

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

Romar Correa

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Neuroeconomics As An Appropriate Approach to Clarify the Economic Model: The Case of Russia

Comments by Romar Correa

The contribution does not meet the requirements of academic scholarship, I am afraid. Also, as a piece of non-technical writing to introduce general readers to the subject, it is confusing and misleading. A lot of the paper combines psychology and behaviour with neuroeconomics in questionable and non-transparent ways.

My disquiet began with the Abstract itself. "Interdisciplinary" does not denote the wide connotations of the term in economics. My bias works in the direction of sociology and history rather than psychology. We have hard-core basic science here. Relatedly, with the huge costs of laboratory setups, the "approach" is hardly "practical".

The debate surrounding the very recognition of neuroeconomics has not been referred to. Offhand, an article by Faruk Gul and co-author(s) comes to mind. They claim that results like those cited by the author do not require the new science. More precisely, the first three "ways" claimed in the Conclusion are long and well-established agendas in mainstream economics and the remaining two are of no use.

As the subject deals with the human brain, there are universal discoveries to be made much like the laws of physics and chemistry. At the same time, neuroeconomics recognises the role played by social or environmental factors as the author acknowledges in a separate section. Thus, the illustration of the connection between food consumption and brain activity is well taken but the thesis evoked by the title would be the establishment of the relationship between the two in Russian society which study would stretch data demands across time and space, and be pre-neuroeconomics anyway.

The case for a link between autocratic regimes and behaviour via neuroeconomics is implausible. Thus, how do regime changes, not excluding the Russian revolutions, arise under the controlled circumstances described?

On a constructive front, I would advise the author to remain confined to neuroeconomics and delete all associations with psychology and behaviour which are attributions made by the writer. The reference to Russia should be dropped. The example of the use of alcohol for the Russian army is unfortunate. Where is neuroeconomics in the section on "...The Russian case"? The section on the "Russian current model ..." moves completely away from the theme. The outcome might be a competent and balanced survey of the field.

