

Peer Review

Review of: "Reimagining Research Gaps"

Amitabha Sarkar¹

1. Association of Schools of Public Health in the European Region, Brussels, Belgium

The commentary is an important contribution to the ongoing discussion and debate on research gaps. The introduction section may briefly entail the importance of discussing research gaps in scientific studies. For example, how the identification of a research gap can contribute to the new body of knowledge and justify initiating new research.

The discussion on specific gaps may need further elaboration to make the arguments more analytical. For example, the integration of the empirical and evidence gap sections needs more subjective analysis of these two strands of gaps, and then show how they are complementary to each other. However, one risk in this integration is to equate the evidence gap with quantitative findings and not qualitative exploration. If the author claims that qualitative findings are not typically considered evidence gaps in research, then that has to be clearly articulated with proper justification. The flip side is, if the evidence gap consists of both qualitative and quantitative findings, then the integration of empirical and evidence gaps does not hold any merit. The author needs to work on this particular section.

Lastly, the author may analytically discuss five different types of research gaps from the point of evidence movement to critically assess a few evidence-based research methodologies (such as RCT, Scoping Review, Evidence Synthesis) and their utility in the production/reproduction of science.

Declarations

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.