Qeios

Peer Review

Review of: "Rediscovering Eckart"

Rogério Custodio[1]

1. Physical Chemistry, Universidade Estadual de Campinas, Brazil

The observation presented by the author is historically pertinent. However, omissions of this kind are not uncommon in the literature, especially when an earlier result is revisited in a broader context. In the present case, the issue concerns a specific aspect of the 2017 article and does not compromise its overall contribution. Thus, although the comment is pertinent, I am not convinced that it justifies an independent critical note. It seems to me more appropriate for the observation to be communicated initially and directly to the authors of the 2017 paper. This would allow for a more constructive interaction between the parties and could contribute to a more appropriate recognition of the relevant bibliographic antecedents, as well as to a possible broader statement in the context of the article by Schilling et al.

Declarations

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

doi.org/10.32388/SN6YMM