

Review of: "Neuroeconomics as an Appropriate Approach to Clarify the Economic Model: The Case of Russia"

John Gountas¹

¹ University of Notre Dame Australia

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Dear author(s),

The title is interesting and impressive in the scope and breadth of the topic to cover. However, the usual rule for a good journal paper is to have a clear and specific focus on a topic that is feasible and provide robust empirical evidence to support any claims you make. National negative biases ought to be avoided and excessive generalizations or selective choice of unflattering information must be prevented in scientific papers.

The literature review is wide, unfocused, full of personal comments and not clearly relevant to the title or the general aim of the paper title. There is hardly any logical coherence between the different topics and constructs discussed in your review. There is a lack of focus and in-depth investigation of any specific issues that relate to the Russian culture such as, specific segments or socio-economic groups of consumers and their various economic decisions. There is no focus on any kinds of psychological characteristics of the Russian decision makers' such as: values, attitudes, personalities and thinking styles. There is very little in-depth discussion of how specific Russian groups of consumers are influenced by key groups of decision makers (politicians, economic policy makers). There is lack of in-depth focus on any of the specific interactive and multiple influences between individual decision makers and their family or social environmental influences. No mention of the complex and multiple dynamic interactive effects between the Russian consumers' social resources and constraints available, which influence differentially individual economic decisions (which is probably an impossible task to achieve in one paper).

The paper mentions "**emotions**" as an influencing factor on decisions, but there is hardly any proper coverage of the huge literature on the interactions of emotions and decision choices. Individual preferences and decision choices cannot be easily summarized (aggregated) for the whole and huge diverse Russian population. Individual emotional preferences of millions of Russians cannot be easily connected with the nature of the political regime. However, emotional influences on Russian consumers could be more than enough to write about in one paper.

The paper suggests that leaders could find ways to "influence brain regions" to attain desired outcomes. This is simply fantasy and unsubstantiated claim because there is no evidence of such a possibility. Making a strong point and suggesting "**imagination**" as the key cognitive process to improve or influence decisions is a limited conceptualization of how people think and not supported by the literature. Making a number of unsupported claims/statements without any proper and valid references is a major weakness which you can improve throughout the paper.

Here is an example of a convoluted and incoherent section which needs to be re-written better by separating the different constructs and topics you are discussing: “These leaders (**too general, who are they?**) are skillfully promoted and often become authorities for many people, creating the mainstream of performance and supporting the official pattern of behavior. Research indicates that human memory is remarkably vulnerable to social influences, and both public and individual conformity play a role in shaping memories (Edelson et al., 2011). The brain can easily imagine (big generalization, because there are so many different types/personalities of people) the results of actions in the context of conformity (Ochsner, 2005). Although memories are often inaccurate, they tend to focus on both individual and public conformity. According to M.P. Richardson, B.A. Strange, and R.J. Dolan (2004), the amygdala is responsible for social and emotional processing and modulates memory related to hippocampal activity.” **This section is mostly disjointed, largely incoherent, mixed up and badly written.**

Another example that needs to be referenced and re-written. “When people experience constant stress, their imagination, value system, and brain activity concerning the amygdala process are reorganized according to the effectiveness of the autocratic regime's performance”. **This is a big and unsubstantiated statement. Reference?**

“The official clarification is deeply grounded due to constant pressure. Only narrow circles of society may reject the official way of interpreting facts, but regimes often try to corrupt or isolate them, marginalizing their influence on society.” The whole section is not referenced at all and does not make any sense regarding the economic system of Russia and neuroeconomics.

Your comments on **"fear and conformity"** influencing economic decisions, could be the (**only**) key focus of the paper. To claim originality and usefulness in your paper you need to produce enough empirical evidence of Russian consumers' choices and political-economic decision makers' strategies, avoiding generalized comments based on secondary research only.

Best of luck and all the best wishes.