

Review of: "Behavioral optimization in Scientific Publishing"

Nabil Semmar

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Reviewing comments concerning the manuscript titled "Behavioral Optimization in Scientific Publishing" (Milind Watve):

The manuscript is very rich in information with strong analytical structure aiming to highlight weakness of current publication system vs reforming propositions in favor of more just system. Very important (but neglected) concepts are underlined in the article including:

- Cost minimization which dominates benefit maximization in the current scientific community!
- High asymmetry and unbalance between traditional minding, reputed affiliation, emotional behavior and friendship network-based-system on one hand and unknown researchers distinguished by deep scientific novelties, genius and high potential on other hand.
- The need of more efforts, attention, neutrality and transparency in reviewing.
- The increase (improvement) of article evaluations by open (public) participation of readers.

Comments helping for further improvements of the manuscript :

1. Synthetic or integrative figure(s) (or diagrams) could be added to provide whole vision on the different analyzed points with links (causal-effect trends) between them. This would significantly help readers for further understanding of the manuscript content. Figures and diagrams represent key components that are compatible with benefit maximization from the authors in their submitted manuscripts.
2. Talking about the effects of title attractivity and abstract reading in the cost minimization way from **editors**.
3. Talking about the importance of statistical population analyses for highlighting trends and association influencing articles reject, revision and acceptance. **Reviewers'** reports can be statistically analyzed to highlight intellectual or emotional trends as well as neutrality vs a priori effects.
4. Talking about the importance of statistical analyses at population scale for classification (categorization) of reviewing ways (and **reviewer** types) using multiple criteria (including their reports' contents a priori, and ordinal scores a posteriori).
5. Talking about the impressionist effects of self-citation favored by friendship networks and leading to virtual reputations for people who exert minimal cost to collect maximal benefit by friendship effect (e.g. collective publications with big numbers of **authors**). This is often the case for publication in highly reputed journals.
6. The two models (subtractive and divisive) can be further explicated by talking about the concepts of production and productivity, respectively. More production attribute more reputation trend for the authors. However, in many cases, high production results from large collective works where some authors could have exerted minimal effort. Productivity

remains less considered than production for researchers' evaluation and reputation: it refers to the ratio of the number of publication (or publication components) to the total number of co-authors in considered manuscript.

7. There is a need to check the type of evaluator **readers**: higher weights are attributed to neutral readers, i.e. who have not shared publications or affiliations with the authors of evaluated article.

I invite the author to consult the article published in the journal *Scientometrics* (2022) on the importance of multicriteria and ratio-based functional evaluation of publications at the web link: <https://rdcu.be/cBI2N>

To finish: an interactive comment in relation with the manuscript backbone:

Numbering of article's lines by the author helps for more fluent location of paragraphs and sections during reviewing and Author-Reviewer exchanges. This simple preliminary act helps for a better cost-benefit ratio in the high scale interaction between Author and Reviewer leading to higher working efficiency.