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

Ian Maxwell[1]

1 University of Technology Sydney

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The article's title was engaging, and the introduction promising. However, the content abruptly transitioned from a seemingly scientific exploration to a more humanities-oriented discourse.

To bridge this gap, empirical research could investigate whether patterns exist in peer review rejection rates across different fields, journal impact factors, or over time. Such data could provide valuable insights into the peer review process.

Qeios' innovative post-peer review modification model offers a promising approach to enhancing the scholarly communication process. Its potential to revolutionize peer review warrants further investigation.

Given the established use of citation counts as a research performance metric, it is intriguing to explore whether these could serve as an alternative or complement to traditional peer review. A comparative analysis of peer review processes and outcomes and subsequent citation rates could shed light on the effectiveness of using peer review metrics in predicting article impact. Additionally, identifying factors influencing citation trends would contribute to a deeper understanding of the scholarly communication ecosystem.