Qeios

Peer Review

Review of: "The Rebirth of Ecological Study"

Earl Duncan[1]

1. Independent researcher

This manuscript is a very well-written overview of the history and shortcomings of ecological study, and its rebirth as a part of a broader framework, the TSGMA, including the advantages, challenges, and future directions. No typographical or contextual errors were found. I offer the following two comments as minor improvements.

The difference between one, two, and three-star MA analysis isn't explained until section 4.2, but they are introduced in section 3.2. It would be helpful for a reader who is not familiar with these terms to know while reading section 3.2 that these terms will be explained in more detail in the following section.

In section 5, it is noted that "uncertainty in underlying measurements may affect downstream analyses." It would be helpful to understand how uncertainty is handled during the iterative refinement of MA networks. Should it decrease or increase with each iteration? Or do measures of uncertainty get dropped between each phase of the TSGMA cycle (only carrying over plug-in estimates)? Given how important measures of uncertainty are in any statistical analysis, this could be a limitation worth briefly elucidating here.

Declarations

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

doi.org/10.32388/QLZC5B