Review of: "Social responsibility, disciplinary moral identity, and not-so-value-free biomedical research(ers)"

Marianne Achiam[1]

1 Copenhagen University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The article ‘Social responsibility, disciplinary moral identity, and not-so-value-free biomedical researchers’ tackles an important topic, namely the increasing impetus for (biomedical) researchers to abandon the value-free stance that has historically characterised normal science, and to a larger extent embrace the value-ladenness and contextuality that is a part of science. This impetus has only grown in the face of the wicked problems we face and the resulting calls for post-normal science and the co-production approach to social responsibility in science policy documents. However, the author argues, the biomedical and health sciences are a special case, because they are already acknowledged to be ‘not-so-value-free’, and thus might require a social responsibility framework of their own.

Other reviewers have already given excellent comments on the main body of the article, which is well-written. From my background in science communication research, I was missing a better explanation of the distinctions between epistemic values and moral values. Perhaps some examples would be useful.

I also wondered about the role of a more progressive and holistic health perspective, in accordance with the WHO's definition: “a state of complete physical, mental and social well-being and not merely the absence of disease or infirmity” (2014). It seems to me that the author's conception of social responsibility as ranging from mechanical and structural changes (e.g. mandating Open Access publications) to interdisciplinarity (inviting humanities scholars into the lab) is a bit unidimensional, and misses the point of this more progressive (and critical) perspective. Perhaps Alan Irwin's notion of third order thinking (2014) would be helpful to conceptualise the nexus between researchers and interested/affected parties.

Finally, I agree with a number of the other reviewers that the paper needs stronger and more detailed implications for practice.

- Irwin, A. (2014). Risk, science and public communication. Third-order thinking about scientific culture. In M. Bucchi & B. Trench (Eds.), *Routledge Handbook of Public Communication of Science and Technology* (pp. 199-212). London: Routledge.
- World Health Organization. 2014. Basic Documents. Forty-Eighth Edition. Geneva: World Health Organization.