

Review Report Template – Version 1 (Pre-publication)

Manuscript: “Conectando Hélices, Gerando Soluções: O Papel do INOVAREPE na Modernização da Gestão Pública Pernambucana”

Authors: Luana Cavalcanti de Melo Ataíde; Ana Elisabete Brito Alves; Carla Regina Pasa Gómez

Reviewer: Marcos Roberto Pisarski Junior – ORCID: [0000-0002-8384-7420]

Report Date: 31/12/2025

Deadline for Version 2: 30 days after receipt of this report

1. Introduction and Greeting

Dear Authors,

Thank you for the opportunity to review this manuscript. The article addresses a highly relevant and contemporary topic, namely the application of open innovation and the Quintuple Helix model in the modernization of public management, grounded in the empirical case of the INOVAREPE program in Pernambuco, Brazil.

Overall, the manuscript demonstrates conceptual alignment, methodological consistency, and strong applied relevance. The study meets the minimum quality standards required for dissemination as a Version 1 – Preprint. Nevertheless, some aspects would benefit from greater analytical refinement, methodological rigor in hypothesis testing, and theoretical deepening, which I outline below with the intention of strengthening future versions.

2. Manuscript Overview

The manuscript investigates how the principles of Open Innovation and the Quintuple Helix Theory are operationalized within the INOVAREPE program and how they contribute to efficiency, sustainability, innovation, and participation in public services.

The empirical focus on a state-level public innovation program is a clear strength, especially given the scarcity of quantitative evaluations of open innovation initiatives in Brazilian public administration. The article contributes to validating the applicability of collaborative innovation models beyond the private sector.

However, the study is strongly perception-based and leans toward a confirmatory and descriptive narrative, which limits the depth of causal inference and theoretical tension. A more critical engagement with the limitations of the model and the results would enhance the manuscript's analytical robustness.

3. Detailed Evaluation

Criterion	Summary Comments	Score ¹
Scientific Relevance	Highly relevant for public administration, innovation policy, and sustainability studies, especially in emerging contexts.	5
Originality	The empirical focus on INOVAREPE is original; however, the theoretical framework largely reaffirms established models.	4
Methodological Rigor	Methodologically coherent, but reliance on one-sample t-tests and perceptual measures limits analytical depth.	3
Data Presentation	Results are clearly presented, though overly detailed and sometimes repetitive.	3

Writing Quality	Clear and well-structured in Portuguese, with minor redundancies.	4
Theoretical Coherence	Strong alignment between theory and objectives, but limited critical dialogue with alternative perspectives.	4
Bibliographic References	Appropriate and relevant, though concentrated on foundational works with limited recent empirical studies.	4

¹Scale from 1 (very unsatisfactory) to 5 (excellent)

4. Section-by-Section Comments

1. Title and Abstract

- The title accurately reflects the manuscript's scope and theoretical focus.
- **Suggestion:** The abstract could be more analytical and less descriptive, explicitly acknowledging methodological limitations and the perceptual nature of the findings.

2. Introduction

- The introduction provides strong contextual grounding and policy relevance.
- **Suggestion:** Some sections reiterate similar arguments regarding innovation and sustainability; condensation would improve narrative focus.

3. Theoretical Framework

- The discussion of Open Innovation and the Quintuple Helix is well grounded in classic literature.

- Suggestion:** The framework would benefit from engaging more critically with recent empirical studies on public-sector innovation and potential drawbacks of multistakeholder collaboration.

5. Methodology

- The methodological design is coherent and transparent.
- **Suggestion:** The use of one-sample t-tests against a zero reference point is statistically valid but analytically weak, given the Likert scale structure. Hypothesis testing largely confirms positive perceptions rather than testing relational or explanatory mechanisms.

6. Results

- Results are clearly reported and statistically consistent.
- **Suggestion:** The extensive confirmation of all hypotheses should be interpreted more cautiously, particularly given the small, non-probabilistic sample and high concentration of academic respondents.

7. Discussion and Conclusion

- The conclusions are coherent and well articulated, with appropriate recognition of limitations.
- **Suggestion:** This section should further distinguish between empirical validation, policy implications, and normative expectations of open innovation in public administration.

5. Questions and Dialogue

- How do the authors address the risk of confirmation bias, given that all hypotheses were supported by highly positive perceptual data?
- To what extent does the predominance of academic participants affect the representation of the Quintuple Helix in practice?
- How might qualitative methods complement these findings and reveal tensions or failures not captured by surveys?

6. Rounds and Publication Plan

Round	Reviewer's Action	Author's Action	Publication	Deadline
1	Initial report and quality assessment	Revise according to suggestions	Version 1 – Preprint ²	30 days
2	Evaluation of Version 2	Address reviewer and community feedback	Version 2 – Revised	15 days
3 ³	Final Report and Approval	---	Final Version + Complete History	Immediate

²Published online with its own DOI and metadata in six languages after my approval of the minimum quality.

³Only if major revisions are requested; otherwise, skip to final publication.

7. Final Recommendation for Version 1

- ☒ **Publish Version 1 – Preprint**
- ☐ Request minor revisions
- ☐ Request major revisions
- ☐ Reject

8. Closing

This manuscript offers a **relevant and empirically grounded contribution** to the literature on innovation in public management, particularly by documenting the INOVAREPE program as a concrete application of open innovation and the Quintuple Helix model. While the study would benefit from **greater analytical depth and methodological sophistication**, it clearly meets the standards for publication as a **Version 1 – Preprint** within the open and dialogical review model adopted by *Scientia International Journals*.

I look forward to reviewing a revised version that further strengthens the manuscript's critical engagement and theoretical contribution.

Sincerely,

Marcos Roberto Pisarski Junior

ORCID: 0000-0002-8384-7420

