

# Review of: "Psychological Power Parity: A Novel Perspective on Perceived Economic Power"

### Edina Molnár<sup>1</sup>

1 University of Debrecen

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The Study introduces the concept of Psychological Power Parity, which, according to the author, has not been addressed by previous theories.

The choice of topic is excellent and provokes the reader to anticipate a new perspective. The term "perspective" may also be changed to "concept" because it is prominently mentioned in the article and can carry more weight than "perspective." The new theory brings in a new perspective where a proposed quantitative approach is used to measure the psychological dimension of power using Psychological Power Parity.

- Authors are advised to adhere to a proper scientific writing format such as a problem statement, sufficient literature review, hypothesis, methodology, results, discussion, and conclusion to meet the expected scientific rigor.
- Provide relevant/related citations for the formulas used, or if they are new, justify with empirical results their validity and reliability.
- It is advisable for such a theoretical argument to be supported with empirical evidence and a subsequent discussion of findings.
- Outline the ethical concerns from the use of the theory and provide the relevant safeguards that should be put into
  consideration when using the theory proposed.

The following can be done to support the arguments given:

#### <u>Introduction</u>

- · Develop a strong introduction by reviewing more relevant literature from previous studies.
- · Cite more existing theories and bring out the missing gaps that your new approach seeks to fill.

#### **Theoretical Framework**

- · Add more recent citations.
- To address the main question posed, discuss exhaustively the principles from which you developed your concept. It
  would be important to discuss them individually under their sub-headings such as the self-perception theory, attribution
  theory, etc.
- There is no compelling data/evidence to support the new theory. Authors are advised to include.



## References

- The references are appropriate but need to be updated with new references after more literature review is done.
- Authors should consider updating the reference section with more recent studies, e.g., within the last 5 years.

The Conceptual Framework: (Missing): Draw a conceptual framework to help the reader visualize. In the framework, show the gap (where your new theory will fill).

Qeios ID: N031FU · https://doi.org/10.32388/N031FU