

# Review of: "Thinking and Acting 'Within the Box' and Thinking and Acting 'Outside the Box': 'Deliberative Democracy' and the Model of Scientific Brainstorming Groups"

Batsheva Guy

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The article "Thinking and Acting 'Within the Box' and Thinking and Acting 'Outside the Box': 'Deliberative Democracy' and the Model of Scientific Brainstorming Groups," examines the relationship between the scientific community and democratic principles. It argues that while science is crucial for human progress, democratic decision-making is superior because it includes a broader range of perspectives and interests.

To improve, the authors could provide concrete examples or case studies illustrating the practical implications of their model. For instance, they could discuss a citizen assembly tasked with developing climate change policies, showing how rational discussions among scientists and the public lead to decisions balancing scientific knowledge with public values. They could also explore participatory budgeting processes in cities, where residents decide how to allocate part of a municipal budget, demonstrating how these processes embody deliberative democracy by engaging citizens in discussions about budget priorities.

The article also challenges the conventional view of "deliberative democracy," suggesting it should involve rational discussions leading to decisions benefiting the common good. It notes that modern representative democracies often fall short of this ideal due to economic and political influences. The authors emphasize the importance of including both scientists and the public in decision-making, suggesting a rational allocation of competences.

Additionally, the authors could offer practical strategies to enhance deliberative democracy. For example, they could discuss the use of deliberative polling, which combines public opinion surveys with deliberative discussions, to gather informed opinions on important issues. They could also propose guidelines for setting up citizen juries, small groups of citizens who deliberate on specific issues and make recommendations, to ensure diverse representation and meaningful deliberations. They could explore the potential of online deliberation platforms to facilitate rational discussions and inclusive participation in the digital age.

To strengthen the argument and provide more concrete support, I recommend incorporating case studies or real-world examples that illustrate the points being made. The authors should select relevant examples, provide detailed descriptions, include diverse examples from various industries or contexts, and use quantitative data where possible to support their arguments.

Additionally, to more effectively illustrate the balance between scientific expertise and public input in decision-making processes, the authors could consider presenting case studies where decisions were made with input from both scientific experts and the public. They could also use comparative analysis, stakeholder interviews, surveys, or visual representations to demonstrate how this balance is achieved in practice.

This article presents a challenging and insightful perspective on the relationship between science, democracy, and societal decision-making. By incorporating real-world examples and practical strategies, the authors could enhance the article's depth and applicability, encouraging readers to reconsider the role of scientific expertise in shaping public policy.