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

Liliana Acero[1]

1 Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

1. Do the title and abstract cover the main aspect of the work?
   The title seems to be appropriate for the nature of the study.
2. Does the introduction provide background and information relevant to the study? The introduction is consistent and provides the necessary background to the paper as well as a substantive literature review. I missed quoting the work of Allan Irwin, so relevant to the topic. (e.g. Irwin, A. 2001. Constructing the scientific citizen: Science and democracy in the biosciences. *Public Understanding of Science* 10 (1): 1–18.Irwin, A., et al. 2012. The good, the bad and the perfect: Criticizing engagement practice. *Social Studies of Science* 43 (1): 118–135)
   The concept of 'degrees' between coproduction and value-free approaches needs clarification as I see it, as co-production implies a much wider concept referring to values, institutions and other instances as originally described by Jasanoff (2006).I think a more appropriate term to describe the situation would be, 'levels, 'shades' or 'interconnections', as degrees sounds too quantitative to relate well with the profound concept of coproduction.
3. Methods, Study design and setting: Being a theoretical study, it covers a variety of interesting aspects that are generally well designed and coherently presented. However, the concept of disciplinary moral identity, I think, could have been further explored, theoretically and empirically. For example, the training aspects involved in the scientific professions and how they do or do not reinforce moral identity could be discussed and also the unconscious aspects of 'moral superiority', as the authors mention, that sometimes scientists are not even aware of their attitudes. Also, the role science occupies in specific societies deserves a look at; how much science is considered an authority and how much it is questioned, or deserves little confidence and the causes of this, etc.
4. Data analysis. Here I miss references to more examples, illustrations and/or empirical studies, specially relating the biosciences. Also, it would be interesting to mention more aspects of the institutional changes in scientific centres that would be needed to conduct socially responsible research given, for example, necessary changes in the tendency to measure scientist´s capacities through the number and/or quality of published articles.
   Moreover, data refers mainly to First World experiences. A reference to 'peripheral science' or science from peripheral countries could have enriched the discussion. For example, there are important delays in the integration of Human scientists into biomedical discussion, governance and regulatory frameworks as well as in the engagement of patients or patient organizations within biomedicine. (See for example, Acero, L (2021) Framing regenerative medicine: culturally specific stories of an emerging technoscience, Biosocieties Online first June 16. https://doi.org/10.1057/s41292-021-00236-6; Acero, L. (2021) Brazilian Patient Organizations and Regenerative

Medicine: Selective Comparisons with the Experience of the United Kingdom. Global Journal of Medical Research Interdisciplinary K, v. 21 (4) 9-24; Kreimer, P. 2019. *Science and Society in Latin America. Peripheral Modernities*. New York: Routledge. Kreimer, P. 2015. Public understanding of science and social studies of science: Convergence or parallel paths? *Science Communication Today* 5: 1–16.Kreimer, P., and H. Vessuri. 2018. Latin American science, technology, and society: A historical and reflexive approach, Tapuya: Latin American Science. *Technology and Society* 1 (1): 17–37).

5. Discussion: The discussion is adequately conducted throughout the paper and I have found specially interesting the section on the relevance of AI devices for biomedical research, their advantages and disadvantages in section 3. This section I find innovative in terms of the evaluation of their pros and cons and their effects both on scientists´ performance and patients´ needs, or even, future potential disruptive uses patients could be induced or inclined to make of AI devices. On the other hand, the discussion on patient engagement and their role, specially in the design and inner phases of research might benefit from a little expansion. Most specially, it would be interesting to have examples on how many times and in which ways public engagement has been used to reinforce consensus.
   The aspect on how to resolve conflict among stakeholders´ interests and engage plurality of perspectives is well dealt with. But I would still recommend the work of STEPS CENTRE (IDS/SPRU) in the UK , that has explored theoretically and empirically different models of dialogue to achieve different forms of such an integration.
6. Conclusion. I found the conclusions a bit short or ‘poor’ in relation to the richness of information the paper provides. “the proposed measures to make research socially responsible may lead to unexpected or even unwanted consequences”. I think the paper explores a number of other questions that could be summarized.
7. Reference: I think they are adequate and suggest including some of the ones mentioned.

Finally, I consider the paper extremely interesting, bringing up new questions and topics for further debate and empirical research and I think it should be published with or without including the suggestions made. I leave it up to the authors. Congratulations, you have made a good contribution to the STS area.