Review of: "The Ethics of Retraction"

Ivan Heibi[1]

1 University of Bologna

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

This article examines the ethics of retraction, using the tools of speech act theory. The author discusses the importance of understanding the ethics of retraction, which represents a crucial tool of repair for ourselves as well as for the social world in general. The article discusses why retraction is ethically substantive, and why there is a need to develop ethics of retraction. Then the analysis is divided in three parts, and discusses: (1) When is retraction *possible*; (2) when is it ethically *permissible*; and, (3) when is it ethically *advisable or obligatory*, as part of a project of repair.

As a reviewer of this article, I am very pleased to report that I am thoroughly satisfied with the quality and content of it. The article is well-written and provides a comprehensive analysis of the subject through a presentation and a discussion toward many crucial aspects of retraction and its ethical importance. The author has presented their work with a clear and concise analysis (structured in three points), making it easy to follow their argument and conclusions. Overall, I have found the article to be a very valuable contribution.

One of my suggestions is to mention and address more clearly in the title the "type" of retraction this paper is discussing (i.e., retraction of speech act). For instance, retraction in the scholarly domain is a completely different case [1] . Indeed, I would also suggest the author to mention and discuss a little bit more (at least in the introduction of the paper) about the other types of retraction which are not strictly related to the speech act.

Regarding this last point, it will be really fascinating to have a general comparison between the retraction of a speech and the retraction of written materials (e.g., articles). For instance, through a comparison of how retraction itself is raised in the two situations (e.g. retraction in the scholarly domain is formally raised with a retraction notice [2]).

In my opinion, another crucial aspect to be analysed and stressed more is regarding how retraction is perceived by the community before and after it is raised. Maybe by giving some examples, and discussing whether (and when) the community pressure was crucial to the raise of a retraction.

References

1. ^R. G. Steen. (2010). *Retractions in the scientific literature: is the incidence of research fraud increasing?* *Journal of Medical Ethics*, vol. 37 (4), 249-253. doi:10.1136/jme.2010.040923.

2. ^Jaime A. Teixeira da Silva, Judit Dobránszki. (2016). *Notices and Policies for Retractions, Expressions of Concern, Errata and Corrigenda: Their Importance, Content, and Context.* *Sci Eng Ethics*, vol. 23 (2), 521-554.

doi:10.1007/s11948-016-9769-y.