

Peer Review

Review of: "Publishing Test-Ready Hypotheses When Experiments Are Out of Reach"

Hossein Hassani¹

1. University of Kurdistan Hewlêr (UKH), Erbil, Iraq

The author presents his idea on the benefits of presenting a hypothesis that is ready to be tested, but the researchers might not be able to conduct the tests for a variety of reasons. To introduce the hypothesis and its related data, he also introduces a kind of method to be followed.

The idea seems to be interesting and new when one reads the title and scans through the abstract. However, the abstract gives a mixed impression: on the one hand, a reasonable opinion and suggestion; on the other hand, an uneasy feeling of unnaturalness in the wording and compilation. Moving to the introduction, that feeling grows further and, for familiar readers, changes to artificiality. Continuing the process, the feeling grows more and more, leading to a new feeling that you are reading a series of repetitions of an idea that has already been realized in a variety of forms, but now you read it in a strange form of presentation. That was the time I stopped reading and did some checking on the complementary sections, where I found where those feelings came from.

The author has clearly mentioned how he fairly and professionally uses AI to expand, compile, and prepare the manuscript draft. While using AI has become a norm in many areas, in academic writing, the case is different. I would like to clearly state my opinion on this matter. I believe asking AI to write or even edit a manuscript for academic publication is more harmful than useful. This review is not a proper venue to argue about that. Therefore, I do not base my view on this personal perspective. While using AI has caused the manuscript to be fancy in wording and to present a sense of novelty in the opinion, presenting early stages of work has been around for several decades. arXiv is a pioneer in this area. The preprint movement is expanding, and it provides a decent and reasonable platform to researchers around the world. So what else does this opinion present? While I appreciate the effort, I cannot find any significant ones.

Some trivial issues:

Abstract: "Opinion" capitalized; why?

Intro: To be supported by similar ideas from various resources.

LMIC in intro (expand the abbreviation)? Do you mean "low- or middle-income countries"?

Stage-0-to-Registered Reports pathway? No mentions in the paper. In the related section, it becomes even more confusing.

Figure 1 has not been cited in the text.

Declarations

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.