

Review of: "Science desperately needs disruptive innovation"

Egor Burda¹

¹ Ludwig Boltzmann Institute of Rheumatology and Balneology

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The paper raises a very interesting and pressing issue of declining innovativeness (disruptiveness in authors' terms) leading to stagnation of many scientific fields. As a remedy, authors propose a framework based on selected evidence from the hi-tech sector, where decisions are made based on venture capital mindset and greater flexibility. While this proposal is very tempting and could be considered as a shift in a positive direction – especially considering an increasing number of papers calling for greater riskiness in research – there are certain aspects that need further refinement.

(1) In its current version, the paper provides rather limited justification on the generalizability of hi-tech insights and evidence to the scientific sector with its different systems and knowledge production systems. Thus, it might be beneficial to conduct a more thorough comparative analysis of the two and root the proposed framework in the observed similarities (and differences).

(2) It is not very clear for me, how do authors position this paper. In its current form it appears as a “call for action” aimed at the scientific community. But at the same time authors rely on a very rich and potentially interesting dataset. Thus, I believe “there is more than meets the eye” and the narrative presented here might be further substantiated in an evidence-based manner.

(3) The same applies to the elements authors proposed for their Disruption Pattern. As a person quite distanced from venture capital, the index with its stages seems to be a little superficial for the scientific context.

Thus, considering all things above, I believe that this paper bears a great potential, but requires further refinement and better justification for the outlined arguments.