Qeios

Peer Review

Review of: "Artificial Intuition for Forecasting the Future: Confirmatory and Exploratory Analyses of 50 Pre-Registered Financial Forecasts"

Dr. Pavan Kumar Nagula[1]

1. Finance, Economics, Rennes School of Business, Rennes, France

Strengths

Pre-registration with Figshare time-stamping is the real deal; every forecast locked in before resolution eliminates the most common form of implicit cheating in this literature.

Phrase coherence is genuinely original, binary by construction, no threshold search, emerges from the protocol's own arithmetic. Worth testing in a replication.

Weaknesses

1. N=1 and the participant is the author. Everything else flows from this. No procedural safeguard fixes it. The author should commission an independent behavioral audit of the existing dataset. Specifically, a researcher blind to the HIT/MISS outcomes should examine whether session-level reaction time profiles, engagement indicators, or verifiable accuracy show any systematic pattern correlated with market volatility or the author's likely awareness of upcoming events. If no such pattern exists, this strengthens the credibility of the findings considerably. If one does exist, it needs to be reported. Additionally, the author should formally document and archive a session diary, notes recorded before each session about awareness of market conditions, fatigue, and motivation, even retrospectively if possible. This creates at least a partial paper trail for examining whether subjective state tracked outcomes.
2. In-sample Sharpe ratios presented alongside real-world benchmarks—that's misleading regardless of the caveats buried in the text. The paper reports in-sample Sharpe ratios of up to 2.65 and then places them in a table alongside:

 doi.org/10.32388/L90JWB

- Hedge fund median Sharpe: 0.5–1.0
- Systematic CTA strategies: 1.0–1.5
- Renaissance Medallion: ~2.5

This creates a visual narrative that the protocol is performing at Renaissance Medallion levels. The caveats exist but are buried in prose. Most readers, including sophisticated ones, will anchor on the numbers in the table. The fundamental problem is that in-sample Sharpe ratios are not the same kind of number as out-of-sample Sharpe ratios. Comparing them directly is like comparing a student's practice test score to their actual exam score as if they were equivalent. They are not, and presenting them side by side without clear visual separation causes genuine misunderstanding.

Declarations

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.