

Peer Review

Review of: "Publishing Test-Ready Hypotheses When Experiments Are Out of Reach"

Michael J. Wolyniak¹

1. Biology, Hampden-Sydney College, United States

This is an intriguing commentary that seeks to provide a way for scientists of limited resources and means to safeguard their ideas through the publication of a test-ready hypothesis. There are lots of questions and concerns about how such a system could be done, but Abegg has seemingly thought of many of them and addressed them in this piece. The work could be cleaned up with respect to providing more clarity on how each section (i.e., the use of AI) ties into the main points Abegg is making. Nonetheless, the commentary provides a lot of ideas for adding to the current model of scientific publication in a way that lessens the ways in which only positive results are considered of value. Also, the safeguards here would protect the intellectual properties of scientists while also maximizing the likelihood that such ideas reach the stage of formal study. Less clear from reading this (and, admittedly, outside the scope of this commentary) is how to best work with journals and other publishing platforms to incentivize adopting ideas like this. As the current model of publication becomes more constrained by financial and workload pressures, however, ideas such as this are most welcome.

Declarations

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.