

Review of: "Behavioral optimization in Scientific Publishing"

Nuno Crespo¹

¹ ISCTE-Instituto Universitário de Lisboa

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The discussion conducted in this paper is extremely important since it deals with key dimensions of the evaluation process in science. In fact it is easy to recognize the existence of several biases in the scientific evaluation process.

The paper has some important merits and suggests some interesting ideas.

However, in my opinion, the paper has some important limitations that should be mentioned.

1. A first problem is, my opinion, the style of the paper, with scarce background and links to previous studies on related topics. Instead, the paper is above all the opinion of the author about a given problem. While this is also important, I feel the lack of a more solid literature review on the specific topic under analysis.
2. Another critical aspect is the definition of "good paper" or even "good science". These concepts are assumed as obvious and objective but this is far from true. What is a good paper? There is abundant literature on this discussion but the author does not mention these issues.
3. The author refers in a very strong way that the "ideal" evaluation method of scientific work is the detailed reading of the published work (by evaluators). I cannot agree with this idea because this procedure raises a lot of other important problems. In fact, if evaluation of science is conducted this way it will be purely subjective. In this context, there is once again a vast literature on the merits of objective versus subjective evaluation. While there is no consensus, the predominant vision (with which I agree) is that a mixed approach is the best solution.

Finally, regarding the suggestion of a new procedure, I see the merits of a preliminary score given by the editors and the reviewers. In my opinion, however, such score should not be definitive. Instead, it could be no more than an initial score. That score should be adjusted in accordance with the (academic and non-academic) impact of the paper.