Review of: "Post-Publication Racism: A Nail in the Coffin of Academic Medical Publishing"

Michael Conklin[1]

1 Angelo State University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The only real contribution to the literature that this paper adds is the suggestion that we should create a "blacklist" of people who raise concerns about published research. This strikes me as a horrible idea as it would stifle legitimate criticism.

This author appears obsessed with alleging racism but never provides any evidence. He asserts that "discrimination is reflected in the low number of accepted publications coming from the third world countries." Assuming that submissions from third world countries are disproportionately lower (no source is provided to support this claim), this is hardly evidence of race discrimination. Perhaps the papers are just of lower quality on average. Or perhaps the language barrier makes them less likely to be accepted.

Another example of this is how the author asserts that "the persistence of repeating the same concerns to journals and the researchers' institutions reflects the racist attitude of the complainant." Again, no citation is provided to support this accusation. Furthermore, there is no reason to assume that someone who communicates the same concern to a journal twice is engaging in a racist activity. They are likely not even aware of the race of the authors.

If the author wanted to salvage something out of this I would recommend a paper on what the best practices are for journals when someone writes a complaint about research published in that journal. He sort of does this in one of the paragraphs but this could be expanded upon to make a paper on this topic. He could provide examples of the policies implemented by different journals, the benefits and downsides of these policies, look at some egregious examples of complaints, and provide a best practices outline for journals to follow.

I strongly urge against the publication of this paper.