

# Review of: "Digital Identity and Promotion of Research Works – Analytical Study of Social Science Researchers at Taiwanese Institutions"

Michal Cerny<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Masaryk University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The present study is very interesting and I think it raises many fundamental questions for the scientific community related to the "operation of science" and "science communication".

I would like to offer some aspects to manage/improve the whole study:

- 1) The topic is changing rapidly. I think it was helpful to work with more current literature.
- 2) There is a lack of deeper interpellation - why are some of the researchers not on the network? Does it really only bring benefits? Are there concerns that lead researchers not to use these services?
- 3) Why is Academia.edu missing from the list?
- 4) Exactly how did the search for Twitter profiles occur (and why not, for example, Facebook - the justification in Chapter I by professionalism does not at all correspond to the current situation, but rather to a time five or eight years ago). Is the author really sure that he found all the profiles?
- 5) What are the real benefits of the services? Can some models of good practice be formed from the research that would be of concrete use to researchers?
- 6) I think the profile-identity relationship is confusing. These are two different aspects and I think the author could be more careful to differentiate between them.
- 7) I would recommend adjusting the formatting of the tables so that it is clear at a glance what the tags mean. Why one table is red and the other is grey is also unclear.
- 8) Table 3 doesn't make sense because the way articles are added to each service is radically different - ORCID proceeds automatically, Researchgate semi-automatically, Twitter is purely manual. The method of comparing disparate services in a quantitative way is non-transparent and (in my opinion) misleading.
- 9) What is the denunciation of the worthiness of Figure No. 1? Can a graph be constructed in this way at all? What was the motivation for its creation by the author of the study?

