

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

Mario Coccia¹

¹ Italian National Research Council

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

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

The topics of this paper are interesting. The structure and content can be improved, and results have to be better explained by the authors before being reconsidered for publication.

The title has to be clear and shorter.

The abstract has to clarify the goal and suggest implications of science and communication policy to support social responsibility in the medical sciences.

I suggest to authors that they structure the paper as follows.

- Introduction
- Study design
- Results and discussion
- Conclusion

Avoiding in the just-mentioned sections, subheadings that create fragmentation of the paper.

The introduction has to better clarify the research questions of this study and provide more theoretical background about these topics, analyzing in a critical manner the previous literature. After that, they can focus on the topics of this study to provide a correct analysis for fruitful discussion of Responsible Research and Innovation (see suggested readings that must all be read and used in the text).

I suggest inserting a section about the methods of this study. Authors have to clarify if this study is:

- A narrative review that explains the existing knowledge on a topic based on all the published research available on the topic.
- A systematic review that searches for the answer to a particular question in the existing scientific literature on a topic.
- A meta-analysis that compares and combines the findings of previously published studies, usually to assess the effectiveness of an intervention or mode of treatment.

Results of this study are not clear, but scattered in many sections. I suggest creating a specific section about results. Some logical figures about relationships among the variables under study and related implications can be fruitful to clarify

content for readers.

Discussion. First, authors have to synthesize the main results in a simple table to be clear for readers and then show what this study adds compared to other studies. I suggest inserting a SWOT matrix to show pros and cons of current activities for biomedical researchers, also considering problems of generative AI. These aspects should be discussed.

I suggest bullet points to suggest best practices and guidelines to be implemented in health organizations to foster social responsibility, also with incentives, so the study may have a higher impact.

Conclusions are too short....Conclusions do not have to be a summary, but authors have to focus on manifold limitations of this study, future development, and, in particular, authors should provide implications for science policy based on intrinsic and extrinsic incentives, and self-determination of scholars driven by research and academic organizations to support interdisciplinarity directed toward responsible biomedical research and related aspects.

Overall, then, the paper is interesting, but the structure can be improved. The theoretical framework, study design, discussion, and presentation of results could be clarified using the suggested comments.

Suggested readings of relevant papers that can improve the study:

Sorbie, A., Gueddana, W., Laurie, G., Townend, D. 2021. Examining the power of the social imaginary through competing narratives of data ownership in health research. *Journal of Law and the Biosciences*, 8(2), Isaa068

Mackelprang, R., Aurand, E.R., Bovenberg, R.A.L., ...Zoloth, L., Friedman, D.C. 2021. Guiding Ethical Principles in Engineering Biology Research. *ACS Synthetic Biology*, 10(5), pp. 907–910

Coccia M., Wang L. 2016. Evolution and convergence of the patterns of international scientific collaboration, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, February 23, 2016 vol. 113, n. 8, pp. 2057-2061. www.pnas.org/cgi/doi/10.1073/pnas.1510820113

Barbee, R.W., Turner, P.V. 2019. Incorporating Laboratory Animal Science into Responsible Biomedical Research. *ILAR Journal*, 60(1), pp. 9–16

Coccia M. 2008. New organizational behaviour of public research institutions: Lessons learned from Italian case study. *International Journal of Business Innovation and Research*, vol. 2, n. 4, pp. 402–419. <https://doi.org/10.1504/IJBIR.2008.018589>

Obi, E.C. 2017. UNESCO Declaration on Bioethics and Human Rights. *Advancing Global Bioethics*, 7, pp. 275–286

Coccia M. 2019. Comparative Institutional Changes. A. Farazmand (ed.), *Global Encyclopedia of Public Administration, Public Policy, and Governance*. Springer, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-31816-5_1277-1

Green, J.M., Rosenfeld, S. 2023. Conflicts of interest in institutional review boards are a threat to ethical research. *Nature Medicine*, 29(11), pp. 2701–2703

Coccia M. 2019. Intrinsic and extrinsic incentives to support motivation and performance of public organizations, *Journal of Economics Bibliography*, vol. 6, no. 1, pp. 20-29, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1453/jeb.v6i1.1795>

Weil, C.J. 2023. Ethical, Legal, and Policy Issues Surrounding

Biospecimen Research Conducted or Supported in the USA. *Biopreservation and Biobanking*, 21(1), pp. 14–22

Coccia M. 2019. Theories of Self-determination. A. Farazmand (ed.), *Global Encyclopedia of Public Administration, Public Policy, and Governance*, Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-31816-5_3710-1

Cook, E., Markham, S., Parker, J., ...Barnicot, K., McManus, S. 2022. Risk, responsibility, and choice in research ethics. *The Lancet Psychiatry*, 9(1), pp. 5–6

Coccia M. 2019. Comparative Incentive Systems. A. Farazmand (ed.), *Global Encyclopedia of Public Administration, Public Policy, and Governance*, Springer Nature Switzerland AG, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-31816-5_3706-1

Jose-Abrego, A., Panduro, A. 2022. Building a culture of scientific integrity among the academic and research communities of Latin America. *Annals of Hepatology*, 27(1), 100655