and structured and has extensive and up-to-date literature. However, the paper still needs to elaborate on some key questions for publication.*

- 1. What is the goal of the paper? See that the presentation of a framework should not be the goal in itself, but the way to contribute to the achievement of a goal. It is not clear from the text what the goal of the paper is because conducting a comprehensive review is a methodological decision and presenting a framework is a form of contribution. What is the missing point here?*
- 2. Although there are two research questions in the methodology section, the introduction of the paper lacks direction. And why is a literature review the best way (or at least a good way) to answer these research questions? Since the paper presents a specific context (VUCA - technology), where will the comprehensive review help? From the introduction, I infer that the study is focused on empirical research rather than a review, so a rationale for using the method is needed.*
- 3. Given so many recent studies calling for a paradigmatic redefinition of leadership (e.g., Sergi, 2016, Carroll et al., 2018, Souza, 2021), why are transformational/collaborative leadership concepts, which still assume a voluntaristic nature of human reality, selected to be related to the VUCA context? See that, in contrast to Krauter (2020), the paper starts from the centrality of the leader to organizational performance and moves toward a prescriptive formulation of what the leader should do in the context at hand. A comprehensive review attempts to describe the studies found, and understanding them can suggest research or practice directions. However, the prescriptive nature assumed in describing the clusters is beyond the capabilities of the method used (i.e., the method is not sufficient, or at least not intended to be prescriptive).*
- 4. The comprehensive literature review as a method should be supported by an already established procedure (e.g., Onwuegbuzie, & Frels, 2016). How do the adopted procedures present themselves as a “comprehensive review”? How do authors ensure that the process they use is sufficient to write a comprehensive review? As it stands, the paper refers to itself as a “comprehensive review,” which compromises the scientific nature of the proposal.*
- 5. Some steps and pathways of the research process need more description. What are the inclusion criteria? That is, how were the search descriptors selected, and why? What exclusion criteria were adopted to move from the 587 studies (from the initial search) to the 103 studies that were actually reviewed? Why did the authors not include just definitive papers in the sample? And how were these 103 papers reviewed? In what time period, by how many reviewers, how were they categorized, and was the software used for the analysis? In short, there is a major gap in the study’s description of how it arrived at the 7 clusters, and the methodological path to get there is not clear. In other words, while the criteria for forming the clusters are mentioned (p. 5), how did the authors arrive at the themes and the characteristics that shaped them?*
- 6. The statement “Our review revealed that transformational leadership is the most cited, prominent, and appealing theory in leadership” seems obvious and biased. If the search term was “transformational leadership,” how could the result be anything other than that?*
- 7. Regarding the clustering presented, the terms Collaborative and Transformational are the keywords of the search and therefore should not be included in the clustering because, according to the procedure performed, it is the content that the comprehensive review is intended to explore in-depth, not the result itself. Furthermore, how did the authors achieve the graphical design of Figure 1? See that the description of the composition of the figure on page 12, even if logical, does not come from an inductive logic of the data itself or from theoretical support for it, but from (seemingly arbitrary) decisions by the authors. A schematic representation would need a theoretical/empirical/theoretical/empirical underpinning in its presentation*

8. *The Discussion section does not really “discuss” the paper with anyone. This would be the place to discuss the findings with other literature and highlight the theoretical and practical contribution of the study. Also, how did the term “techno-orchestration” come to be the title of the paper? How does this conception differ from others? What constitutes “techno-orchestrated” leadership? The nomenclature encourages a discussion of how the individual’s relationship to technology would be shaped (for an excellent introduction, see, e.g., Emirbayer, 1997). In other words, the authors present a nice label, but the theoretical and onto-epistemological underpinnings of the concept are not presented, lacking support.*

## References

- Carroll, B., Firth, J., Ford, J., & Taylor, S. (2018). *The social construction of leadership studies: representations of rigor and relevance in textbooks*. *Leadership*, 14(2), 159-178.
- Emirbayer, M. (1997). *Manifesto for a relational sociology*. *American journal of sociology*, 103(2), 281-317.
- Latour, B. (2007). *Reassembling the social: An introduction to actor-network-theory*. Oup Oxford.
- Onwuegbuzie, A. J., & Frels, R. (2016). *Seven steps to a comprehensive literature review: A multimodal and cultural approach*
- Sergi, V. (2016). *Who’s leading the way?: Investigating the contributions of materiality to leadership-as-practice 1*. In *Leadership-as-Practice* (pp. 110-131). Routledge.
- Souza, E. M. D. (2021). *The poststructuralist ontology on leadership: identity and materiality in evidence*. *Cadernos EBAPE. BR*, 19, 595-606.

## PEER REVIEW REPORT

### Peer review report for:

Osorio, M. L., Madero, S., Castillo, E. del. Non-frontline employees' emotional behavior during crises: A comparison between essential and non-essential industries. *RAE-Revista de Administração de Empresas*, 63(5), e2022-0395. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/S0034-759020230506>

**Disclaimer:** The content of the Peer Review Report is the full copy of reviewers and authors' reports. Typing and punctuation errors are not edited.

### Reviewer:

Bei Lyu  Panyapiwat Institute of Management, Chinese Graduate School, Thailand  
One of the reviewers did not authorize the disclosure of their identity and peer review report.

## ROUND 1

### Reviewer 1 Report

Reviewer: Bei Lyu

Date review returned: 22-Oct-2022

Recommendation: Reject & Resubmit

Please state any conflict(s) of interest that you have in relation to the review of this paper (state “none” if this is not applicable).

None.

### Comments to the Author and Edition

*Firstly, many thanks for giving me the chance to review this paper titled “NON-FRONTLINE EMPLOYEES’ EMOTIONS DURING CRISES: A COMPARISON BETWEEN ESSENTIAL AND NON-ESSENTIAL INDUSTRIES”.*

*This study identifies and provides a comparative perspective between the emotions of non-frontline employees in industries. However, the manuscript, in its present form, contains several weaknesses. Appropriate revisions to the following points should be undertaken in order to justify recommendation for publication. For readers to quickly catch your contribution, it would be better to highlight major difficulties and challenges, and your original achievements to overcome them. My major concerns are as follows:*

*The topic is important and interesting.*

*In the Abstract, generally speaking, its structure is made up of “background, purpose, method, result, conclusion, and value section”. However, it needs to add “background section” and shorten “conclusion section”, and the authors also control the number of words and there are 151 words at present.*

*In the Keywords, they are good.*

*In the Introduction, the materials of the paper on “emotions” shown should be just up-date to 2022, and the authors also can look through the recent and important paper on this topic. For emotional attachment influences on business, I also suggest whether the authors can cite the following literature or not*

DOI:10.1080/14330237.2020.1871235

*In the Literature on “Organizational Crisis”, “Emotions in the workplace”, and “Essential and Non-essential industries”, we should link to the recent and most literature, specially 2020-2022. Besides, we also pay more attention to the value and contribution of the paper. The authors should add it, use literature to develop the arguments. The literature should be updated, I also suggest that. DOI:10.1007/s12144-020-01120-5 (emotion and gratitude at work).*

DOI:10.2147/PRBM.S340209 (Occupational Wellbeing)

*In the Methodology section, the authors should describe more details about how to investigate. The authors should add more details about a qualitative content analysis performed and the selection standard to keep the effective reliability and validity. Besides, how the authors keep the effective reliability and validity of the qualitative content from Spanish transcripts into English. The author should use tables to list the contents of the three-level code representatively to let readers understand clearly and even I have seen Table 2, which is not better.*

*In the Discussion section, the authors should explain results, derive specific theoretical, practical implications, and describe limitations. So I also suggest that the authors should add more compared with the recent and important literature.*

*In the Conclusion and recommendations section, the paper should make a theoretical or practical or methodological contribution. They should be divided into two parts, I suggest that. Besides, the authors should adjust and shorten the section of “Implications for HR”.*

*In the References section, we should strictly conduct as APA style. And their DOIs should be added. Besides, it is lack of the recent and important ones, specially the year of 2020-2022. All the references should add their DOIs.*

*Therefore, based on the contribution and value of the Manuscript, I must choose “re-submission”. I also welcome to receive the revised manuscript in the future.*

## **Reviewer 2 Report**

The reviewer did not authorize the disclosure of her peer-review report.

## **Reviewer 3 Report**

The reviewer did not authorize the disclosure of her peer-review report.

# **ROUND 2**

## **Reviewer 1 Report**

Reviewer: Bei Lyu

Date review returned: 27-Jan-2023

Recomendation: Minor Revision

Please state any conflict(s) of interest that you have in relation to the review of this paper (state “none” if this is not applicable).

Nenhum

### Comments to the Author and Edition

*Firstly, many thanks for giving me the chance to review this paper titled “NON-FRONTLINE EMPLOYEES’ EMOTIONS DURING CRISES: A COMPARISON BETWEEN ESSENTIAL AND NON-ESSENTIAL INDUSTRIES” again.*

*My major concerns are as follows:*

*The topic is important and interesting.*

*In the Abstract, generally speaking, its structure is made up of “background, purpose, method, result, conclusion, and value section”. It is good at present.*

*In the Keywords, they are good.*

*In the Literature on “Organizational Crisis”, “Emotions in the workplace”, and “Essential and Non-essential industries”, we should link to the recent and most literature, specially 2020-2023. For emotional attachment influences on business, I also suggest whether the authors can cite the following literature or not (Relationship between Nurses’ Psychological Capital and Satisfaction of Elderly Cancer Patients during the COVID-19 Pandemic)*

*<https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1121636/full>*

*In the Discussion section, the authors should explain results, derive specific theoretical, practical implications, and describe limitations. So I also suggest that the authors should add more compared with the recent and important literature.*

*In the References section, we should strictly conduct as APA style. And their DOIs should be added. Besides, it is lack of the recent and important ones, specially the year of 2020-2023. All the references should add their DOIs.*

*Therefore, based on the contribution and value of the Manuscript, I must choose “Minor Revision”. I also welcome to receive the revised manuscript in the future.*