

Peer Review

Review of: "Reimagining Research Gaps"

Mark Reed¹¹. Scotland's Rural College, Edinburgh, United Kingdom

This is a useful and accessible commentary that provides an important re-balancing of research enquiry towards topics and people that are under-represented and marginalised.

Importantly, this goes beyond Miles' recognition that research may not address the needs and concerns of the marginalised and further marginalise them by serving the needs of those in power, who often frame the problems that underpin research questions. It also recognises the geographical biases in research, and although these often coincide with the "population gap," the recognition of this new gap remains important, especially when the two are paired. Given the overlap of marginalised populations in marginalised areas and the thematic coherence of these two gaps, the author might consider integrating them into a single category, reducing the size and hence complexity of the typology and giving it more narrative impact?

I also wondered if the knowledge gap might be re-titled and the integration of the theory gap in this category made more explicit than it is currently, both in the framing of the paper (which doesn't explain where the theory gap has been placed in the new typology) and in the text for the knowledge gap itself. Effectively, this gap integrates know-how (practical knowledge) with know-why (theoretical knowledge) - it is worth doing a literature search on this. Such a category might also link to different levels of knowledge via the triple-loop learning model that suggests sometimes the gaps in knowledge are at the level of assumptions and paradigms?

Overall, I found this a well-written and useful paper, citing relevant literature to make an original contribution that will help researchers from all disciplines think more holistically about how they direct and frame their research.

Declarations

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.