

Review of: "The Contribution of the Rejection Mechanism to Scientific Knowledge Production: A View from Granular Interaction Thinking and Information Theories"

David Banks¹

¹ Université de Bretagne Occidentale

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

This is a very short paper of less than 1000 words. It is therefore more of a short note or squib than an article. Its purpose seems to be to make two recommendations about the peer review system. First, "rejection letters should be more informative." This is a non-starter: in my experience, over 40 years, editors invariably accompany a rejection notification with reviewers' comments explaining why the decision to reject has been taken. Secondly, "editors and reviewers should maintain humility." This is a common sense suggestion, with which few, if any, would disagree, but impossible to check or enforce.

Hence, with all due respect to the authors, I do not feel that this piece has much point. Our present peer review system is certainly imperfect, but it is the best we have, and I do not believe the suggestions made here, one of which is already what happens, and the other relates to the internal cognitive attitudes of the gatekeepers, can help improve the situation.