RAE
FGV EAESP
Revista de Administração de Empresas®
eISSN 2178-938X

PEER REVIEW REPORTS

CONTENTS

Do you want to enrich consumers' experience? Let them negotiate.

Ramón-Jerónimo, M. Á., Makri, K., Stoettinger, B., Smith, B. (2024). Do you want to enrich consumers' experience? Let them negotiate. *RAE-Revista de Administração de Empresas*, *64*(6), e2024-0073. http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/S0034-759020240604

To read the peer review report, click here

The invisible management of visibility-driven work: Governance by social media platforms.

Pithan, L. H., Closs, L. Q. (2024). The invisible management of visibility-driven work: Governance by social media platforms. *RAE-Revista de Administração de Empresas*, *64*(6), e2023-0434. http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/S0034-759020240603

To read the peer review report, click here

Estratégias de cooperação no processo de internacionalização: revisitando o modelo de Uppsala.

Figueira-de-Lemos, F., Ferreira, P. (2024). Estratégias de cooperação no processo de internacionalização: revisitando o modelo de Uppsala. *RAE-Revista de Administração de Empresas*, 64(6), e2024-0270. http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/S0034-759020240605

To read the peer review report, click here

The role of Foreign-educated faculty in fostering research internationalization in Pakistan higher education.

Ahmad, A., Azeem, A., & Aslam, S. (2024). The role of Foreign-educated faculty in fostering research internationalization in Pakistan higher education. *RAE-Revista de Administracao de Empresas*, *64*(6), e2023–0366. https://doi.org/10.1590/S0034-759020240602

To read the peer review report, click here

Assessing soft skills for supply chain integration.

Arantes, F. P., Leite, M. S. A., Bornia, A. C., & Santos, K. V. D. (2024). Assessing soft skills for supply chain integration. *RAE-Revista de Administracao de Empresas*, *64*(6), e2024–0040. https://doi.org/10.1590/S0034-759020240607

To read the peer review report, click here

Impulsiveness as a creative and playful process of discovery: a study on its relationship with treasure hunting, serendipity, and bricolage in second-hand markets.

Campos, P. de O., Porto-Bellini, C. G., Pereira, R. de C. de F., Lins, S. L. B., & Costa, M. F. da. (2024). Impulsiveness as a creative and playful process of discovery: a study on its relationship with treasure hunting, serendipity, and bricolage in second-hand markets. *RAE-Revista de Administracao de Empresas*, *64*(6), e2023-0517. https://doi.org/10.1590/S0034-759020240601

To read the peer review report, click here

The effect of innovation and strategic resources on capital structure.

Faria, A. M. de, Kayo, E. K., Meireles, B. L., Borini, F. M., & Oliveira Junior, M. de M. (2024). The effect of innovation and strategic resources on capital structure. *RAE-Revista de Administracao de Empresas*, *64*(6), e2023-0342. https://doi.org/10.1590/S0034-759020240608

To read the peer review report, click here

eISSN 2178-938X

PEER REVIEW REPORT

Peer review report for:

Ramón-Jerónimo, M. Á., Makri, K., Stoettinger, B., Smith, B. (2024). Do you want to enrich consumers' experience? Let them negotiate. *RAE-Revista de Administração de Empresas*, *64*(6), e2024-0073. http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/S0034-759020240604

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: The first reviewer did not authorize your identification and peer review report. Mohit Srivastava[https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0580-4118], EM Normandie Business School, Le Havre, France. The third reviewer did not authorize your identification.

ROUND 1

Reviewer 1 Report

He/She did not authorize disclosure of their identity and peer review report

Reviewer 2 Report

Reviewer: Mohit Srivastava

Date review returned: 27-Apr-2024

Recommendation: 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

The paper titled "Cross-Cultural Consumer Bargaining Behavior: A Study of Austria, Brazil, and Italy" offers a refreshing perspective on consumer behavior by examining the bargaining practices across three culturally distinct countries. The researchers propose that contrary to conventional understanding, consumers are driven more by hedonic satisfaction than purely economic motives such as obtaining a discount. This finding challenges the traditional utilitarian viewpoint and introduces a novel angle to understanding consumer-retailer interactions.

The study clearly outlines the scope of the study and its findings. It emphasizes the importance of hedonic motivation in bargaining and suggests that this pleasure-driven approach significantly impacts the intention to engage in bargaining. The authors also highlight that satisfaction from the bargaining outcome mediates the relationship between hedonic motives and bargaining intentions, indicating a complex interplay between satisfaction and consumer behavior.

eISSN 2178-938X

One of the paper's strengths lies in its comparative analysis across different cultural contexts—Austria, Brazil, and Italy. This broadens the applicability of the findings and provides a nuanced view of how cultural differences might influence bargaining behaviors. The methodology seems robust with clear definitions of what constitutes hedonic and utilitarian motivations, although further details in the methodology section would be helpful to understand the study's design, participant selection, and analytical techniques.

The insight that consumers bargain for hedonic fulfillment rather than just discounts is particularly compelling. This suggests a shift in how retailers should approach the bargaining process—potentially focusing more on the experiential aspects of bargaining rather than merely the economic incentives. The paper also introduces the idea of bargaining intentions as a tool for retailers to enhance customer satisfaction and loyalty, which could be a valuable strategy in competitive retail markets.

The implications for retailers are significant. By understanding that consumers are seeking pleasure in the bargaining process, retailers can craft strategies that cater to this desire, potentially leading to enhanced customer experiences and increased loyalty. The suggestion to activate hedonic motives could involve creating more engaging, game-like interactions where bargaining is seen as a fun and enjoyable activity rather than a stressful or purely transactional experience.

While the findings are intriguing, the paper could benefit from a broader consideration of how socio-economic factors and individual differences (such as income levels, bargaining power, etc.) might affect bargaining behaviors. Additionally, expanding the research and including theoretical implications (for example, include more countries) could help verify whether these hedonic motivations are universally applicable or if they are particularly strong in the countries studied.

Overall, this paper makes a valuable contribution to the field of consumer behavior by highlighting the hedonic aspects of bargaining. It opens new avenues for research and offers practical advice for retailers looking to innovate in their customer interaction strategies. Further research could continue to explore this hedonic perspective, examining how it interacts with other consumer motives and behaviors in different retail settings.

Reviewer 3 Report

He/She did not authorize disclosure of their identity

Date review returned: 01-May-2024

Recommendation: Major 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

The paper is well-structured, and the intended purpose is clearly stated in the introduction. The literature review effectively addresses points that contribute to the discussion of bargaining.

However, there are several areas that require attention and improvement. The issues of culture and its contribution to behavior are not addressed in the literature review. These issues are later inserted in a

somewhat not rigorous manner, making it difficult to understand how they justify the differences observed. It is recommended that the authors clarify these points in the literature review and hypothesize how the dimensions of culture they deem appropriate influence behavior in different countries. This would help strengthen the paper's argument and make the contribution of culture to behavior more explicit.

In the data treatment, there are problems with two scales - MoS and Satisfaction - that do not meet the minimum criteria to be validated.

Part of the discussion seems abusive in its assertions, with some confusion between low variable values and low satisfaction correlation. The conclusions do not present theoretical contributions.

I hope these suggestions will be useful in further improving your paper. I look forward to seeing the revised version of your work.

ROUND 2

Reviewer 1 Report

He/She did not authorize disclosure of their identity and peer review report

Reviewer 2 Report

Reviewer: Mohit Srivastava

Date review returned: 28-Jun-2024

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).

None

Comments to the Author

Thank you for making the required changes in your manuscript. I have now read the revised manuscript and am satisfied with the changes.

eISSN 2178-938X

PEER REVIEW REPORT

Peer review report for:

Pithan, L. H., Closs, L. Q. (2024). The invisible management of visibility-driven work: Governance by social media platforms. *RAE-Revista de Administração de Empresas*, *64*(6), e2023-0434. http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/S0034-759020240603

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: Samir Adamoglu de Oliveira[https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4978-0557], Universidade Federal da Paraíba, Departamento de Administração, João Pesssoa, PB, Brazil. The second evaluator did not authorize his/her identification

ROUND 1

Reviewer 1 Report

Reviewer: Samir Adamoglu de Oliveira

Date review returned: 28-Feb-2024

Recommendation: Major 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

OVERALL COMMENTS

The essay approaches the governance by platforms and its implications for workers (i.e., content creators and influencers) of social media platforms, discussing labor management issues in a critical fashion. It also proposes a framework for analysis of plataformization of work in such digital economy organizations.

This review is structured in two main topics: (i) a first, involving minor issues (which seem to require corrective attention, or even suggestions for development/improvement); and, (ii) a second, of greater scope, with chances of configuring substantive changes in the structure and even in the content of the manuscript, if they are considered pertinent and, to some extent, accepted.

1. MINOR ISSUES

1.1 – There are a few papers not listed in the References section, such as Cotter (2019), Harvey (2003), Hertzog (2020), Langley & Leyshon (2017) and van der Vlist (2022). I suggest a double-check on what is being cited and what is listed in the end of the manuscript.

1.2 – The manuscript's title is insightful, however, it seems a tad misaligned with the framework and the motto of the discussion, as it talks about "content creators", whereas Figure 2 – and even the argument in the section 'The Invisible Manager of Visibility-Driven Work' – prioritizes the category of "influencers". I suggest to revise it, perhaps adopting something like that section title – maybe 'The Invisible Management of Visibility-Driven Work: Governance by Social Media Platforms' would be more suitable, even catchy.

1.3 – Figure 2 (p. 23) seems to suggest that the mechanisms of governance by platforms would only reach digital influencers, but not content creators, according to the lines and the influences indicated. I suggest to reconsider such display of lines (or influences, so to say) to a more encompassing design in which both digital influencers and content creators are achieved.

1.4 – Manuscript's final section would benefit from a more assertive conclusion; in an essay in which so many interesting things are said, at least an up-to-date research agenda would seem appropriate, not to mention more theorization effort.

2. MAJOR ISSUE

The main issue of the manuscript is the fact that it contends that just the organization, but not what circulates outside it at a societal level is pertinent to the 'governance by platform' as a labor management mechanism. For instance, Figures 1 (p. 22) e 2 (p. 23) are very interesting, even logically coherent with the argument; however, I strongly disagree that governance issues occur exclusively within the organization (i.e., intra-organizationally), as the set of policies that regulate is in no way an exclusive reflection of the platform values or set of preferences, but mostly influenced by larger societal/institutional issues that are external to the organization. All the "hate speech" typification, for example, is contested precisely due to the influence of public opinion and legislative agencies of nations, if not by supranational entities. Even if we talk about the few big techs operating in the global digital economy, and even if we know that, in the world, digital regulations are still being established – if not still being created –, I believe the essay is mistaken in attributing too much agentic power to these organizations, and little or no power of agency at all (in this case, agentic resistance) to content creators and digital influencers, central to these platformed business models. This combination (few players + absence of regulatory and normative governance structures with legal support), which makes this a poorly/precariously regulated sector of economic activity, ends up giving the impression that the organizations that integrate it would have a so centralized agentic power that they could define, autonomously and solely, their operating rules, policies, and standards. This point seems to be mistaken as it ignores how external influences from the organizational field, markets, and institutional/societal spheres are, indeed, present in these very definitions, guiding/influencing them. In this sense, I would like to suggest the following literature, hoping that they will help to understand this issue:

Beverungen, A., Beyes, T., & Conrad, L. (2019). The Organizational Powers of (Digital) Media. Organization, 26(5), 621–635. https://doi.org/10.1177/1350508419867206

Bullock, G. (2022). Information-based governance (pp. 298-308). In Ansell, C., & Torfing, J. (Ed.). Handbook on Theories of Governance. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar Publishing. https://doi.org/10.4337/9781800371972.00037

Couldry, N., & Hepp, A. (2022). Media and the Social Construction of Reality (pp. 27-39). In D. A. Rohlinger, & S. Sobieraj (Ed.). The Oxford Handbook of Digital Media Sociology. Oxford: Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780197510636.013.2

Hofmann, J., Katzenbach, C., & Gollatz, K. (2017). Between Coordination and Regulation: Finding the Governance in Internet Governance. New Media & Society, 19(9), 1406-1423. https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444816639975

Laapotti, T., & Raappana, M. (2022). Algorithms and Organizing. Human Communication Research, 48(3), 491–515. https://doi.org/10.1093/hcr/hqac013

Langlois, G. (2013). Participatory Culture and the New Governance of Communication: The Paradox of Participatory Media. Television & New Media, 14(2), 91-105. https://doi.org/10.1177/1527476411433519

McNealy, J. (2024, forthcoming). Adding Complexity to Advance AI Organizational Governance Models. In Justin B. Bullock, Yu-Che Chen, Johannes Himmelreich, Valerie M. Hudson, Anton Korinek, Matthew M. Young, & Baobao Zhang (Eds). The Oxford Handbook of AI Governance. Oxford: Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780197579329.013.37

Napoli, P. M. (2014). Automated Media: An Institutional Theory Perspective on Algorithmic Media Production and Consumption. Communication Theory, 24(3), 340–360. https://doi.org/10.1111/comt.12039

I would like to thank the author(s) for the opportunity to review the manuscript, and I hope my comments and suggestions to be considered for the purpose of improving the work.

Reviewer 2 Report

The second evaluator did not authorize his/her identification and peer review report

ROUND 2

Reviewer 1 Report

Reviewer: Samir Adamoglu de Oliveira
Date review returned: 17-Jun-2024
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).

None

Comments to the Author

Dear Author(s),

I would like to express my gratitude for your appreciation on my suggestions, which I was glad to see being incorporated into this version. This is, indeed, a version of the manuscript that surpasses the previous one (the originally submitted), enhanced in quality and better developed. The only thing I would like to comment on this new version regards the incorporation of my suggestion (item '1.2' of my review): make sure that the right expression is "The invisible manageMENT" (as in the new title adopted) instead of "The invisible manaGER" such as stated in line 46, page 13 and in line 28, page 14; I think these are two different arguments/points, in terms of meaning.

That minor issue aside, I would like to thank once again for the opportunity to participate in the evaluation process of your work, and congratulate you for the quality and relevance of the essay, as well as for the improvement efforts undertaken in this version of the manuscript.

eISSN 2178-938X

PEER REVIEW REPORT

Peer review report for:

Figueira-de-Lemos, F., Ferreira, P. (2024). Estratégias de cooperação no processo de internacionalização: revisitando o modelo de Uppsala. *RAE-Revista de Administração de Empresas*, *64*(6), e2024-0270. http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/S0034-759020240605

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

Reviewers: Raquel Meneses[https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5829-9402], Universidade do Porto, Faculdade de Economia, Porto, Portugal. José Luís da Silva Pinho[https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2070-8009], Universidade de Minho, Escola de Engenharia, Guimarães, Portugal.

ROUND 1

Reviewer 1 Report

Reviewer: Raquel Meneses

Date review returned: 01-May-2024

Recommendation: 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

Agradeço aos autores a oportunidade de ler este paper muito interessante.

A explicação da metodologia adotada é muito clara e esclarecedora. A apresentação das AI e das JVI como um espectrum embora não sendo nova, está muito bem explicitada e utilizada.

Parece-me que há alguma over-simplification no modelo que deverá ser discutida, pois desta forma a cooperação estratégica parece demasiado vantajosa, não se discutindo os riscos adicionais que por si só representa. Penso que este ponto merce alguma reflexão.

Da mesma forma não se precebe porque é que o compromentimento conjunto em JV deve ser o dobro, porque não apenas o comprometimento de cada empresa ser apenas metade? As questões da capacidade de absorção também poderiam / deveriam ser discutidas. Acredito que dada a distância psicológica da empresa não local a sua capacidade de absorção e aprendizagem seria menor.

Posto isto, dou o parabéns aos autores pelo trabalho efectuado.

Penso que é necessário fazer a revisão do português, visto ter alguns typos.

eISSN 2178-938X

Reviewer 2 Report

Reviewer: José Luís da Silva Pinho
Date review returned: 06-Jun-2024
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).

None

Comments to the Author

A conceptualização da cooperação entre empresas no modelo de Uppsala Trabalho parece-me muito interessante.

Trata-se de facto de um modelo de referência na área de internacionalização empresarial em que à medida que a empresa vai conhecendo melhor os seus mercados, menor será a incertez e a percepção do risco, o que implica um maior envolvimento em termos de recursos de capital.

O modelo tem um cariz essencialmente económico o que lhe confere alguma pertinência conceptual. Além disso, os autores ressalvam o facto de os autores do modelo de Uppsala não explicitaram qual o tipo de estrutura organizacional da empresa do modelo, pese embora a subsidiária em análise gozar de elevada autonomia no processo de tomada de decisão.

Apenas uma chamada de atenção, sugiro que os autores releiam cuidadosamente o artigo porque apresenta algumas gralhas. Ex. pag. estreitece (linha32), pag. 5 co2mo (linha39,p.5).

ROUND

Reviewer 1 Report

Reviewer: Raquel Meneses
Date review returned: 09-Jul-2024
Recommendation: 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

Agradeço aos autores a forma como acolheram os meus comentários.
Penso que o paper beneficiaria de uma revisão do português.

RAE Revista de Administração de Empresas®

eISSN 2178-938X

PEER REVIEW REPORT

Peer review report for:

Ahmad, A., Azeem, A., & Aslam, S. (2024). The role of Foreign-educated faculty in fostering research internationalization in Pakistan higher education. *RAE-Revista de Administracao de Empresas*, *64*(6), e2023–0366. https://doi.org/10.1590/S0034-759020240602

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: Tariq Malik[https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6906-3622], Liaoning University, Liaoning, China. The second reviewer did not authorize disclosure of their identity and peer review report.

ROUND 1

Reviewer 1 Report

Reviewer: Tariq Malik

Date review returned: 05-Oct-2023

Recommendation: Major 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

Dear Authors,

I keenly read your article for three reasons. Firstly, I am engaged in research on higher education issues across countries. Secondly, the research context of this article is of interest to me. Thirdly, you have written the manuscript very to make it worth reading. The issues I have raised below are of different types, which will improve the article in technical terms and contextual terms. Technically, they can increase legibility of data and finings, and contextually, they can improve the latent logic.

1. *You have not considered where the returnees come from. My observation reveals that all returnees are from China or Malaysia, with a minimal proportion of others.*
2. *You have detailed very well the process of dividing your targeted groups into domestic and international, but you have not detailed what you are measuring.*
3. *Nowhere you have mentioned about the dependent variable: what it is, how it is and why it is? Only once you have mention the dependent variable in your entire manuscript is at 10, "The preliminary analysis revealed a non-normal distribution of all dependent variables across". It means you are more dependent variables.*

eISSN 2178-938X

4. *One way to look at your design is that there are multiple dependent variables (articles, conferences, and so on) and one independent variable (foreign versus domestic). The thought of this design is fine, but the development falls short.*
5. *You have mentioned in passing about sciences and non-sciences, but you have not mentioned about the differences. For instance, PhD returnees from China are in many areas.*
    a. *Medical*
    b. *Engineering*
    c. *Business/economics*
    d. *Others*
6. *Your study is fine if we do not what to understand anything more than the T-text, but it raises question if we want to know what is happening there. For instance, here are to observations in relation to Chinese returnees from abroad and Pakistanis returnees from China.*
    a. *Chinese returnees from abroad have more publications when they are in the UK or USA, but it goes down when they return to China.*
    b. *Chinese returnees have to adjust with the system they had left behind decades ago.*
    c. *Pakistanis returnees publish more because Chinese finding requires them to do so. Moreover, their professors, who are usually not well-versed in English rely on Pakistani students—those come from slightly better trained schools back home.*
7. *You have not considered the ranking of articles. I am not suggesting high ranking articles are by any chance are more valuable than others. I am suggesting with experience that high ranking journals are being controlled by interest groups. It is a politics at its best.*
8. *Regarding the technical points, you have not shown details of your methodology.*
9. *Your tables are not refined and are incomplete. Please add more tables if required and show rather than tell what you have done.*
10. *You have not draw any figures to show any relationships. Perhaps you are not interested to expose your data subjects!*
11. *You have not mentioned the location of the universities in terms of cities. How many cities and which cites?*
12. *You have not included the ranking or status of the universities (with or without disciplines).*
13. *I noticed that you have deliberately ignored some literature because it will force you to mention China.*
14. *You have cited Baloch and followed the same path, but neither have gone a step further to explain more than regression analysis.*

Thus, please have a look what you can do to fill those blind spots in the article!

Good luck

Reviewer 2 Report

He/She did not authorize disclosure of their identity and peer review report

ROUND 2

Reviewer 1 Report

Reviewer: Tariq Malik

Date review returned: 05-Mar-2024

Recommendation: 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

Dear Authors,

You have done sufficient revision to merit a minor revision. It is because you have not even tried to look for relevant literature. In your next and hopefully final round, please do the following two things.

a) differentiate and relate your work with these previous studies. This contrast in your analysis and discussion will bring out the best of you and your main contribution.

(1) Malik, T. H. 2022. The Belt and Road Initiative, joint intellectual capital development towards industry value added of a partner economy. International Journal of Chinese Education, 11(3): 2212585X221144900.

(2) Malik, T. H. 2023. Tension and transition between technical and conformance devices in sino-foreign university alliances towards innovativeness. International Journal of Chinese Education, 12(1): 2212585X231162118.

b) Please write with confidence what is you had hoped to accomplish but were constrained by many factors. Those issues can be settled by you or others if you disclose them without a worry.

Best

c) write what you want want

Reviewer 2 Report

He/She did not authorize disclosure of their identity and peer review report

eISSN 2178-938X

PEER REVIEW REPORT

Peer review report for:

Arantes, F. P., Leite, M. S. A., Bornia, A. C., & Santos, K. V. D. (2024). Assessing soft skills for supply chain integration. *RAE - Revista De Administracao De Empresas*, *64*(6), e2024–0040. https://doi.org/10.1590/S0034-759020240607

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: Joan Ogendo[https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2167-0455], Technical University of Kenya, Kenya. Ibtisaama Ahmed, Georgia Southern University, Georgia, USA. The second reviewer did not authorize disclosure of their identity and peer review report.

ROUND 1

Reviewer 1 Report

Reviewer: Joan Ogendo

Date review returned: 13-Feb-2024

Recommendation: 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

Topic: The authors need to rephrase the topic to read, 'measuring skills and supply chain for integration instrument

Abstract: The abstract should include the objectives of the study, the methodology, findings, conclusion and suggestion for further research.

Introduction: The authors should state the conceptual argument on measuring skills, supply chain and integrated instrument. Next, is the theoretical argument anchoring the concepts of measuring skills, supply chain and integrated instrument. Followed by the contextual argument on companies.

The authors should include the statement of the problem, either the conceptual, methodological or contextual gap of the study and the research question of the study.

Literature Review: The authors should explain the foundational theories in relation to the concepts of measuring skills, supply chain and integrated instrument. The criticism of the given theories should be described.

The authors should include empirical studies of the relationship between measuring skills, supply chain and integrated instrument and also the hypotheses / propositions.

Results – The authors need to describe the findings of the study based on the specific objectives.

Discussion – the discussion should involve the findings in comparison with the given literature review.

Conclusion - The conclusion should state the general objective and its relations to the findings of each specific objective.

The contributions of the study, its limitations and future research should have separate subtopics

Reviewer 2 Report

He/She did not authorize disclosure of their identity and peer review report

ROUND 2

Reviewer 1 Report

Reviewer: Joan Ogendo
Date review returned: 21-Mar-2024
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).

None

Comments to the Author

Abstract- Include the findings of the study
Introduction - Include the contextual argument of the study
Describe the statement of the problem and state the research question.
Methodology - Organize the methodology section
First, Describe the research design.
Next, describe the population of the study
Next describe the sample of the study
Next, explain the sample technique of the study
Next, describe the data collection of the study
Lastly, describe the data analysis of the study.
Results - Analyse the results based on the findings of the study
Discussions - Compare the findings with the literature review and state whether the findings support the literature or otherwise
Implication of the study - Describe the implication of the study
Conclusion - State the general objective of the study and relate it with the achievement of the study.
Limitation of the study - Describe the limitation of the study
Future research - Describe future research

Reviewer 2 Report

He/She did not authorize disclosure of their identity and peer review report

RAE Revista de Administração de Empresas®

eISSN 2178-938X

PEER REVIEW REPORT

Peer review report for:

Campos, P. de O., Porto-Bellini, C. G., Pereira, R. de C. de F., Lins, S. L. B., & Costa, M. F. da. (2024). Impulsiveness as a creative and playful process of discovery: a study on its relationship with treasure hunting, serendipity, and bricolage in second-hand markets. *RAE-Revista de Administracao de Empresas*, *64*(6), e2023-0517. https://doi.org/10.1590/S0034-759020240601

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: Claudio Zancan[https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9150-4962], Instituto Nacional da Propriedade Industrial, Academia da Propriedade Intelectual, Brasília, DF, Brasil. The second reviewer did not authorize disclosure of their identity and peer review report.

ROUND 1

Reviewer 1 Report

Reviewer: Claudio Zancan

Date review returned: 29-Dec-2023

Recommendation: Major 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

Dear Authors' Names,

I have had the privilege of reviewing your manuscript titled "EUREKA! IMPULSIVENESS AS CREATIVE AND PLAYFUL PROCESSES OF DISCOVERY." I appreciate the effort you have invested in exploring the positive aspects of impulsiveness in consumer behavior, particularly in the context of second-hand markets and bricolage practices.

Your study sheds light on an intriguing intersection between impulsiveness, treasure hunting attitudes, serendipity awareness, and bricolage behavior. However, I would like to offer constructive feedback to enhance the clarity and impact of your work.

Here are some key points for consideration:

Strengths of the Manuscript:

Innovative Approach: The study's exploration of the positive dimensions of impulsiveness in creative and playful processes of discovery is innovative and contributes to shifting the perspective on impulsiveness in consumer behavior.

Contextual Relevance: The focus on Brazilian second-hand shoppers adds depth to the study, considering the cultural and economic factors influencing creativity in this specific consumer group.

Suggest areas for improvement:

Title Enhancement: While the title is attention-grabbing, it might benefit from a slight refinement to succinctly convey the essence of the study. Consider aligning it more closely with the central theme of impulsiveness, creativity, and consumer behavior.

Introduction Clarification: The introduction provides a comprehensive background, but it could benefit from a more explicit statement of the research gap and the specific contribution your study aims to make. Clearly articulate why examining impulsiveness in the context of second-hand markets is crucial for advancing current knowledge.

Conceptual Framework Detail: Further elaboration on the conceptual framework, particularly the dimensions of bricolage practice (practice, epistemology, metaphysics), could enhance readers' understanding of how these dimensions relate to impulsiveness and creativity.

Methodological Transparency: Provide additional details on the online survey and structural equation modeling methodology employed. This will help readers better assess the robustness of your findings.

Discussion of Results: While the results are intriguing, a more in-depth discussion of the implications of your findings for theory and practice would add value. Explore how your results contribute to existing literature and offer insights for marketers or policymakers.

Conclusion Refinement: The conclusion is strong, but consider rephrasing to enhance the coherence between your primary findings and the call for further research. Clearly delineate the implications of your study for future research directions.

Language and Style: Ensure consistency in language and style throughout the manuscript. Some sentences could be refined for greater clarity and coherence.

Overall Impression:

Your study has the potential to make a significant contribution to the literature on impulsiveness and creativity in consumer behavior. Addressing the suggested improvements will further enhance the clarity and impact of your work. I commend your innovative approach and look forward to seeing the continued development of your manuscript.

Thank you for considering these suggestions, and I am available for any further clarification or discussion.

BR, Reviewer.

Reviewer 2 Report

He/She did not authorize disclosure of their identity and peer review report

eISSN 2178-938X

ROUND 1

Reviewer 2 Report

Reviewer: Claudio Zancan
Date review returned: 29-Dec-2023
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).

None

Comments to the Author

Congratulations on this research. All prior suggestions have been addressed.

Reviewer 2 Report

He/She did not authorize disclosure of their identity and peer review report

eISSN 2178-938X

PEER REVIEW REPORT

Peer review report for:

Faria, A. M. de, Kayo, E. K., Meireles, B. L., Borini, F. M., & Oliveira Junior, M. de M. (2024). The effect of innovation and strategic resources on capital structure. *RAE-Revista de Administracao de Empresas*, *64*(6), e2023-0342. https://doi.org/10.1590/S0034-759020240608

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: Henrique Castro Martins[https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3186-4245], Fundação Getulio Vargas, Escola de Administração de Empresas de São Paulo, São Paulo, SP,

Brazil. Andres Mesa-Toro[https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2788-1528], Universidad de Navarra, School of Economics and Business, Pamplona, Spain. Lucas Macoris[https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0732-5011], Fundação Getulio Vargas, Escola de Administração de Empresas de São Paulo, São Paulo, SP, Brazil

ROUND 1

Reviewer 1 Report

Reviewer: Henrique Castro Martins

Date review returned: 06-Sep-2023

Recommendation: Major 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

Dear authors

I have read your manuscript with great pleasure. The topic is well selected and the potential of the research is great.

Here I have some suggestions to improve the manuscript and to make it closer to a publication level.

1. *I believe the motivation of the article needs to improve significantly. Take for example the first paragraph of the introduction. The authors make some strong statements about the relationship between IBS and leverage, but they do not motivate well why this is an important topic or why should the reader care. The second paragraph also could be improved to motivate more the topic. More specifically, the authors state they believe there is a moderator of the association, but they never explain truly why. In other words, my first suggestion would be to work in the upfront of the paper (i.e., the two first paragraphs) to improve its motivation.*

2. *The "friction" and the contributions of the article are also not well explained. The introduction ends at the middle of p2, without clearly stating them. Therefore, I'd also suggest rewriting this part to make the contributions clearer to the reader.*
3. *Because the motivation was not quite clear to me, I fail to understand completely the hypotheses. For instance, why did the authors assume that firms with IBS and high IC have lower financial constraints? This assumption is critical to the hypotheses. Take for instance the paragraph just above the hypotheses on p9. I did not follow how the paragraphs in the previous pages lead to this paragraph's assumptions. Therefore, I'd think the authors could improve the story and the arguments underlaying the hypotheses.*
4. *Is there a reference to the IBS proxy to include at the first paragraph of p13?*
5. *I also have some comments about the empirical model.*
    a. *a. Given the simultaneity possibility between the controls and the Y, I'd argue that the authors should lag the independent variables by one period of time.*
    b. *b. Also, to improve the readability, the authors could present only one equation explaining that they have different proxies for the main independent variable.*
    c. *c. If I understand correctly, not all variables included in the models have their empirical proxy explained at Table 2 (i.e., RD intensity), and not all variables in Table 2 are used in the study (i.e., capital intensity).*
    d. *d. Looking at the tables, the order of the lines could also be improved by presenting the main variables and the interactions at the bottom of the tables.*
6. *Reading the statistics about OC and KC, the authors say that adding these two, on average, represents almost the size of the company. I found that statistic quite intriguing. Does it mean that no other "source" of capital is important to a firm's total asset? What about long-term assets not necessarily labeled as KC (i.e., buildings and plants)? I believe the authors could elaborate more what this statistic means really.*
7. *I guess this comment is also an outcome of the lack of a good motivation, but I believe the authors could elaborate more on the meaning of their results. The final section is simply a description of the statistical results, but the authors never explained why they are important and how they contribute to the related literature. I'd say the authors need to elaborate on that in the next version. Related to that, it would be important to discuss more clearly the limitations of the research not only conceptually (the proxies they use), but also empirically (the models and the endogeneity-type of problems they may have). Also, the suggestions for future research are very vague and also could be better explained.*

I hope these comments help. Good luck with the article.

Reviewer 2 Report

Reviewer: Andres Mesa-Toro

Date review returned:

Recommendation: Major 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

RAE Revista de Administração de Empresas®

eISSN 2178-938X

Comments to the Author

The effect of innovation and strategic resources on capital structure

Referee report September 29, 2023

The paper entitled: "The effect of innovation and strategic resources on capital structure" analyze how the interaction between strategic resources (organization capital, knowledge capital and intangible capital) and innovation strategy affect the capital structure (leverage) of firms. According with the authors previous literature have found a positive relation between strategic resources and leverage while negative between innovation-based strategy (IBS) and leverage. This paper found that in the presence of strategic resources firms with IBS have more leverage.

This an interesting paper that indeed makes a contribution by studying a gap in the literature. While the relation between strategic resources and leverage has been widely studied as well as the relation between IBS and capital structure. The authors find the opportunity to study whether the interaction of IBS and capital structure might have a positive effect on leverage which indeed they find it.

Nevertheless, I think there are some points that the authors should check in order to improve the paper and publish it:

The authors test their hypothesis with tobit regressions that censor negative variables where the dependent variable is leverage and the independent variables are: IBS, strategic resources (organization capital, knowledge capital or intangible capital), the interaction between IBS and strategic resources plus a set of controls. My main concerns are the following:

1. *The lack of robustness: The only robustness that the authors mention is the use of PMS or SIC sector industry. This is fine but in my opinion the authors should have consider other alternatives as well. For example, the authors use a sample of US companies covering years 2008 to 2018. This sample have an issue: it covers part of the financial crisis (2008 and 2009) where many firms have leverage constrains in the US. (Cornett et al.,2011; Rossi and Malavasi, 2016). I suggest the authors to run the regressions excluding the years of the financial crisis as a robustness.*
2. *According with the information of the tables the standard errors are robust and grouped at the company level. Then the authors cluster standard errors by firm. I would like to know why the authors didn't cluster by year as well. It appears to me that there might be temporary patterns or shocks that are correlated with certain time periods between 2008 and 2018. Also, it is a common practice to cluster by time when fixed effects are used. Nevertheless, is not compulsory for the authors to cluster by entity and time, however in that case the authors should justify their decision either with a test of heteroskedasticity or just arguing why they believe that in their model there are no issues with respect to temporary patterns that justify the use of cluster by time.*
3. *The authors didn't consider possible issues of endogeneity. In particular I am worried about reverse causality. The only approach they make to this issue is the reference to Bartolini (2013). In my opinion the authors have two options to deal with this issue. First, they can use an empirical approach that eliminate or at least reduce issues of endogeneity, such as instrumental variables. However, I understand that sometimes is not easy (or even not possible) to find a set of instrument variables. Instead the authors might recognize the potential issue and argue why they believe there is no reverse causality in their study. In this particular paper the issue might come from the relation between leverage and IBS or by the relation between leverage and capital structure. The authors appear to deal with the first one by referencing the paper by Bartolini (2013). However, the authors do not recognize the possibility of reverse causality in the relation between capital structure and leverage. The authors should recognize this possibility and present arguments of why capital structure causes leverage and not the opposite.*

Minor comments:

- *In page 15 the authors mention return on assets as one of the controls. However, in the tables the authors show ROE (Return on equity) it might be a typo. In any case I would like to know why the authors use ROE instead of ROA (Or vice versa).*
- *From the tables I understand that the authors use industry and years dummy's but I would like to see this information also in the regression model section. In particular in equations 5,6 and 7 the authors, for example, explains very well why they use random effects. Then they also should point out why they use industry and time effects.*
- *In the regression model section, the authors should explain how leverage is calculated: liabilities/assets, (short term + long term debt)/assets, long term debt/assets, liabilities/equity, long term debt/equity?*
- *I am wondering why the authors use the independent variables as contemporaneous instead of lagged. Then, the authors should explain that design in the paper.*

References:

Bartoloni, E. (2013). Capital structure and innovation: causality and determinants. Empirica, 40(1), 111-151.

Rossi, S. P., & Malavasi, R. (Eds.). (2016). Financial crisis, bank behaviour and credit crunch. New York, NY: Springer International Publishing.

Cornett, M. M., McNutt, J. J., Strahan, P. E., & Tehranian, H. (2011). Liquidity risk management and credit supply in the financial crisis. Journal of financial economics, 101(2), 297-312.

Reviewer 3 Report

Reviewer: Lucas Macoris

Date review returned: 15-Oct-2023

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

Major comments:

1. *There is a lack of motivation on why this specific setting is important: in the manuscript, the authors state that "[...] However, we believe the relationship between a company's strategy and its leverage is incomplete and deserves further study, as most studies do not consider the effect of firms' strategic resources." If that is the case, why has this not been considered in other studies? Is it because it is still an underdeveloped research area, or because other papers did not manage to correctly address this issue? If the latter, what specific points do other studies fail to address? There needs to be a clear punch line to level-set the paper and position it to the current literature.*

2. *Alternative theories on financing constraints and innovation need to be discussed: although there has been an extensive list of empirical contributions, there is still a gap in the paper regarding which theories provide support for the financing constraints and innovation discussion. Because of that, the content described in the hypothesis development section remains blurry, and it is not clear what the economic rationale for the hypotheses is.*
3. *Econometric specification: although the text described linear models, table headlines clearly state Tobit regressions. Since you want to understand the relationship and not the specific estimate, I'd strongly advise using linear models (OLS) and focusing on the interpretability of the results, as you'd be able to gauge an estimate of the average effect. Notwithstanding, the econometric specification needs to be augmented to include firm-fixed effects so that we can partly insulate from potential endogeneity concerns. Finally, there is a clear lack of additional empirical results, such as falsification tests, and discussion of the results.*

Minor comments:

1. *Some terms are not defined in the manuscript (e.g., SG&A).*
2. *There needs to be a more in-depth discussion of the summary statistics. For example, such as analyzing how the three metrics adopted in the study correlate with firm-level characteristics and how this relationship aligns with previous studies in the field.*