Qeios

Peer Review

Review of: "Implications of Methodological Approaches in Decision Theory: A Conceptual Synthesis with Emphasis on Heuristics"

Mohamad Hjeij[1]

1. Microeconomics, Handelshochschule Leipzig, Germany

The paper is clear and well-structured and offers a conceptual synthesis of major frameworks in Decision Theory, with a useful emphasis on how methodological approaches shape perspectives on heuristics. Its central claim that disagreements about heuristics are partly methodological rather than purely theoretical is interesting and consistently sustained throughout the manuscript. The comparative table is also effective in summarizing the argument and increasing the paper's flow and value.

The manuscript's main strength lies in its "curation" approach. Bringing together Bounded Rationality, Heuristics and Biases, Naturalistic Decision Making, Ecological Rationality, and Neuroeconomics in one discussion gives readers a broad and accessible overview of the field. The paper also succeeds in showing that different frameworks can focus on different kinds of heuristics and therefore generate different evaluative positions toward them.

My main recommendation is to sharpen the analytical contribution. Sometimes, the paper appears as a strong literature review rather than as a fully developed theoretical intervention. The argument would become stronger if the author more explicitly stated the criteria by which methodological approaches are being compared and clarified how exactly these approaches "shape" theoretical interpretation rather than merely correlate with it.

A second point concerns conceptual precision. The distinction among task-specific, general, and domain-specific heuristics is promising, but it would benefit from tighter definition and more explicit justification, especially because this classification supports the paper's broader conclusion about optimistic, skeptical, and pragmatic perspectives.

doi.org/10.32388/J710RG

A third suggestion is to engage a bit more critically with possible overlap between frameworks. The paper persuasively presents them as complementary, but some tensions, hybrid cases, and internal diversity within each tradition could be acknowledged more directly. That would make the synthesis feel less categorical and more analytically robust.

Overall, this is a valuable and promising manuscript. It is readable, relevant, and intellectually well-organized. With a somewhat sharper methodological comparison and a more explicit theoretical tweak, it could make a stronger contribution.

Just as a side note, please check the numbering and some minor language improvements.

Declarations

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.