

# Review of: "The Contribution of the Rejection Mechanism to Scientific Knowledge Production: A View from Granular Interaction Thinking and Information Theories"

Mario Coccia<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Italian National Research Council

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The Contribution of the Rejection Mechanism to Scientific Knowledge Production: A View from Granular Interaction Thinking and Information Theories

The topics of this paper are interesting, though well known. The structure and content can be better explained by the authors.

Title can be shorter.

Abstract has to clarify the goal, results, and implications of rejections for science development.

Authors have to structure the paper as follows.

- Introduction
- Study design
- Results and discussion
- Conclusion

Avoiding in the just-mentioned sections, subheadings that create fragmentation of the paper.

Introduction has to better clarify the research questions of this study and provide more theoretical background. After that, they can focus on the topics of this study to provide a correct analysis for fruitful discussion (See suggested readings that must be all read and used in the text).

Methods of this study are not clear. The section of Materials and methods must be re-structured with the following three sections:

- Sample and data
- Measures of variables
- Models and Data analysis procedure.



Authors have to avoid subheadings that create fragmentation and confusion. If necessary, they can use bullet points (same comments for the section of results and all sections).

Results can be better systematized with tables and figures.

Discussion. First, authors have to synthesize the main results in a simple table to be clear for readers and then show what this study adds compared to other studies. Explain well the determinants of rejections and suggest general characteristics

Conclusion has not to be a summary, but authors have to focus on the manifold limitations of this study and provide implications to guide editors to fair rejection for the scientific development of good science.

Overall, then, the short paper is interesting, but the structure is poor. The theoretical framework is weak, and some results create confusion... The structure of the paper has to be improved; study design, discussion, and presentation of results have to be clarified.

Suggested readings to improve the study.

Coccia M. 2021. Comparative Hypotheses of Scientific Development. J. Econ. Soc. Thought. vol. 7, n. 3, pp. 153-180

Ali J. Manuscript rejection: causes and remedies. J Young Pharm. 2010 Jan;2(1):3-6. doi: 10.4103/0975-1483.62205. PMID: 21331183; PMCID: PMC3035881.

Coccia M., Benati I. 2018. Comparative Evaluation Systems, A. Farazmand (ed.), Global Encyclopedia of Public Administration, Public Policy, and Governance, Springer International Publishing AG, part of Springer Nature, [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-31816-5\\_1210-1](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-31816-5_1210-1)

Chen, H., Rider, C. I., Jurgens, D. & Teplitskiy, M. Preprint at <https://ssrn.com/abstract=4872023> (2024).

Coccia M. 2020. The evolution of scientific disciplines in applied sciences: dynamics and empirical properties of experimental physics, Scientometrics, n. 124, pp. 451-487. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-020-03464-y>

Nature. Western scientists more likely to get rejected papers published — and do it faster doi: <https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-024-02142-w>

Coccia M., Roshani S. 2024. General laws of funding for scientific citations: how citations change in funded and unfunded research between basic and applied sciences. Journal of Data and Information Science, 9(1), 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.2478/jdis-2024-0005>

Stephan Lewandowsky and Klaus Oberauer, 2016. Motivated Rejection of Science Current Directions in Psychological Science, Vol. 25, No. 4 (AUGUST 2016), pp. 217-222 (6 pages)

Mosleh M., Roshani S., Coccia M. 2022. Scientific laws of research funding to support citations and diffusion of knowledge in life science. Scientometrics 127, 1931–1951. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-022-04300-1>



Gauchat, G. (2012). Politicization of science in the public sphere: A study of public trust in the United States, 1974 to2010. *American Sociological Review*, 77, 167–187.

Roshani S., Bagheri R., Mosleh M., Coccia M. 2021. What is the relationship between research funding and citation-based performance? A comparative analysis between critical disciplines. *Scientometrics* 126, 7859–7874. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-021-04077-9>

Lewandowsky, S., Gignac, G. E., & Oberauer, K. (2013). The role of conspiracist ideation and worldviews in predicting rejection of science. *PLoS ONE*, 8(10), e75637. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.007563

Coccia M. 2018. General properties of the evolution of research fields: a scientometric study of human microbiome, evolutionary robotics and astrobiology, *Scientometrics*, vol. 117, n. 2, pp. 1265-1283, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-018-2902-8>

Lewandowsky, S., Gignac, G. E., & Vaughan, S. (2013). The pivotal role of perceived scientific consensus in acceptance of science. *Nature Climate Change*, 3, 399–404. doi:10.1038/nclimate1720