Review of: "Digital Identity and Promotion of Research Works – Analytical Study of Social Science Researchers at Taiwanese Institutions"

Eric David Cohen[1]

1 Universidade Estadual de Campinas

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

I really liked some phrases and passages provided by the authors regarding the measurement of the impact of scientific work, namely: "restrictions.. confined to a certain category of special privileges"; the quote from (Zimmerman & Woolf, 2014): "importance of creating new identities that match and reflect the real identities in the digital world"; the provocation of the reader, inviting him or her to reflect about the "significance of a digital identity"; stating that the "identity is closely linked to the idea of difference"; "virtual user not being present in the field of vision that we belong".

I readily recognize the fact that "it's about what one says as a researcher on the internet or what others publish about him or herself, and the result is a digital reputation that relates to what is said about the academic work on the web, the digital identity or electronic". I also fully agree with the fact that reputation is not fully controllable!

In addition, Boyd & Crawford's (2012) criteria (location, similarity with the name of the researcher presentation in an attractive way, regular updates, finding one's contributions in social communication media, and finding out what others say about it) seems highly relevant to the issue at hand. In fact, I think your study could be expanded to select a sample, so as to develop an in-depth analysis using these criteria – this could enable you to expand your research and construct more knowledge around the phenomenon, which we clearly know some but should expand further.

I think you should rethink your tables (1 and 2), because they don't convey a lot of information. You should eliminate rows or cells that only show "/", and make comments regarding your conclusions and relevant observations. For instance: if introduction and photo are common to all platforms, why show it on table 2? Also, you should take the opportunity to draw some conclusions, for instance: you showed that research gate is the most used, but also the one that there is greater percentage of non-promoted... what can we take out from this?

You provide some great insights, such as "some researchers see that answering Research Gate questions is of no academic benefit"; "Google Scholar does not provide an opportunity for daily interaction", "Orcid high percentage of promoted work"; Orcid does not list non-promotion of non peer-reviewed research.

You should correct the text "Table No. 2 shows a strong correlation" – it is actually table 4, and you should refrain from using the term "correlation" (rather, use correspondence or some other term).

I fully agree with your main conclusion that "researchers should seek to prove their presence in virtual spaces and

establish their digital identity", after all we live in an age where being present and active on social media has become somewhat of a norm for all individuals. I suppose this should be counter-argued that, in science, appearance is not everything and maybe not the most important factor – it is important, yes, but appearance does not necessarily create knowledge.

Lastly, I liked your categorization regarding the three identity types: introduction, activity and statistical identity. Perhaps future studies could use these types, combined with Boyd & Crawford's (2012) criteria to probe deeper in your research. Good job!