

Review of: "Infodynamics, a Review"

Roman Krzanowski¹

¹ Pontifical University of John Paul II in Kraków

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

A review of "Infodynamics, a Review".

The paper presents an interesting topic, so it is worth publishing if certain technical problems are resolved. In its present form, it requires a major review. A few specific comments:

- The abstract needs rewriting. The abstract is not the presentation of the problem but the summary of the paper; it must tell the reader what the paper is saying, not what the problem is.
- The section Content has no place in the paper; it is suitable for a book or a report.
- The author listed some definitions, but they seem like random choices without much context or order. How they are related to the topic is not explained.
- One cannot find the definition of information. The claim that it is a complex concept does not explain anything.
- Equating the amount of information with the number of books and articles on Wikipedia, comparing these numbers with the DNA of a mouse, and translating it into bytes does not make any sense in the absence of the definition of information. The implied claim that that information is everything is empty.
- The entries about infodynamic researchers look like lexicon entries.
- Quoting Vopson's work is incorrect. Vopson's theories of information have been demonstrated to be incoherent.
- The paper gives the impression of short encyclopedic entries with limited or no analysis.
- Examples of empirical data seem to be out of place and not related to anything.
- References seem not to follow some coherent format.

My suggestion for the author would be to first get the formal structure of the paper in order and then work on the content; the topic is certainly worth pursuing. There are excellent guides to writing scientific, philosophical, and scientific papers online. These are just examples:

https://philosophy.fas.harvard.edu/files/phildept/files/brief_guide_to_writing_philosophy_paper.pdf;

<http://www.sfu.ca/philosophy/resources/writing.html>. I also suggest a book by Jay Rosenberg. 1996. The Practice of Philosophy at Prentice Hall.