

Review of: "Behavioral optimization in Scientific Publishing"

Ning Cai

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

This paper analyzed the bias in scientific publishing and proposed some novel discussions like type A and B errors. The behaviour-based alternative system seems workable to suppress the bias and improve the efficiency and justice of scientific publishing.

However, there are some obvious limitations:

1. Some view points are exaggerated, or arbitrary. For example, "The purpose of peer review has largely, if not entirely, deteriorated to support a dichotomous editorial decision of accepting or rejecting a manuscript" is exaggerated. The suggestion from peer review is as important as the accepting or rejecting decision. For another example, the view that evaluating a researcher by impact factors and h-index rather than reading and "Evaluating someone's science without reading it is pseudoscience" is somewhat arbitrary. While evaluating a researcher by impact factors has limitations, this method is effective, because the index reflects impact, directly or indirectly.
2. The basis and result of this study are based on a series of hypotheses and inferences that makes this study less persuasive. For example, conformity bias and rationalization are widely used to support the author's opinion in this paper. However, the existence and influence of conformity bias and rationalization have not been proven.
3. There are numerous grammar and spelling mistakes in the paper.