

# Review of: "Behavioral optimization in Scientific Publishing"

Mario Coccia<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Italian National Research Council

**Potential competing interests:** No potential competing interests to declare.

## Behavioral Optimization in Scientific Publishing

The topics of this paper are interesting, though well known. The structure and content can be improved, and results have to be better explained by authors before being reconsidered for publication.

Title has to be clear and clarify if it refers to scholars, editors, publishers, etc.....

Abstract has to clarify the goal and suggest implications for science and communication policy.

Authors have to structure the paper as follows.

- Introduction
- Study design
- Results and discussion
- Conclusion

Avoiding in the just-mentioned sections, subheadings that create fragmentation of the paper.

Introduction has to better clarify the research questions of this study and provide more theoretical background about these topics, analyzing in a critical manner the previous literature. After that, they can focus on the topics of this study to provide a correct analysis for fruitful discussion (See suggested readings that must be all read and used in the text).

Methods of this study are not clear. Authors have to clarify if this study is:

- A narrative review that explains the existing knowledge on a topic based on all the published research available on the topic.
- A systematic review that searches for the answer to a particular question in the existing scientific literature on a topic.
- A meta-analysis that compares and combines the findings of previously published studies, usually to assess the effectiveness of an intervention or mode of treatment.

Results of this study are not clear, but scattered in many sections. I suggest creating a specific section about results.

To reiterate, avoiding a lot of subheadings that create fragmentation of the paper.

Discussion. First, authors have to synthesize the main results in a simple table to be clear for readers and then show what this study adds compared to other studies. I suggest inserting a SWOT matrix to show pros and cons of current activities in scientific publishing, also for the evolution of science. As well as the new problems of generative AI. Moreover, many problems are related to some research fields, because of communities, such as in medicine, management, etc. These aspects should be discussed.

Conclusion has not to be a summary, but authors have to focus on the manifold limitations of this study and provide implications of science policy based on incentive systems to maximize the benefits for good research and effects in science and society.

Overall, then, the paper is interesting, but the structure is confused. The theoretical framework is weak, and some results create confusion... The structure of the paper has to be improved; study design, discussion, and presentation of results have to be clarified using the suggested comments.

Suggested readings of relevant papers that can improve the study.

Höller, Y., Urbschat, M.M., Bathke, A. 2024. Sustainable scientific publishing: a pilot survey on stakeholder motivations and opinions. *Discover Sustainability*, 5(1), 1

Coccia M., Wang L. 2016. Evolution and convergence of the patterns of international scientific collaboration, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, vol. 113, n. 8, pp. 2057-2061.  
[www.pnas.org/cgi/doi/10.1073/pnas.1510820113](http://www.pnas.org/cgi/doi/10.1073/pnas.1510820113)

Bertolo, R., Antonelli, A. 2024. Generative AI in scientific publishing: disruptive or destructive? *Nature Reviews Urology*, 21(1), pp. 1–2

Coccia M. 2008. New organizational behaviour of public research institutions: Lessons learned from Italian case study. *International Journal of Business Innovation and Research*, vol. 2, n. 4, pp. 402–419.  
<https://doi.org/10.1504/IJBIR.2008.018589>

Scheidegger, F., Briviba, A., Frey, B.S. 2023. Behind the curtains of academic publishing: strategic responses of economists and business scholars. *Scientometrics*, 128(8), pp. 4765–4790

Coccia M. 2019. Comparative Institutional Changes. A. Farazmand (ed.), *Global Encyclopedia of Public Administration, Public Policy, and Governance*. Springer, [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-31816-5\\_1277-1](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-31816-5_1277-1)

Zupanc, G.K.H. 2023. “It is becoming increasingly difficult to find reviewers”—myths and facts about peer review. *Journal of Comparative Physiology A: Neuroethology, Sensory, Neural, and Behavioral Physiology*

Coccia M. 2019. Intrinsic and extrinsic incentives to support motivation and performance of public organizations, *Journal of Economics Bibliography*, vol. 6, no. 1, pp. 20-29, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1453/jeb.v6i1.1795>

Bonaccorsi, A. 2023. Towards peer review as a group engagement. *JLIS.it*, 14(1), pp. 46–59

Coccia M. 2019. Comparative Incentive Systems. A. Farazmand (ed.), *Global Encyclopedia of Public Administration, Public Policy, and Governance*, Springer Nature Switzerland AG, [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-31816-5\\_3706-1](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-31816-5_3706-1)

Boerckel, J.D., Plotkin, L.I., Sims, N.A. 2021. Editorial Peer Reviewers as Shepherds, Rather Than Gatekeepers. *Journal of Bone and Mineral Research*, 36(7), pp. 1220–1224