

Applying Machine Learning to Examine Psychological Ownership and Work Passion in Innovation Processes

Mikko. Lahtinen¹, Youssef. El Amrani^{2*}, Adrian. Tan Wei Ming³

¹ Department of Industrial Engineering and Management, Aalto University, Espoo, Finland

² Department of Organizational Management, Mohammed V University, Rabat, Morocco

³ Department of Strategy and Policy, NUS Business School, National University of Singapore, Singapore

* Corresponding author email address: you.elamrani@um5.ac.ma

Editor

Khaliqzaman Khan
Associate Professor, School of
Business Administration, Al Dar
University College, United Arab
Emirates
kaliqzaman.khan@aue.ac

Reviewers

Reviewer 1: Mehrdad Bayat
Assistant Professor, Department of Management, Payam Noor University, Tehran,
Iran.
Email: bayatmehrdad60@pnu.ac.ir
Reviewer 2: Alinaghi Amiri
Professor, Management Department, Tehran University, Tehran, Iran.
Email: anamiri@ut.ac.ir

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

In the retrieved excerpt, the Abstract is not shown; this prevents assessing research purpose, data, ML pipeline, and main quantitative findings. Ensure the Abstract concisely states dataset/source, sample size, ML models used, validation strategy, key performance metrics, and the substantive takeaways for psychological ownership/work passion.

From broad innovation narrative to a sharp research gap. The Introduction is rich and current in citations and context (innovation ecosystems, open innovation, digital ecosystems), but it reads somewhat panoramic. It should converge faster toward a specific unresolved gap (e.g., nonlinear effects, interaction patterns, heterogeneity, or predictive prioritization) that ML uniquely addresses.

The Introduction discusses knowledge management and strategic HRM as key for innovation; however, the excerpt does not yet demonstrate how those elements integrate into the focal ML model (as controls, moderators, antecedents, or contextual variables). The manuscript would benefit from an explicit conceptual model that shows where these pieces fit.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the new document.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

Psychological ownership and work passion are signposted as the “human driver” bridge, yet the excerpt does not show clear construct definitions, dimensionality choices, or boundary conditions. The paper should define each construct, justify measurement instruments, and clarify whether passion is harmonious/obsessive and whether ownership is individual vs. collective, because these distinctions matter for innovation behavior mechanisms.

The Introduction frames innovation outcomes as driven by human capital and psychological states; the manuscript must be careful not to imply causality unless the design supports it (e.g., longitudinal, experimental, or strong quasi-experimental identification). If the study is cross-sectional/self-report (common in this domain), the language should be explicitly associative and limitations must be candid.

Because the paper explicitly foregrounds ML, it should justify why ML is necessary (nonlinearity, high-dimensional predictors, interactions, predictive accuracy) rather than using it as a rebranding of regression/SEM. A strong section is needed explaining the modeling objective and how interpretability is handled (e.g., feature importance, SHAP, partial dependence).

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the new document.

2. Revised

Editor’s decision after revisions: Accepted.

Editor in Chief’s decision: Accepted.