

Peer Review

Review of: "Risks for Academic Research and Possible Responses"

Frank Einhorn¹

1. University of Johannesburg, South Africa

Overall, a well-explained and useful paper on a relevant subject. It corrects some general misunderstandings about the risks in research.

It is good that you mention, under Limitations, that many of the sessions were exclusively health sciences oriented.

Most of my concerns from the first version have been addressed. A few minor additional suggestions are noted.

Suggest that the text in Box 1 be left-justified as this is a bulleted list.

Similar suggestion for Box 2. The numbering needs attention: two no 1's.

Table 1. The right-hand columns should be left-justified – difficult to read.

P7, left near the bottom. 'fulfilling their needs'. Should note somewhere that this might cause bias, especially if the needs relate to hoped-for results.

The practical recommendations (Research organisations can use the work . . .) still deserve its own heading. I believe that many of the risks outlined relate to project governance, rather than to project management. This is alluded to at the end of Conclusions but could be further discussed under practical recommendations. Indeed, the governance of research projects could even be an area deserving future research.

Declarations

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.