# Deep learning diffusion by search trend: a country-level analysis of BRICS and OECD nations

# Carlos Kazunari Takahashi

PhD candidate in International Management at Escola Superior de Propaganda e Marketing (ESPM) Rua Dr. Álvaro Alvim, 123 - Vila Mariana - São Paulo – Brazil carloskazunari@gmail.com https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3797-463X **Corresponding author** 

# Júlio César Bastos de Figueiredo

Professor of the Masters and Doctorate Program in International Management at Escola Superior de Propaganda e Marketing (ESPM), and Professor at Fundação Getulio Vargas -Escola de Administração de Empresas de São Paulo (FGV EAESP) Rua Dr. Álvaro Alvim, 123 - Vila Mariana - São Paulo – Brazil jfigueiredo@espm.br https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7359-9411

# José Eduardo Ricciardi Favaretto

Researcher and Professor in Innovation Diffusion and Data Science at Escola Superior de Propaganda e Marketing (ESPM) Rua Dr. Álvaro Alvim, 123 - Vila Mariana - São Paulo – Brazil jose.favaretto@espm.br https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0143-0809

# ABSTRACT

Innovation diffusion theory and modeling were the theoretical lenses discussed in this research, with the purpose to analyze the diffusion of the deep learning thematic in the BRICS and OECD nations.

This study brought theoretical, methodological, and practical contributions, which allowed to extend new understandings for works on the diffusion of innovations that use a thematic as the object of innovation using Search Trends.

As implications of this study, organizations can develop their business strategies more adherent to the market reality, and governments can promote the adoption of actions to stimulate the development of their global competitiveness.

# **KEYWORDS**

deep learning, innovation diffusion, search trend, country-level analysis, BRICS, google trends

## **INTRODUCTION**

Innovation diffusion modeling has become the fourth topic with the largest number of published articles between 1997-2016 in 11 journals from the academic study field of Technology and Innovation Management (TIM) (Lee and Kang, 2018). This topic is being used to analyze a multi-generational product diffusion considering the effect of customers' forward-looking behavior (Shi et al., 2014), the relationship between 'technology diffusion' and 'material diffusion' (Cheng, 2012), consumer behaviors, and the effects of a generation-specific price (Tsai, 2013), consumer groups as late-adopters (Jahanmir and Lages, 2016), and also regarding social network effects on diffusion (Hu, 2013).

The theoretical lens of Innovation Diffusion Theory (IDT) (Rogers, 2003) is also identified in academic literature in some works that used country-level analysis, for example, regarding new product diffusion considering macro-environmental variables (Talukdar et al., 2002), or about the influence of culture on diffusion (Desmarchelier and Fang, 2016; Takieddine and Sun, 2015).

This research uses the country-level as units of analysis, selecting a total of 42 countries to be studied – 37 OECD members (Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, 2020; The World Bank Group, 2020a), and 5 BRICS constituent countries (Ministry of Foreign Affairs - Brazil, 2020; South Africa Government, 2020), as detailed in Table 1.

#### Table 1

Groupings and names of the countries that were covered in this research

 Group
 Total of
 Names of all Countries
 R

Names Nations		Names of all Countries	Reference	
BRICS	5	Brazil, Russia, India, China, South Africa	(Ministry of Foreign Affairs - Brazil, 2020; South Africa Government, 2020)	
OECD	37	Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Korea, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Slovak Republic, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, United Kingdom, United States	(Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, 2020; The World Bank Group, 2020a)	

Note: OECD = Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development; BRICS = Acronym for Brazil, Russia, India, China, and South Africa.

Although the literature identifies in the works of Rogers (1976), and the authors Mahajan and Muller (1994) the intrinsic aspect that the diffusion model can be used for both products, ideas, and technology, the development of the studies in this research paradigm was mainly paved by the diffusion of products/services (Im et al., 2007; Lassar et al., 2005) - little has been developed to advance the theory of diffusion of innovations specifically using a thematic as the own innovation.

To fill this gap and expand the understanding of the diffusion of innovation studies, the authors chose the thematic of Deep Learning (DL) in the context of country-level, to address the followed research question: How to analyze the diffusion of the Deep Learning thematic in the BRICS and OECD nations?

Bass Diffusion Model (BDM) (Bass, 1969) has been analyzed and adopted until today for diffusion analysis because it has good adherence to technological diffusion (Cheng, 2012; Naseri and Elliott, 2013), and has been applied with some variations (Michalakelis et al., 2010) to understand how diffusion processes occur.

With IDT and BDM together, it is possible to identify the diffusion comparatively of innovators and imitators, understanding and analyzing this behavior based on the country-level.

DL was the thematic chosen to be used in this work because new technologies can create opportunities, such as new business solutions and business models, reform of the public sector, renewable energy sources, intelligent transport and the increased need for security as the quality of life improves for new economies (Lacasa et al., 2019; World Economic Forum, 2019), or enhance the competitiveness of already developed economies (Kong et al., 2017).

Google Trends (GT) (Google, 2020a) was set for the analysis of social behavior, because provides access to the amount of research on different terms over time, which allows the mapping of the human mind, analyzing Google users behavior (Omar et al., 2017), in observing the diffusion of a thematic. This non-traditional data source (Dos Santos, 2018) has been used for more than ten years (Jun et al., 2018) to provides up-to-date information, showing how often a term is searched for, relative to the total search volume in the specific region (Blazquez and Domenech, 2018; Jun et al., 2018).

Finally, data from the Global Innovation Index (GII) - a study from the collaboration of Cornell University, INSEAD, and the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) that inform a ranking about more innovative countries (Cornell University; INSEAD; WIPO, 2019a), was also used as an additional measurement for the countries included in this study.

## LITERATURE REVIEW

## **IDT and BDM**

According to Everett Rogers (Rogers, 2003), diffusion is a process in which: (1) an innovation, (2) is communicated through certain channels, (3) over time, and (4) among the members of a social system. Such theoretical concepts pointed out can be explained shortly: (1) Innovation can be an idea, practice, or object that is perceived as new; (2) Communication can be defined as the process in which individuals create and share information, with diffusion being a specific type of communication focused on new ideas; (3) Time can be understood as essential in the diffusion process and, although not so widely considered in other behavioral research, the adoption process cannot occur without contemplating elapsed time; and (4) Social System is also relevant to understanding diffusion and can be defined as a set of units interacting with a common goal – these theoretical concepts are also summarized in Figure 1 to help better understanding about the theoretical contribution of this work.

A mathematical diffusion model developed by Frank Bass (Bass, 1969), known as Bass Diffusion Model (BDM), was initially applied in studies to forecast product sales in marketing (Bass, 2004; Meade and Islam, 2006; Peres et al., 2010), to identify two different consumer groups: innovators - who intrinsically through information from communication for adoption,

and imitators - who, by social pressures, are more susceptible to the influence of other consumers who have already adopted an innovation.

Although in the classic work of Mahajan and Muller (1994) the concept of the diffusion of new ideas and technologies in addition to products is present, the studies that followed did not adopt such premises and focused their main research specifically on products. One of the possible explanations for the most research interests using data sources based on product sales could be because this type of data was more accessible for collection and analysis.

A study identified in the literature that explores this versatility (focusing on data sources that are not sales data) is from Cheng (2012), which uses BDM to explore the relationship between the diffusion of technology and new materials. The author used citations of patents and sales respectively to conclude that it is possible to use BDM for analysis and that the diffusion of technology has a positive effect on the diffusion of materials.

In a study that also used BDM in its design (Shi et al., 2014), among their findings, it was identified that the diffusion process of technological products of multigenerational consumption (video game consoles, computers, tablets, media player, smartphone) is changeable often by adapting the market, due to changes in the strategies adopted by the manufacturers. Following this same path, the study of Jun, Yoo, and Choi (2018) identified that the diffusion procedure for products is constantly observed the conventional approach following their life cycles, also seen in the perspective of the manufacturers. These same authors also reiterate the possibility of observing the diffusion process from the perspective of consumers.

According to the authors Meade and Islam (2006), due to the increasing availability of cross-sectional data and time series that characterize consumers, there are areas for future research in forecasting the diffusion of innovation where once there were few data. Also, the use of unstructured data was seen as a challenge in the diffusion of innovation study field to expand the dissemination of research (Peres et al., 2010).

Based on the considerations of these studies, there is a new research front to be widely studied, both in academia and in the market. In this sense, both a thematic or an idea, seen from the perspective of individuals, rather than the manufacturers - when the initial perception of innovation, that is, the search carried out with free interest, without bias, using the popular internet search tools, may result in new insights for understanding this line of research, no longer necessarily dependent on time series of product sales obtained from its manufacturers.

## **Deep Learning**

The field of Artificial Intelligence (AI) has impacted economies and different sectors, creating several opportunities and challenges, with the involvement of governments, companies, academics, and civil society organizations, interested in exploring its potential benefits, is considered an important strategic asset for countries (World Economic Forum, 2019).

DL is a machine learning technique (a subset of the AI field) that uses multiple processing layers to process raw data, learn and classify or detect patterns (LeCun, 2018; LeCun et al., 2015), an extension of research in the field of artificial neural networks (ANNs) (Chen and Lin, 2014). DL provides big data processing and impacts several areas, such as science, business, and public policy (Arulkumaran et al., 2017; LeCun et al., 2015).

Emerging technologies can be used as early-stage technologies with rapid growth and potential for socioeconomic (Rotolo et al., 2015) and scientific impact (Kwon et al., 2019).

The massive use of a search engine on the internet, by a large number of people, allows obtaining data from these "digital footprints", which can be modeled in generating forecasts (Brynjolfsson et al., 2016).

In this way, studies on innovation diffusion can help to understand how countries are positioning themselves for this emerging technology by looking at the spread of DL thematic interest at the country level. This research used the GT as a proxy, to extract data of interest from the DL thematic in the countries covered by the study.

#### **Google Trends**

Studies on the diffusion of innovation call for future research to address the issue of using data from alternative sources, such as social networks and web search engines (Peres et al., 2010). Through the interactions of people with technology in digital online platforms such as Internet search engines, Twitter, Facebook, and others, a large amount of data is generated, and Google Trends (GT) (Google, 2020a) as a source of open data, has attracted academic attention, allowing to identify possible market potential calibrated with the own interactions of users/individuals (Chumnumpan and Shi, 2019).

New data sources resulting from human interactions on the Internet has been subject to exploitation by researchers (Schaer et al., 2019), and the web search trend analysis is being used in several areas of human and social sciences, such as: in economics, to predict economic activity (Choi and Varian, 2012), unemployment rates (Askitas and Zimmermann, 2015), and financial markets (Perlin et al., 2016); in politics, to predict referendum results (Mavragani and Tsagarakis, 2016), and even in marketing, to predict consumer behavior (Goel et al., 2010) and the behavior of the diffusion of products in the market (Chumnumpan and Shi, 2019).

The authors Schaer, Nikolaos and Robert (2019) identified that the GT is adopted in most studies that use search engine traffic, to the detriment of a few studies that explored the forecasting skills of popular social media platforms, such as Instagram, Snapchat, Pinterest, LinkedIn, and YouTube. In a study by Jun, Yoo and Choi (2018), who reviewed the last decade in the development of articles that used GT, identified the expansion of research areas that used this source, with its popularization of use, and with the advantage of being accessible and free, updated and focused on the researcher's objective. The contribution of the study of Jun, Sung and Park (2017) pointed out that the potential for using search traffic (i.e. search trends) brings a new perspective in the generation of forecasts by analogies. The authors clarified that the trend identified in this traffic may suggest in advance the possible adoption of the innovation that was the focus of the study.

#### **Diffusion across countries**

As an emerging technology in the digital economy, DL can enable new business models, capture value, and generate profit for organizations (Teece, 2018), contributing to the development of countries.

The innovation diffusion literature brings studies using as a context the analysis of different countries (Desmarchelier and Fang, 2016; Takieddine and Sun, 2015; Talukdar et al.,

2002). The study by Talukdar et al. (2002) was the first to analyze macro-environmental variables at the country-level using BDM parameters, concluding that there are differences between developed and developing countries. The authors Takieddine and Sun (2015) studied why countries exhibit different levels of internet banking adoption using a sample of 33 European countries, with the results indicating that national culture is an important moderator in the diffusion of internet banking. Desmarchelier and Fang (2016), that investigated the role of national culture in shaping innovation diffusion patterns in different markets, also found significance in the influence of culture on diffusion rates.

Several researchers reiterate the need to develop new studies for the diffusion of innovation with a cross-countries approach (Chumnumpan and Shi, 2019; Jun et al., 2017; Peres et al., 2010).

Obtaining data for comparative analysis between countries is restricted by the different ways of measuring and providing reliable information by the governments of the countries, which practically is summarized to integrating social and economic data, to the detriment of other research objects (i.e deep learning).

This study compared the weighted interest of individuals in the theme of DL, at the country level (OECD and BRICS), with the data coming from the GT, which are not absolute, but with the use and analysis of the BDM makes this comparison relative and possible. Using this artifice, this research identifies a new way of communication coming from the user themselves rather than traditional forms already known, resulting in obtaining and using series of temporal data in the analysis.

## **Settings of Theoretical Context**

The main approach in the development of this study was the choice of a thematic as the innovation in the diffusion process, with other complementary approaches as illustrated by the diagram of Fig. 1.



Fig. 1. Diagram with the approaches used in this study to build the theoretical contribution

**Notes:** (a) Innovation Diffusion Theory (IDT) based on Rogers (1962, 2003) studies - concepts: (1) an innovation, (2) communication through certain channels, (3) over time, and (4) among the members of a social system; (b) Types of theoretical contribution elements (*what* and *how*), according to Whetten (1989); (c) GII = Global Innovation Index, considered an innovation index resulting from the

collaboration of Cornell University, INSEAD and the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) (2019b), used in this research as an additional mensuration for each country.

Fig. 1 summarizes the approaches adopted in this study for the construction of its theoretical contributions. In the communication of theoretical contribution made by the authors when necessary easy understanding for different audiences, using figures, tables, and other exhibits, allows the dissemination of such contribution in a more intuitive way (Crane et al., 2016).

Taking as a basis the reflections of Whetten (1989) on the possible ways to contribute to the development of a theory, as its first theoretical contribution, this study extends the 'what' element of the concept of *innovation* by using the diffusion of the DL thematic, instead of considering the diffusion process of a product, technology or service - as already explicitly recognized by the theory (Rogers, 2003, 1962). Based on the definition of thematic from the Collins English Dictionary: "thematic means concerned with the subject or theme of something, or with themes and topics in general" (Thematic, n.d.) – in this research, thematic was considered a body of topics for study or discussion.

According to Straub (2009) "(...), innovation can refer to something abstract, like an idea, it can also be concrete, like a new piece of technology" (p. 626). This reinforces that the choice of the Deep Learning thematic by the authors, seen by the theory as a form of abstract innovation and specific focus of this work, can arouse the wide interest of the community in the exploration of the diffusion of other thematics, in a variety of other researches or studies, even in different areas of knowledge.

And also does the same way, as its second theoretical contribution, when using the 'what' element of the concept of *members of a social system* – instead of the actual adoption [of a product, technology, or service] by people – as the weighted interest of people by the thematic of DL, i.e, the inhabitants of each of the studied nations, members of the BRICS or OECD.

In a complementary way, when using the time series of different nations (BRICS and OECD) obtained through a web search engine with open access (GT), instead of a proprietary data series on the consumption or actual adoption of products, technology, or services, this study identified the element 'how', also pointed out by Whetten (1989), as its third theoretical contribution, by modifying the way of the *communication process* is perceived and constructed, from the emergence of 'an innovation' (i.e., DL thematic), with the own interactions from users / individuals and their 'digital footprints' (Brynjolfsson et al., 2016) (i.e., the weighted interest of people in each country, OECD and BRICS), using a web search engine (Google, 2020b), and its relative interest trend obtained by Google Trends (GT) (Google, 2020a), as a mode or 'proxy' (Jun et al., 2017) for this diffusion process to exist.

By doing so, this study identifies a type of communication coming from the user themselves ('digital footprints'), instead of considering, for such means, the communication already recognized by the body of theoretical knowledge, i.e., IDT (Rogers, 2003, 1962) and BDM (Bass, 2004, 1969), when they mention as traditional media (example: tv, radio, newspapers, magazines, internet site, contact sales team, etc.), or influencer media (example: referral of a user, word-of-mouth from personal contacts, use of social or collaborative media, etc.).

Also comparing the BDM results with the Global Innovation Index indicator, or shortly, GII indicator (Cornell University; INSEAD; WIPO, 2019b, 2019a), considered an innovation index for each country (BRICS and OECD) – an external measurement not required by

conceptual bases of the IDT or BDM – this study could also bring new ways to link possible existence of relationships or correlations of theoretical concepts with an external and applied index, and by making use of BDM analysis in the evaluation of the diffusion peak curves of the countries, this research brought a practical contribution.

This research also provided a methodological contribution, by creating a step-by-step diagram and instrument, as shown in Fig. 2, which can be useful to assist fellow scholars in further empirical studies that investigate innovation diffusion with other thematics of interest, as a way of extending the current frontiers of knowledge on the topic of modeling the diffusion of innovations.

According to Sutton and Staw (1995), scientific journals should also be receptive to articles that test part of a theory and use data as observed empirical standards. As declared by Barney (2020): "normal science theorizing cannot be understood as just 'filling a gap,' but rather, as 'filling an important gap." (pp. 49–50). This article clearly states the declaration of its contribution, which is declared repeatedly throughout the text content, easily understood by the reader with direct and objective language (Linton, 2012), where the authors show their original contribution, both theoretical and practical, not reproducing previous studies and highlighting what is new about the work, and its substantial interest for the social science journals and management area, considering non-existent studies (Linton, 2016).

## METHOD

To follow a detailed step-by-step of the method of this research, Fig. 2 was created containing four main steps that were accomplished: (a.) Data Collect, (b.) Dataset Compilation, (c.) Data Preparation, and (d.) Statistical Modeling.



Fig. 2. The four main steps followed in the method of this research

## (a.) Data Collect

To analyze the diffusion pattern across countries were selected OECD member countries (37 countries), additionally with the BRICS member countries (5 countries). A country was considered the unit of analysis of this research.

The first step was to collect data from two sources: firstly, from a web search trend service (Google, 2020a) which was chosen the search term "deep learning" on GT, in a specific time interval, i.e., from January 2014 to March 2020, a total of 75-month measurements for each country with the same selection criteria; secondly, from the Global Innovation Index (GII), an index resulting from the collaboration of Cornell University, INSEAD and the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) (2019b, 2019a) - a secondary data source available for consultation on each country's innovation index/score.

The specific choice of GT by the researchers was due to be the most used search engine in the world (Brynjolfsson et al., 2016), and allow the criterion of query search could have the occurrence in the vast majority of countries (Choi and Varian, 2012).

≡	Google Trends Explore			
	• deep learning Search term		+ Compare	
	Worldwide 👻 1/1/14	3/31/20 ▼ All categories	<ul> <li>Web Searc</li> </ul>	h 🔻

Fig. 3. Google Trends (GT) input options with filter interface

It proceeded a sequence of five configurations in GT interface (i.e. <u>https://trends.google.com/trends/explore?hl=en&date=2014-01-01%202020-03-</u>

<u>31&q=deep%20learning</u>), as informed in Fig. 3: 1) the search term (or keywords) in the query search was chosen as "Deep Learning"; 2) the geographical filter, indicated as "Worldwide" in Fig. 3, was modified specifically with the name of each of the 42 countries chosen for the study; 3) the date range of the search, was from 01/01/2014 to 03/31/2020; 4) the categories like "All categories" and finally, 5) search type like "Web Search".

Using these criteria to analyze 42 countries, the Czech Republic and Iceland were withdrawn because there were no relevant searches on "deep learning" on GT to show the results.

# (b.) Dataset Compilation

The second step was the compilation and organization of a dataset with raw data from a list of 40 countries left, where 5 BRICS nations and 35 OECD members.

The data are generated individually by country, monthly, and relative to the degree of interest. These data are adjusted by GT in two ways: (i) first the search is relativized by the total number of searches for other subjects, considering the amount of data in a given interval of time, and (ii) after that the GT normalizes with the time specified in the selection, setting the point of most interest in time as 100 and updating the rest of the time points according to this parameter. Fig. 4 shows an example of data extraction, considering BRICS nations.



**Fig. 4.** Example of data extraction about Deep Learning search interest in BRICS nations, in the period from January 2014 to March 2020.

**Notes**: WI = Weighted Interest for a specific country's population, is a measure in percentage value (%). This percentage value changes each time the initial and final intervals of data extraction are modified, as these data are weighted, ranging from 0 (minimum value) to 100 (maximum value).

Due to a feature of the GT data generation system, there are situations it considers some data with value "<1". So, the authors decided to replace "<1" values with "0", to be imported and processed into data analysis tools. After that, Latvia, Luxembourg, and Slovakia, three OECD members, were removed from the dataset for having more than thirty missing data in their extracted data series.

Reiterating this process, after data extraction and compilation, five nations were withdrawn from the study - two nations (Czech Republic and Iceland) had insufficient data relevance, and three other nations (Latvia, Luxembourg, and Slovakia) had excessive missing data, then totalizing 37 countries in the final compilation of the research dataset.

#### (c.) Data Preparation

As a third step, from the dataset compiled for the research, it was necessary to perform two adjustments to the data format, due to the request of each technique to be used in the statistical analysis step – the following step (d.) of this method.

To prepare the data for the execution of the cluster analysis (first adjustment), to avoid the imprecise comparison between all countries (Kupfer and Zorn, 2019), it was performed statistical standardization of the dataset, when viewed in an integrated way for the 75 monthly measurements from all 37 countries together, with the subtraction of the mean and division by the standard deviation.

To prepare the data for the analysis of the Bass model (second adjustment), for each country, individually, the data series obtained from GT (the 75 monthly measurements) - that are not absolute values, because they are normalized concerning the maximum volume of the series which is 100 - were converted proportionally, using the specific series for each country, dividing the monthly value by the total sum of this same series.

So, this new series obtained now, with the calculated proportional monthly value, have a sum of values equal to 1, to each one of 37 countries.

## (d.) Statistical Modeling

The fourth and last step of the method was the statistical modeling. Two different models of analysis were necessary to understand how similarities and differences in the diffusion processes of the *deep learning* thematic in the BRICS and OECD countries

The first statistical model used was the clustering method, to identify similarities between countries (pairwise distances between data items) and to find groups. In the execution of the *hierarchical cluster analysis* procedure using *Orange Data Mining* software (Demšar et al., 2013; Godec et al., 2019), the *ward* linkage method was chosen (Ward, 1963), with the *manhattan* normalized distance metric.

The second statistical model used was the *Bass diffusion model* (Bass, 1969), to identify the comparison between all countries, considering three measurements: the diffusion peak, the innovation coefficient (p), and the imitation coefficient (q).

From the mathematical formulation created by Bass to use diffusion series with accumulated data, as shown in Eq.(1):

$$S(t) = K \frac{1 - e^{-(p+q)t}}{\frac{q}{1 + (\frac{q}{p})e}}$$
(1)

where, the function S(t) represent p the total accumulated individuals who have already adopted/accepted an innovation (in this research, the interest in a thematic or idea), at time t; p is the innovation coefficient (individual's intrinsic tendency to adopt the innovation), q is the coefficient of imitation (contagion force by social pressures), and K is the carrying capacity (maximum size of the target population that can be achieved), other mathematical transformations were carried out.

As the study interest was in the variation (rate) of the diffusion of *Deep Learning* thematic, to be analyzed in different countries, it was possible to adopt the maximum value of K = 1, and to use the differentiation of the Eq.(1) mentioned, to generate the noncumulative distribution, resulting in Eq.(2), given by the following steps:

$$\frac{dS(t)}{dt} = (K - S(t))(p + q\frac{S(t)}{K})$$
$$\frac{dS(t)}{dt} = p(K - S(t)) + q(K - S(t))\frac{S(t)}{K}$$
$$\frac{dS(t)}{dt} = p(1 - S(t)) + q(1 - S(t))S(t)$$
$$\frac{dS(t)}{dt} = \frac{p(p + q)^2 e^{-(p + q)t}}{(p + q e^{-(p + q)t})^2}$$
(2)

Besides the Eq.(2), which is also detailed discussed in innovation diffusion literature (Mahajan et al., 1990b, 1990a), it is possible to calculate the noncumulative adopter distribution peak, at time  $T^*$ , by Eq.(3), that occurs when:

$$T^* = peak = -\frac{1}{(p+q)} \ln\left(\frac{p}{q}\right) \quad (3)$$

In this study, the statistical results of the three coefficients estimated by the Bass model (p, q, peak, and their significance levels) were obtained using Nonlinear Least Squares (NLS) procedure (Meade and Islam, 2006) with the R software (R Core Team, 2020). The diffusion curves of the countries and the correlation diagram of the variables were generated by the R software, while the dendrogram, the geographic maps, and the dispersion diagrams were generated with the *Orange Data Mining* software.

Also, was used *GII score* data from the *Global Innovation Index* (GII) (Cornell University; INSEAD; WIPO, 2019b), which measures the level of innovation in the countries.

## RESULTS

Based on the execution of the *hierarchical clustering* procedure, it was constructed the corresponding clustering and then visualized in a dendrogram, as shown in Fig. 5.



Fig. 5. Dendrogram of four clusters (C1, C2, C3, and C4) obtained with the research data

Note: Based on the Deep Learning thematic search interest (BRICS and OECD members), from January 2014 to March 2020; N=37 (except for countries Czech Republic, Iceland, Latvia, Luxembourg, and Slovakia).

Fig. 5 shows that cluster 1 (C1, 6 countries) is formed by two BRICS countries, South Africa and China, and by the other four countries (New Zealand, Norway, Denmark, and Greece). In cluster 2 (C2, 12 countries) are grouped the main economies of the OECD, the United States (USA), United Kingdom (UK), France, Germany, and Japan, and other seven countries. Cluster 3 (C3, 2 countries) is formed only by Estonia and Lithuania and finally, the other three BRICS countries (Brazil, India, and Russia), appeared in cluster 4 (C4, 17 countries), along with other countries in Latin America and Europe.

Another intuitive way of presenting the results of the cluster analysis [with the visualization of the country groupings] is by displaying the world geopolitical map, as shown in Fig. 6.



Fig. 6. Geopolitical world map showing clustered groupings and detailed outline of the European continent.

As seen in Fig. 6, cluster 1 (C1) is the most geographically dispersed, with nations spread across four continents (Europe, Africa, Asia, and Oceania), with no apparent connection. In cluster 2 (C2), 58.3% of the group consists of seven European countries (Belgium, France, Germany, Ireland, Netherlands, Switzerland, and United Kingdom) and the remainder (41.7%),

consists of five countries (Australia, Canada, Japan, South Korea, and the United States) bordering the Pacific Ocean.

In cluster 3 (C3), which was formed only by Estonia and Lithuania, both countries considered Baltic states, and finally, cluster 4 (C4) consists of three BRICS member countries (Brazil, India, and Russia), three other Latin American countries (Chile, Colombia, and Mexico), and eleven other countries (Austria, Finland, Hungary, Israel, Italy, Poland, Portugal, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, and Turkey), mostly European countries.

By integrating the results of the statistical models used in this research and the data from the GII score, it was possible to elaborate Table 2.

#### Table 2.

id	country	cluster	GII_score	p_Bass	q_Bass	peak (time)
1	Australia	C2	50.3	0.0008986	0.0826810	54.1
2	Austria	C4	50.9	0.0007827**	0.0817768	56.3
3	Belgium	C2	50.2	0.0007117	0.0877859	54.4
4	Brazil	C4	33.8	0.0003064	0.1006571	57.4
5	Canada	C2	53.9	0.0006889	0.0882885	54.5
6	Chile	C4	36.6	0.0003180**	0.0999629	57.3
7	China	C1	54.8	0.0014849	0.0825330	47.8
8	Colombia	C4	33.0	0.0001833**	0.1031665	61.3
9	Denmark	C1	58.4	0.0010194	0.0789050	54.4
10	Estonia	C3	50.0	0.0016489*	0.0659346	54.6
11	Finland	C4	59.8	0.0011022	0.0775769	54.1
12	France	C2	54.2	0.0005789	0.0887267	56.3
13	Germany	C2	58.2	0.0005634	0.0900551	56.0
14	Greece	C1	38.9	0.0011845	0.0740519	55.0
15	Hungary	C4	44.5	0.0008394	0.0803998	56.2
16	India	C4	36.6	0.0003946	0.0921502	58.9
17	Ireland	C2	56.1	0.0010376	0.0830967	52.1
18	Israel	C4	57.4	0.0007706	0.0862402	54.2
19	Italy	C4	46.3	0.0005416	0.0893864	56.8
20	Japan	C2	54.7	0.0023159	0.0705841	46.9
21	Lithuania	C3	41.5	0.0012107*	0.0749115	54.2
22	Mexico	C4	36.1	0.0004502	0.0902426	58.4
23	Netherlands	C2	61.4	0.0008115	0.0837711	54.8
24	NewZealand	C1	49.6	0.0012386	0.0750143	53.8
25	Norway	C1	51.9	0.0010240	0.0786206	54.5
26	Poland	C4	41.3	0.0005797	0.0895694	55.9
27	Portugal	C4	44.6	0.0002965	0.0991460	58.4
28	Russia	C4	37.6	0.0007570	0.0831109	56.0
29	Slovenia	C4	45.3	0.0012885*	0.0692714	56.5
30	South Africa	C1	34.0	0.0009356**	0.0807443	54.6
31	South Korea	C2	56.6	0.0012622	0.0750161	53.6

List of countries and their specific characteristics resulting from this research

32	Spain	C4	47.9	0.0006182	0.0887010	55.6
33	Sweden	C4	63.7	0.0009354	0.0845617	52.7
34	Switzerland	C2	67.2	0.0007094	0.0862221	55.2
35	Turkey	C4	36.9	0.0002226	0.1017565	60.1
36	United Kingdom	C2	61.3	0.0009662	0.0804839	54.3
37	USA	C2	61.7	0.0009835	0.0824653	53.1

Source: Elaborated by the authors based on research data

**Notes**: 'no marks' p<0.001, '\*\*' p<0.01, '\*' p<0.05, '.' p<0.10, ns = not significant; Statistical significance was estimated using R software (R Core Team, 2020).

Table 2 summarizes the information from the *hierarchical cluster analysis* (C1, C2, C3, and C4), the *GII score* (level of innovation), the *Bass diffusion model* - p\_Bass (coefficient of innovation), q\_Bass (coefficient of imitation), and peak (country diffusion peak) with the statistical significance of each coefficient, for each of the 37 study countries.

The five nations identified with the largest innovation coefficients (p\_Bass), significant at p<0.001, were: Japan, China, South Korea, New Zealand, and Greece, located into cluster C1 or cluster C2, and the five nations identified with the lowest p\_Bass, also significant at p<0.001, were respectively: Turkey, Portugal, Brazil, India, Mexico - all of them located in cluster C4.

On the other hand, the five countries with the highest imitation coefficient (q\_Bass) identified in the study were Turkey, Brazil, Portugal, India e Mexico, all belonging to cluster C4 and, and the five countries with the lowest p\_Bass were, Japan (C2), Greece (C1), New Zealand (C1), South Korea (C2), and Finland (C4).

To further explore the numeric variables of the study (GII score, p\_Bass, q\_Bass, and peak), a correlation table between the variables was presented in Fig. 8.



**Fig. 8.** Correlation between the GII\_score, the coefficient of innovation (p\_Bass), the coefficient of imitation (q Bass), and the Bass model curve peak

Fig. 8 shows that all relationships between variables are statistically significant, the variable GII\_score has a weak correlation to the variables p\_Bass (0.40) and q\_Bass (-0.38), and a negative and moderate correlation with the variable peak (-0.58), which may suggest the more grows the GII\_score, the peak value of diffusion decreases, ie the time due to the diffusion curve reaches its peak is lower. The other associations between the variables peak and p\_Bass (-0.83), and q\_Bass and p\_Bass (-0.89), both strong and negative, are confirmed by theoretical concepts.

One way to identify the results of the BDM in this study and graphically visualize the diffusion curve of the DL thematic interest from countries can be represented by Fig. 7.



Fig. 7. Example of the real data and its fit with the Bass model diffusion curve

Fig. 7 shows an example of the real data and its fit of the diffusion curve after using the BDM to the country Brazil, a BRIC nation. In this example, the points displayed in blue color represent the history of real data (actual), measured monthly, identified by noncumulative *proportional values* (y-axis) series. The *estimated curve* (fitted) generated by the model (Bell curve) is represented by the black bold line. The green dotted line indicates the *peak marking* of the curve, with the measurement value of the x-axis (number of months) being the time elapsed in the diffusion process (57.4), represented by the measurement of the respective month.

This type of graphic exploration exemplified by Fig.7 was carried out in the following section, bringing a comparative analysis between the five BRICS countries and the five largest economies of the OECD.

## ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

In this work, a new way of analyzing the diffusion of innovation of a thematic in a group of countries (OECD and BRICS) was presented, using the thematic of DL in the exemplification

of this context. To enable comparison and analysis between countries, research trend data were used obtained by GT, and the statistical models of cluster analysis (to determine the groupings of countries) and the BDM model (to obtain the coefficients of innovation, imitation, and the peak of the diffusion curve) were applied. The graphic constructions of scatterplots (Fig. 11) were also used data from GII *score* (which measures the level of innovation in countries), as an indicator obtained from a secondary data source, which allowed to generate interpretations of the theoretical results of this study, additionally with an external indicator.

#### **Cross-country comparison and analysis**

Despite the results obtained by the cluster analysis, which allowed to group the main OECD economies in cluster 2 (C2, United States, United Kingdom, France, Germany, Japan, and other seven countries), as well as the BRICS member countries appeared in cluster 1 (C1, China and South Africa, plus other 4 countries) and cluster 4 (C4, Brazil, Russia, and India, plus other 14 countries), by the researchers' choice, the following analyzes and discussions were intensified in the findings of BDM.

From the initial month measured by this research (January / 2014), and as shown in Table 2, the values of the diffusion peaks of each country varied from 46.9 months (November / 2017), the lowest value, associated with Japan, up to 61.3 months (February / 2019), the highest value, associated with Colombia.

For comparative analysis between the five BRICS member countries (Brazil, Russia, India, China, and South Africa), where China and India, represent the second and fifth economies in the world respectively, the researchers chose the five OECD member countries representing, in order, the largest economies in this bloc (USA, Japan, Germany, United Kingdom, France (The World Bank Group, 2020b).

One way to compare and analyze the diffusion of innovation across countries is to use the variation of the peak of the diffusion curve, which commonly follows a bell-shaped curve (Geroski, 2000), and graphically in this case (Fig. 9 and Fig. 10), shows on the Y-axis (ranging from 0 to 1) the non-cumulative proportion of interest in the DL thematic of the population of a certain country versus the time spent in this diffusion, measured on the X-axis (ranging from 0 = January / 2014, to 74 = March / 2020, a total of 75 measurements) for the number of months in the evaluated period.



**Fig. 9.** Diffusion bell-shape curve to the BRICS members – Brazil, Russia, India, China, and South Africa (Ministry of Foreign Affairs - Brazil, 2020; South Africa Government, 2020)

Notes: Actual data (blue points) - obtained from GT, fitted data (a black bell-shaped curve), and diffusion peak (green dotted line) - obtained from BDM.



**Fig. 10.** Diffusion bell-shape curve to the five largest economies of the OECD members – USA, Japan, Germany, United Kingdom, and France (The World Bank Group, 2020b)

Notes: Actual data (blue points) - obtained from GT, fitted data (a black bell-shaped curve), and diffusion peak (green dotted line) - obtained from BDM.

Fig. 9 and Fig. 10 show, respectively, the diffusion bell-shape curve to the BRICS members – Brazil, Russia, India, China, and South Africa (Ministry of Foreign Affairs - Brazil, 2020; South Africa Government, 2020), and to the five largest economies of the OECD members – USA, Japan, Germany, United Kingdom, France (The World Bank Group, 2020b). The lower the peaks, the faster the speed of the country in which the DL thematic is disseminated.

It was identified that in the BRICS member countries, the lowest peak was China (47.8), and for the OECD member countries, the lowest peak was Japan (46.9). This demonstrates that in these two countries the diffusion of innovation as measured by the DL thematic was faster than the others, reaching its peak in the months of December / 2017 and November / 2017 respectively.

As for the other countries of each block, the peaks in BRICS (ie respectively in the countries South Africa, Russia, Brazil, India), ranging from 54.6 (July / 2018) to 58.9 (November / 2018) - at least seven months after the peak of diffusion occurred in China, and in the five largest OECD economies, the peaks range from 53.1 (June / 2018) to 56.3 (September / 2018), in order, in the countries the USA, United Kingdom, Germany, France, and, in the same way, the diffusion occurred in these other OECD countries, at least seven months after the peak of diffusion in Japan.

When observing a comparison of the average between the variation of the diffusion peaks of the DL thematic among these five countries of the two blocks (ie, BRICS and OECD), this study demonstrated that the five BRICS experience a slower DL interest rate, on average 2.9% more to be achieved (54.9 against 53.3 months) compared to the five largest OECD economies. This finding differs from the study of Talukdar et al. (2002), which also used BDM in its analyzes, where it was identified that in developing countries the peak sales of a set of products takes an average of 17.9% more to be achieved (19.25 against 16.33 years) when compared to developed countries.

Regarding the quality adjustment of the BDM (actual data versus fitted data), it was identified by Fig.9, that among the BRICS members, India obtained the best fit in the diffusion curve, and among the five OECD countries evaluated by Fig. 10, both USA and Germany also had the best adjustments.

According to a study by the authors Desmarchelier and Fang (2016), the increase in connectivity in a globalized world, intensified by new technologies, can promote the acceleration of diffusion rates in all markets - this result was corroborated by this research when identified the average peak of the diffusion of the DL thematic in the BRICS as 54.9 months, and of 53.3 months in the five largest economies of the OECD, presenting a difference of only 1.6 months between these countries.

With the results presented in Table 2, the scatterplots (a) and (b) of Fig. 11 were created, with the innovation coefficients ( $p_Bass$ ) on the horizontal axis, and the imitation coefficients ( $q_Bass$ ) on the vertical axis.



Fig. 11. Relationship between the coefficients of innovation (p\_Bass) and imitation (q\_Bass)

**Notes**: two types of marks - circle to BRICS or cross to OECD nations; two different variables (GII score and BDM Peak) to scatterplot color legends (a) GII score and (a) BDM Peak; the country names and id number (obtained from Table 2) were highlighted by the arrows.

In Fig. 11, the colors used in the legends of each of the scatterplots, allowed to compare two types of continuous numerical measurements, with the graph (a) highlighting the *GII score*, and graph (b) the BDM Peak.

In the scatterplot (a) the arrows highlight the positions of the countries belonging to the BRICS, with the GII *score* ranging from 33.8 (Brazil) to 54.8 (China). The lowest identified value of the innovation coefficient (p\_Bass) of all BRICS countries is Brazil (0.0003064, p<0.001), and the highest is China (0.0014849, p<0.001). Excluding China, the *GII score* of other BRICS countries, where Russia is the second-best placed (37.6), is less than at least 28 OECD countries, corresponding to 87.5% of the OECD countries assessed in the study (28/32).

In the scatterplot (b) the arrows highlight the positions of the countries that integrate the five largest economies of the OECD (USA, Japan, Germany, United Kingdom, France), with the measurement of the BDM Peak of these countries ranging from 46.9 (Japan) to 56.3 (France). The lowest identified value of the innovation coefficient (p\_Bass) between these five OECD countries is Germany (0.0005634, p<0.001) and the highest is Japan (0.0023159, p<0.001). Similarly, when excluding China, the BDM Peak of 15 OECD countries (46.9% of the 32 OECD countries in this study), when compared to that of South Africa - the second-best placed among the BRICS, with a value of 54.6, is inferior to the other BRICS countries.

When observed by the imitation coefficient (q\_Bass), among all 37 countries in this study (5 BRICS and 32 OECD), five countries were identified as the most imitators, in this order: Colombia (0.1031665, p <0.01), Turkey (0.1017565, p <0.001), Brazil (0.1006571, p <0.001), Chile (0.0999629, p <0.01), and Portugal (0.099146, p <0.001). Four of these countries (Colombia, Turkey, Brazil, and Chile) have a very low *GII score*, ranging from 33 to 36.9, among the lowest identified in the study, while Portugal has a *GII score* value of 44.6.

As the *GII score* measures the level of innovation in a country, in these five countries observed in the upper left positions of the graph in Fig. 11 (a), when aspects of the theoretical bodies of IDT and BDM are also integrated, it is possible to state that the higher the value of q\_Bass, the more slowly the process of diffusion of innovation occurs, and thus, characterizing the country as less innovative.

Among the BRICS, Brazil was considered the least innovative country in the diffusion process of the DL thematic, and Colombia was the least innovative among OECD countries.

It was identified that among all the countries in the study, Japan (p\_Bass = 0.0023159, p<0.001) and China (p\_Bass = 0.0014849, p<0.001), had the lowest BDM Peaks, respectively 46.9 and 47.8, and in this sense, by observing the theoretical aspects and the rightmost positions of the graph in Fig. 11 (b), it can be considered that the countries that have the fastest diffusion process on the DL thematic are the most innovative.

It was identified by Fig.12, by the two Boxplot charts, the comparison of the measurements of the *GII score* (an innovation indicator), external to the research, with the measurements of the BDM Peak (Bass diffusion model curve peak), obtained by the study itself.



Fig. 12. Comparative Boxplots between GII score and BDM Peak measurements

**Notes**: the yellow mark indicates the median of the distributions; (c) *GII score* measure – in the BRICS ranging from 33.8 to 54.8, and for OECD countries ranging from 33 to 67.2; (d) BDM Peak measure – in the BRICS ranging from 47.8 to 58.9, and for OECD countries ranging from 46.9 to 61.3;

By Fig.12 (c), when observed by the *GII score*, which in this study ranged from 33 (Colombia) to 67.2 (Switzerland), characterized as a detailed indicator that follows a complex methodology, when excluding Colombia (33) and China (54.8), the other BRICS countries, that is, Brazil (33.8), South Africa (34), India (36.6), and Russia (37.6), when compared to OECD countries, are less dispersed and worst ranked in the ordered list of the 37 countries included in the study.

In contrast, by Fig.12 (d), when observed by the BDM Peak measuring, which in this study ranged from 46.9 (Japan) to 61.3 (Colombia), characterized as an accessible, up-to-date, and specifically targeted measurement, no discrepant statistical differences were found between the dispersions of the countries in the two blocs (BRICS and OECD), with the approximation of the mean values between the BRICS (54.9) and OECD (55.2), and also the median between the BRICS (56) and OECD (54.7).

While the GII score is a more complete indicator, which takes into account several characteristics of countries, both social and economic, the BDM Peak in this study only measures the interest of users in a given thematic.

Thus, with the measurement of BDM Peak, it is possible to notice little difference in the comparison between BRICS and OECD, because the interest in a thematic does not imply in

the adoption or acquisition of any product or service, disregarding the purchasing power of a population, and resulting in a more genuine interpretation of the interest of a country's population.

Another form to visualize the location of the all countries analyzed in this study, in the world geopolitical map, based on the measurement of the BDM Peak of the diffusion curve for each of these, is shown by Fig.13.



Fig. 13. Geopolitical world map showing BDM peak intervals to BRICS and OECD nations studied in this research

By Fig.13, the only two countries in dark blue are Japan (at the peak time of 46.9 months, ie November / 2017), belonging to the group of the five largest OECD economies, and China (at the time of 47.8, ie December / 2017) as a member of the BRICS.

Despite the study by Desmarchelier and Fang (2016), which identified that countries culturally "close" to Anglo-Saxon cultures are the most likely to experience rapid diffusion processes, while Latin Americans are less, this study demonstrated that countries with Anglo-Saxon cultures (Ireland, USA, New Zealand, Australia, United Kingdom, Canada, South Africa) had the average BDM Peak in 53.8 months, while countries of Latin American cultures (Chile, Brazil, Colombia) had the average of BDM in 58.7 Peak, being found only a small difference between them (4.3%).

## **Theoretical contributions**

This research brought three theoretical contributions to the studies of Innovation Diffusion Theory (IDT).

The *first* theoretical contribution was the use of a thematic as an innovative object of analysis of the IDT, instead of considering the diffusion process of a product, technology, or service. The thematic allows us to carry out numerous analyses of the diffusion of concepts and

ideas when it is not possible to use tangible data in sales or adoption. To exemplify, in this study, it was used the thematic of Deep Learning (DL), because is no feasible way to capture sales or production data about DL.

Few studies identified in the literature have used other information besides sales data as a proxy, such as patents (Cheng, 2012), programming language within source codes font (Papagiannidis et al., 2015), and the adoption of ethical behaviors (Ganglmair-Wooliscroft and Wooliscroft, 2016), and they brought alternative forms for the analysis of the diffusion process, but these works used ad hoc data, making these studies little applied to other contexts.

The contribution of this work, which focused on the diffusion of a thematic such as the *innovation* or the new innovative object, incorporated into the theoretical body of the IDT an important and versatile way of carrying out new analyzes for diffusion processes in different contexts.

The *second* theoretical contribution of this work is the expansion of understanding of what the theory considers as a social system of mutual attraction, through the use of interest of a population in a particular thematic, not necessarily this population considered a member of a social system of adopters or buyers of any product or service.

In this study, it was used the weighted interest of thematic of DL by the inhabitants of each of the studied nations, members of the BRICS or OECD, these considered by theory, the *members of the social system*, those people who were interested in the thematic of DL, rather than, similarly, having adopted or bought some product, service or technology.

This new approach to the weighted interest of a population confirms that it is an alternative to the 'what' (Whetten, 1989) of the concept of *members of a social system* in the innovation diffusion theory.

Finally, as a *third* theoretical contribution, this research identified a new way of how communication works or is seen implicitly, without direct dependence on other known communication sources (mass media and social pressure) by modifying the way the *communication process* is perceived and constructed, with the own interactions from users / individuals and their 'digital footprints' (Blazquez and Domenech, 2018), i.e., the weighted interest of people in each country, OECD and BRICS, using a web search engine which also has trend analysis feature, as one way or proxy for the existence of this diffusion process.

In a complementary way, when using the time series of different nations (BRICS and OECD) obtained through a web search engine trend with open access, instead of a proprietary data series on the consumption or actual adoption of products, technology, or services, it demonstrates the intrinsic or spontaneous interest of people when searching in a web search engine like Google (Google, 2020b), that also generates the relative weighting of these searches as Google Trends (GT) (Google, 2020c), i.e, the own concept of a population's weighted interest.

This theoretical contribution identified the element 'how', also pointed out by Whetten (1989) as made it possible to change the way of pointing out the relationships between forms of communication, previously only perceived through the actions of the mass media and social pressure, and now being able to be analyzed in a new way through 'digital footprints'.

## Methodological contribution

As a complementary contribution to the study of innovation diffusion modeling, this research brought a significant methodological contribution to this field, by detailing the step by step of a methodological procedure followed, starting with the obtaining of raw data such as

time series, coming from a search engine for free and open use (Google Trends), followed by the standardization of data that would allow it to be clustered among the nations studied (members of the BRICS and OECD), and additionally using Bass's first derivative equation, which results in the identification of a Bell curve (noncumulative proportions) instead of an Scurve (accumulated values), by using percentage measurements, to the detriment of subtotaled (summed) measurements, commonly used in other studies already known in the literature.

Although the GT does not report absolute data, it was possible to analyze the weighted data of interest from a population on specific thematic (not tangible) and their variation over time, and also to demonstrate how the data from the search trend fits well with Bass's mathematical model, making it possible to accurately calculate comparable coefficients, i.e. the innovation (p) and imitation (q) coefficients, allowing to understand the diffusion of 37 countries analyzed.

This aspect also allows the comparison of countries considering only the people who are interested in the researched thematic, presenting a more realistic perspective of how that innovation was spread over time. Other researchers will be able to investigate something that has not even been adopted yet, as a way of interest for the possible adoption [of the innovation] (Jun et al., 2018, 2017), or identify possible market potential calibrated with the own interactions of users / individuals (Chumnumpan and Shi, 2019), such as an "anticipated" and "exploratory" diffusion process, obtained from spontaneous manifestations by people, in an accessible and democratic way.

This methodological contribution is scientifically useful to broaden the academic debate (Crane et al., 2016) about 'digital footprints' and the derivations from these studies.

#### **Pratical contribution**

Analyzes extracted from "digital footprints" identified that the procedure for diffusing an innovation can be driven by the perception of individuals (ie, the population of a country) when interacting spontaneously with digital tools on the Internet (ie, web search), with externalization interest about a thematic, idea or new knowledge.

Thus, from the perspective of individuals rather than organizations, which usually use sales data series for their products or services, BDM analysis can no longer be used based only on these series provided by organizations. With the use of this artifice, companies will be able to predict the population's interest in a specific innovation and build their country-level positioning process for their products, services, strategy development, etc., according to the elapsed time identified at the peak of the diffusion curve of those countries selected by the company.

While the traditional approach (i.e. use of time series of goods and services) has focused on the life cycle of a product or service, and with the evaluation of this process seen from the perspective of organizations (Jun et al., 2018), the practical contribution of this study reinforces that the process of diffusion of a thematic can be seen from the perspective of the individuals in a population of a country.

Due to constant market changes, the drivers of diffusion have also been constantly changing, and in turn, influencing new products in the current market (Shi et al., 2014). Following this path, this study also brought another practical contribution which reflects in the identification of the acceleration of diffusion, when analyzing the peaks of the innovation diffusion curves of different countries and comparing them to an external indicator (ie GII score), generated annually and used by governments to compare their developments.

In a world with a growing demand for the practical utility of academic work (Crane et al., 2016), this research identified that while the *GII score* integrates important indicators, with coverage for several countries, its elaboration follows a broad and complex methodology, on the other hand, BDM Peak analyzes bring advantages of immediacy when allowing the realization in the desired time, up-to-date and directed to a thematic, idea, knowledge, technology, etc. of interest to researchers, whether individuals, organizations, societies or governments.

### STUDY LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE STUDIES

This research has identified limitations in obtaining and compiling data from the GT, on the DL thematic, from a total of 42 countries originally belonging to the study (5 members of the BRICS and 37 members of the OECD).

In the data collection stage, two nations, Czech Republic and Iceland, due to the low interest of the thematic in these countries, did not generate sufficient data availability during the study period. In the dataset compilation stage of the raw data from three other countries, Latvia, Luxembourg, and Slovakia, an excess of null values or missing data were identified in the time series. Thus, the researchers chose to remove these five countries from the research, remaining with a total of 37 countries in the study.

To motivate future studies and encourage new questions (Linton, 2016), the researchers suggest three new paths to follow: 1) explore and consolidate the methodology that has been described in detail in this study, using other thematics and research problems, freely chosen by fellow scholars; 2) isolate the effect of a population's purchasing power, considering similar interest levels on a given thematic, compared to certain sales series (or adoption) of products or services acquired (or adopted) by that population; 3) generate theoretical contribution and theoretical development for IDT based on the *why* element (Whetten, 1989), considering causal approaches depending on the diffusion process according to the economic stage of a population, which is located in different geographical regions, in groups of nations, or some cities of the world.

#### CONCLUSION

This study analyzed the diffusion of the thematic of Deep Learning from member nations of the BRICS and OECD, using data obtained from the Google Trends and the Global Innovation Index, with the support of the theoretical framework of the Innovation Diffusion Theory and the Bass Diffusion Model.

In the main findings of this research, it was identified that China is the country with the highest innovation coefficient among the members of the BRICS, and Japan among the members of the OECD. On the other hand, Brazil is the country with the highest imitation coefficient among the BRICS countries, and Colombia, among the OECD nations.

Considering the peak of the diffusion of innovation through the Bell curves of each nation, no discrepant statistical differences were identified between the dispersions of the two groups of countries (BRICS and OECD), which may mean a more genuine interpretation of the interest of the population of a country in a thematic, not implying the adoption or acquisition of any product or service.

This study brought to the academic community in the study field of the Innovation Diffusion Theory, theoretical, methodological, and practical contributions, which allowed to extend new understandings for works on the diffusion of innovations that use a thematic as the object of innovation, and the data series of the diffusion process as the weighted interest of a given population in a country.

As implications of this study, organizations now have access to a methodological procedure to generate the prediction of the interest of innovation, according to a specific population, enabling the development of business strategies more adherent to the market reality. Governments will also be able to take advantage of this study to identify, in the comparison of results between nations, perceptions that promote the adoption of actions to stimulate the development of their global competitiveness.

## REFERENCES

- Arulkumaran, K., Deisenroth, M.P., Brundage, M., Bharath, A.A., 2017. Deep reinforcement learning: A brief survey. IEEE Signal Process. Mag. 34, 26–38. https://doi.org/10.1109/MSP.2017.2743240
- Askitas, N., Zimmermann, K.F., 2015. Health and well-being in the great recession. Int. J. Manpow. 36, 26–47. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJM-12-2014-0260
- Barney, J.B., 2020. Contributing to theory: opportunities and challenges. Acad. Mark. Sci. Rev. 10, 49–55. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13162-020-00163-y
- Bass, F.M., 2004. Comments on "A New Product Growth for Model Consumer Durables The Bass Model." Manage. Sci. 50, 1833–1840. https://doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.1040.0300
- Bass, F.M., 1969. A New Product Growth for Model Consumer Durables. Manage. Sci. 15, 215–227. https://doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.15.5.215
- Blazquez, D., Domenech, J., 2018. Big Data sources and methods for social and economic analyses. Technol. Forecast. Soc. Change 130, 99–113. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2017.07.027
- Brynjolfsson, E., Geva, T., Reichman, S., 2016. Crowd-Squared: Amplifying the Predictive Power of Search Trend Data. MIS Q. 40, 941–961. https://doi.org/10.25300/MISQ/2016/40.4.07
- Chen, X.W., Lin, X., 2014. Big data deep learning: Challenges and perspectives. IEEE Access 2, 514–525. https://doi.org/10.1109/ACCESS.2014.2325029
- Cheng, A.-C., 2012. Exploring the relationship between technology diffusion and new material diffusion: The example of advanced ceramic powders. Technovation 32, 163–167. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.technovation.2011.10.008
- Choi, H., Varian, H., 2012. Predicting the Present with Google Trends. Econ. Rec. 88, 2–9. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-4932.2012.00809.x
- Chumnumpan, P., Shi, X., 2019. Understanding new products' market performance using Google Trends. Australas. Mark. J. 27, 91–103. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ausmj.2019.01.001

Cornell University; INSEAD; WIPO, 2019a. Global Innovation Index - Report.

- Cornell University; INSEAD; WIPO, 2019b. Analysis Explore the interactive database of the gii-2019 indicators [WWW Document]. URL https://www.globalinnovationindex.org/analysis-indicator (accessed 6.5.20).
- Crane, A., Henriques, I., Husted, B.W., Matten, D., 2016. What Constitutes a Theoretical Contribution in the Business and Society Field? Bus. Soc. 55, 783–791. https://doi.org/10.1177/0007650316651343
- Demšar, J., Curk, T., Erjavec, A., Gorup, Č., Hočevar, T., Milutinovič, M., Možina, M., Polajnar, M., Toplak, M., Starič, A., Štajdohar, M., Umek, L., Žagar, L., Žbontar, J., Žitnik, M., Zupan, B., 2013. Orange: Data Mining Toolbox in Python. J. Mach. Learn. Res. 14, 2349–2353.
- Desmarchelier, B., Fang, E.S., 2016. National Culture and Innovation diffusion. Exploratory insights from agent-based modeling. Technol. Forecast. Soc. Change 105, 121–128. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2016.01.018
- Dos Santos, M.J.P.L., 2018. Nowcasting and forecasting aquaponics by Google Trends in European countries. Technol. Forecast. Soc. Change 134, 178–185. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2018.06.002
- Ganglmair-Wooliscroft, A., Wooliscroft, B., 2016. Diffusion of innovation: The case of ethical tourism behavior. J. Bus. Res. 69, 2711–2720. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2015.11.006
- Geroski, P.A., 2000. Models of technology diffusion. Res. Policy 29, 603–625. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0048-7333(99)00092-X
- Godec, P., Pančur, M., Ilenič, N., Čopar, A., Stražar, M., Erjavec, A., Pretnar, A., Demšar, J., Starič, A., Toplak, M., Žagar, L., Hartman, J., Wang, H., Bellazzi, R., Petrovič, U., Garagna, S., Zuccotti, M., Park, D., Shaulsky, G., Zupan, B., 2019. Democratized image analytics by visual programming through integration of deep models and small-scale machine learning. Nat. Commun. 10, 1–7. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-019-12397-x
- Goel, S., Hofman, J.M., Lahaie, S., Pennock, D.M., Watts, D.J., 2010. Predicting consumer behavior with web search. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A. 107, 17486–17490. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1005962107
- Google, 2020a. Google Trends [WWW Document]. URL https://trends.google.com/trends (accessed 3.15.20).
- Google, 2020b. Google [WWW Document]. URL https://www.google.com/ (accessed 3.15.20).
- Google, 2020c. FAQ about Google Trends data Google Trends [WWW Document]. URL https://support.google.com/trends/answer/4365533?hl=en (accessed 3.15.20).
- Hu, Y., 2013. Hyperlinked actors in the global knowledge communities and diffusion of innovation tools in nascent industrial field. Technovation 33, 38–49. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.technovation.2012.10.001
- Im, S., Mason, C.H., Houston, M.B., 2007. Does innate consumer innovativeness relate to new product/service adoption behavior? the intervening role of social learning via vicarious innovativeness. J. Acad. Mark. Sci. 35, 63–75. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11747-

006-0007-z

- Jahanmir, S.F., Lages, L.F., 2016. The late-adopter scale: A measure of late adopters of technological innovations. J. Bus. Res. 69, 1701–1706. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2015.10.041
- Jun, S.P., Sung, T.E., Park, H.W., 2017. Forecasting by analogy using the web search traffic. Technol. Forecast. Soc. Change 115, 37–51. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2016.09.014
- Jun, S.P., Yoo, H.S., Choi, S., 2018. Ten years of research change using Google Trends: From the perspective of big data utilizations and applications. Technol. Forecast. Soc. Change 130, 69–87. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2017.11.009
- Kong, D., Zhou, Y., Liu, Y., Xue, L., 2017. Using the data mining method to assess the innovation gap: A case of industrial robotics in a catching-up country. Technol. Forecast. Soc. Change 119, 80–97. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2017.02.035
- Kupfer, A., Zorn, J., 2019. Valuable information in early sales proxies: The use of Google search ranks in portfolio optimization. J. Forecast. 38, 1–10. https://doi.org/10.1002/for.2547
- Kwon, S., Liu, X., Porter, A.L., Youtie, J., 2019. Research addressing emerging technological ideas has greater scientific impact. Res. Policy 48, 1–16. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2019.103834
- Lacasa, I.D., Jindra, B., Radosevic, S., Shubbak, M., 2019. Paths of technology upgrading in the BRICS economies. Res. Policy 48, 262–280. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2018.08.016
- Lassar, W.M., Manolis, C., Lassar, S.S., 2005. The relationship between consumer innovativeness, personal characteristics, and online banking adoption. Int. J. Bank Mark. 23, 176–199. https://doi.org/10.1108/02652320510584403
- LeCun, Y., 2018. The Power and Limits of Deep Learning. Res. Technol. Manag. 61, 22–27. https://doi.org/10.1080/08956308.2018.1516928
- LeCun, Y., Bengio, Y., Hinton, G., 2015. Deep learning. Nature 521, 436–444. https://doi.org/10.1038/nature14539
- Lee, H., Kang, P., 2018. Identifying core topics in technology and innovation management studies: a topic model approach. J. Technol. Transf. 43, 1291–1317. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10961-017-9561-4
- Linton, J.D., 2016. Improving impact of research papers. Technovation 52–53, 1–3. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.technovation.2016.02.003
- Linton, J.D., 2012. How to get your papers rejected (or not). Technovation 32, 6–8. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.technovation.2011.09.006
- Mahajan, V., Muller, E., 1994. Innovation Diffusion in a Borderless Global Market : Will the 1992 Unification of the European Community Accelerate Diffusion of New Ideas , Products , and Technologies ? Technol. Forecast. Soc. Chang. 45, 221–235. https://doi.org/10.1016/0040-162590047-7
- Mahajan, V., Muller, E., Bass, F.M., 1990a. New Product Diffusion Models in Marketing: A Review and Directions for Research. J. Mark. 54, 1–26. https://doi.org/10.2307/1252170

- Mahajan, V., Muller, E., Srivastava, R.K., 1990b. Determinants of Adopter Categories by Using Innovation Diffusion Models. J. Mark. Res. 27, 37–50. https://doi.org/10.1177/002224379002700104
- Mavragani, A., Tsagarakis, K.P., 2016. YES or NO: Predicting the 2015 GReferendum results using Google Trends. Technol. Forecast. Soc. Change 109, 1–5. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2016.04.028
- Meade, N., Islam, T., 2006. Modelling and forecasting the diffusion of innovation A 25year review. Int. J. Forecast. 22, 519–545. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijforecast.2006.01.005
- Michalakelis, C., Varoutas, D., Sphicopoulos, T., 2010. Innovation diffusion with generation substitution effects. Technol. Forecast. Soc. Change 77, 541–557. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2009.11.001
- Ministry of Foreign Affairs Brazil, 2020. BRICS Brazil, Russia, India, China, South Africa [WWW Document]. URL http://www.itamaraty.gov.br/en/politica-externa/mecanismos-inter-regionais/7505-brics-brazil-russia-india-china-south-africa (accessed 5.31.20).
- Naseri, M.B., Elliott, G., 2013. The diffusion of online shopping in Australia: Comparing the Bass, Logistic and Gompertz growth models. J. Mark. Anal. 1, 49–60. https://doi.org/10.1057/jma.2013.2
- Omar, M., Mehmood, A., Choi, G.S., Park, H.W., 2017. Global mapping of artificial intelligence in Google and Google Scholar. Scientometrics 113, 1269–1305. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-017-2534-4
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, 2020. Our global reach [WWW Document]. URL http://www.oecd.org/about/members-and-partners/ (accessed 5.31.20).
- Papagiannidis, S., Gebka, B., Gertner, D., Stahl, F., 2015. Diffusion of web technologies and practices: A longitudinal study. Technol. Forecast. Soc. Change 96, 308–321. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2015.04.011
- Peres, R., Muller, E., Mahajan, V., 2010. Innovation diffusion and new product growth models: A critical review and research directions. Int. J. Res. Mark. 27, 91–106. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijresmar.2009.12.012
- Perlin, M.S., Caldeira, J.F., Santos, A.A.P., Pontuschka, M., 2016. Can we predict the financial markets based on google's search queries? J. Forecast. 36, 454–467. https://doi.org/10.1002/for.2446
- R Core Team, 2020. R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing.
- Rogers, E.M., 2003. Diffusion of Innovations, 5th ed. Free Press, New York, NY.
- Rogers, E.M., 1976. New Product Adoption and Diffusion. J. Consum. Res. 2, 290-301.
- Rogers, E.M., 1962. Diffusion of Innovations, 1st ed. Free Press, New York, NY.
- Rotolo, D., Hicks, D., Martin, B.R., 2015. What is an emerging technology? Res. Policy 44, 1827–1843. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2015.06.006
- Schaer, O., Kourentzes, N., Fildes, R., 2019. Demand forecasting with user-generated online information. Int. J. Forecast. 35, 197–212.

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijforecast.2018.03.005

- Shi, X., Fernandes, K., Chumnumpan, P., 2014. Diffusion of multi-generational hightechnology products. Technovation 34, 162–176. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.technovation.2013.11.008
- South Africa Government, 2020. BRICS (Brazil, Russia, India, China, South Africa) [WWW Document]. URL https://www.gov.za/about-government/brics-brazil-russia-india-china-south-africa-1 (accessed 5.31.20).
- Straub, E.T., 2009. Understanding Technology Adoption: Theory and Future Directions for Informal Learning. Rev. Educ. Res. 79, 625–649. https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654308325896
- Sutton, R.I., Staw, B.M., 1995. What Theory is Not. Adm. Sci. Q. 40, 371–384. https://doi.org/10.2307/2393788
- Takieddine, S., Sun, J., 2015. Internet banking diffusion: A country-level analysis. Electron. Commer. Res. Appl. 14, 361–371. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.elerap.2015.06.001
- Talukdar, D., Sudhir, K., Ainslie, A., 2002. Investigating New Product Diffusion Across Products and Countries. Mark. Sci. 21, 97–114. https://doi.org/10.1287/mksc.21.1.97.161
- Teece, D.J., 2018. Profiting from innovation in the digital economy: Enabling technologies, standards, and licensing models in the wireless world. Res. Policy 47, 1367–1387. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2017.01.015
- The World Bank Group, 2020a. The World Bank Data OECD members [WWW Document]. URL https://data.worldbank.org/region/oecd-members (accessed 5.31.20).
- The World Bank Group, 2020b. World Bank national accounts data, and OECD National Accounts data files [WWW Document]. URL https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/NY.GDP.MKTP.CD?most\_recent\_value\_desc=true (accessed 6.5.20).
- Thematic, n.d. ., in: Collins English Dictionary.
- Tsai, B.H., 2013. Modeling diffusion of multi-generational LCD TVs while considering generation-specific price effects and consumer behaviors. Technovation 33, 345–354. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.technovation.2013.05.002
- Ward, J.M., 1963. Hierarchical Grouping to Optimize an Objective Function. J. Am. Stat. Assoc. 58, 236–244. https://doi.org/10.1080/01621459.1963.10500845
- Whetten, D.A., 1989. What Constitutes a Theoretical Contribution? Acad. Manag. Rev. 14, 490–495. https://doi.org/10.5465/AMR.1989.4308371
- World Economic Forum, 2019. A Framework for Developing a National Artificial Intelligence Strategy Centre for Fourth Industrial Revolution 20.