

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

Anita Pipere¹

¹ Daugavpils University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

It was a real pleasure to read your paper and to sense your passion towards the reasonable, thoughtful, and sustainable application and implementation of terms like interdisciplinarity, disciplinary moral identity, etc. In general, paper gives a sense of importance in relation to suggested topic, however, since this is suppose to be the theoretical (or conceptual?) paper, there are some moments that should be considered to improve the manuscript and make it more instrumental for philosophers of science, scientists, or policymakers in the field of science. Below, please, see some suggestions and discussion in relation to some of your ideas:

1. At the beginning of the paper, I would suggest to describe the problem you are dealing with and trying to underline in this theoretical paper in a very clear and specific way. Otherwise, the readers are left with fussy feeling that something is missing between the lines.
2. In the second paragraph of your manuscript, please specify the fields detached from social or ethical concerns and, probably, try to explain later in your manuscript why it is so, or even try to depict some system of criteria determining the degree of involvement of different fields in social and ethical concerns.
3. You are saying: "That science ought not to harm people and society, of course, is unquestionable" – this axiomatic principle should be contextualized, as historically world have witnessed different interpretations and practical implications of this idea. This is probably one of the reasons why, notwithstanding the political partiality and other imperfections, ideas of inter/transdisciplinarity, RRI, etc. are so important. However, I agree that implementation of such quite general ideas will always stumble upon problems of local character, difficulties with contextualisation, etc.
4. Citing your manuscript: "Midstream interventions may include interdisciplinary collaborations between lab researchers and scholars from the Humanities, in order to make research communities more diverse and pluralistic, and the requirement of an active public engagement, aimed at involving different stakeholders in research". This sounds rather artificial: interdisciplinarity, first of all, never have been principle or approach just to make the research communities more diverse. Primarily, it is a reasonable way to deal with the research problem from the methodological point of view of different disciplines, thus making the methodological solutions more efficient and contextual.
5. Although you use the term of biomedical sciences in the title of your manuscript and key words, sometimes, in the text of the paper you mention also health sciences, I would suggest sticking only to biomedical sciences throughout the manuscript.
6. Quote: "The far more modest problem discussed in this article, however, concerns the fact that the main objective of much biomedical research does not seem to be the production of immediately marketable goods. Biomedical projects

may be 'innovative', but in the sense that they may modify the clinical practice and the healthcare system". I do not see it as a problem: simply, this is a terminological issue, and also, in different disciplines we can come up with different types of innovation.

7. Quote: "At the same time, however, the policy strategies that aim at implementing a sense of social responsibility in research seem to presuppose that, indeed, researchers are not already engaged in such a reflection". Provide evidence for your argument that these policy strategies seem to presuppose that researchers are not already engaged in reflection of their social responsibility.
8. Quote: "Some empirical evidence suggests that, in some fields, researchers carry on their activity in a rather 'value-free' fashion, without reflecting upon the societal implications of their work". Are you talking here about the discipline or about the individual researchers?
9. In the chapter on Disciplinary moral identity, please, explain not only term of identity, but also moral identity and disciplinary moral identity.
10. In the section Interdisciplinarity for responsibility: integration, delegation, or moral reinforcement? you speak about natural sciences and humanities. See also soft and hard interdisciplinarity. In each type of interdisciplinarity, there could be different approaches and issues related to moral identity and responsibility.
11. Substitute 'Humanists' with Humanities researchers/Humanities scholars
12. This sentence asks for clarification: Within interdisciplinary research groups, in fact, there is a concrete possibility that scientists and engineers will keep regarding socioethical issues as something that their humanist colleagues will have to look after.
13. Quote: "TEM researchers, in other words, may simply pay lip-service to the science policy by hiring some sociologist or philosopher "to look after the social responsibility part" of their project. In this way, awareness and reflexivity do not really get implemented in the internal stage of research. As some scholars have already noticed, in other words, interdisciplinarity by itself may easily lead to the delegation of social responsibility to SSH scholars, rather than its integration in research (Delgado and Åm 2018; Sigl et al 2020)." This is a pervasive issue in the contemporary overcomplicated and bureaucratised world, and paying lip-service to some policy is not specific just for the scientific research and scientific institutions, but also for many other spheres of social life. What do you suggest in terms of dealing with it?
14. Quote: "The assumption, that is, that researchers do not already engage in the kind of critical and ethical reflection that interdisciplinary collaborations with scholars from the Humanities would supposedly elicit". Again, you should probably explain in detail exactly what arguments you could use to justify the existence of such an assumption. Could it be that this assumption is based on some local institutional experience?
15. Quote: "... biomedical researchers have the belief that their only objectives are indeed finding the best treatments or therapies, and that such objectives are also morally good, and if such a belief is reinforced through moral training or interdisciplinary interactions with bioethicists, then their disciplinary moral identity may actually be an obstacle to their development of a wider and more nuanced sense of social responsibility". Do you have a proof that biomedical researchers really have such beliefs?
16. Quote: "The issue is of course exacerbated if the interaction with bioethicists may reinforce the moral perspective of

biomedical researchers, putting them in a position of ‘moral authority’ within the interdisciplinary group”. See the transdisciplinary dialogue as one of the possible strategies to deal with this problem (Pipere & Lorenzi, 2021). Also, you would probably find some ideas for Section 6 in this paper.

17. At the end of your manuscript, you could add two dimensions: 1) your own (and/or literature-based) suggestions and strategies for dealing with mentioned dilemmas and issues, 2) specific and detailed conclusions.