

Manuscript: “**Scientist As Parrhesiastes**”

**Submitted: 30 March 2021**

**Accepted: 10 July 2021**

**Published: 31 July 2021**

Corresponding Author: Francesco Scotognella

Doi:10.19044/esj.2021.v17n25p1

Peer review:

**Reviewer 1:** Blinded

**Reviewer 2:** Dr. Jacques de Vos Malan, University of Melbourne, Australia

**Reviewer 3:** Dr. Brian Sloboda, University of Maryland, USA

# ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021

You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper:

\*

As part of the Open Review, you can choose to reveal your name to the author of the paper as well as to authorize ESJ to post your name in the review history of the paper. You can also choose to make the review report available on the ESJ's website. However, ESJ encourages its reviewers to support the Open Review concept.

- Yes
- No

You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper:

\*

- Yes
- No

You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper:

\*

- Yes
- No

**The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.**

\*

*(Please insert your comments)*

The title is clear. A sub-title that refers to the order/anarchy debate within scientific work might be useful

**The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.**

\*

*(Please insert your comments)*

The abstract is good. A brief reference to the three examples that will be juxtaposed may help to set out the descriptive method employed.

**There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.**

*(Please insert your comments)*

The paper is so interesting that a quick review by a native English speaker will be useful in eliminating some actual errors of language and introducing a slightly more fluent tone on occasion.

**The study METHODS are explained clearly.**

\*

*(Please insert your comments)*

The study methods are set out but I feel they could be characterised as for example "a descriptive approach to the presentation of three historical examples."

**The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.**

\*

*(Please insert your comments)*

The text is fine.

**The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.**

\*

(Please insert your comments)

The conclusion has been carefully restricted to what is indisputable: "an anarchic society, without need of consensus and authoritative positions, can be considered as an interesting description of the scientific community." I would have enjoyed slightly more commentary on the protocols of the scientific method, which would seem to mitigate against the "anything goes" dictum.

**The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.**

\*

Each in-text citation has to be included in the list of references and vice versa.

(Please insert your comments)

Yes, the references are good. The reference to the work of Jamie Shaw is key, since this paper really interrogates Shaw's review of Feyerabend's approach.

***Please rate the TITLE of this paper.***

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

\*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

***Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.***

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

\*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

***Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.***

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

\*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

***Please rate the METHODS of this paper.***

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

\*

- 1
- 2

- 3
- 4
- 5

**Please rate the *BODY* of this paper.**

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

\*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

**Please rate the *CONCLUSION* of this paper.**

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

\*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

**Please rate the *REFERENCES* of this paper.**

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

\*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

**Overall Recommendation!!!**

\*

- Accepted, no revision needed
- Accepted, minor revision needed
- Return for major revision and resubmission
- Reject

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

# ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021

You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper:

\*

As part of the Open Review, you can choose to reveal your name to the author of the paper as well as to authorize ESJ to post your name in the review history of the paper. You can also choose to make the review report available on the ESJ's website. However, ESJ encourages its reviewers to support the Open Review concept.

- Yes
- No

You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper:

\*

- Yes
- No

You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper:

\*

- Yes
- No

**The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.**

\*

*(Please insert your comments)*

The title of the paper is quite attention-grabbing.

**The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.**

\*

*(Please insert your comments)*

The abstract is succinct. But I would recommend that the author place a sentence or two to describe the purpose of this paper. By doing the latter, it provides a roadmap for the reader.

**There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.**

*(Please insert your comments)*

The author should seriously read the paper again to get rid of the grammatical errors and spelling errors throughout the paper. I attached a pdf version of the paper with editorial comments throughout the paper. These editorial comments would greatly improve the readability of the paper.

**The study METHODS are explained clearly.**

\*

*(Please insert your comments)*

There are no specific methods used in this paper. The author clearly explains the anarchy in the scientific community of varying degrees.

**The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.**

\*

(Please insert your comments)

Here are specific comments on the paper:

1. But I would recommend that the author place a sentence or two to describe the purpose of this paper in the introduction of the paper. By doing the latter, provides a roadmap for the reader about what this paper is about and to start to generate thoughts about the themes in the paper.
2. In the title and throughout the paper, the term parrhesiastes is used. At the beginning of the paper, the author should present this term and explain to the readers how parrhesiastes relate succinctly to the theme of the paper. As I stated earlier in this referee report, the term parrhesiastes is used in the title and it does pique the interest of the readers.
3. In the paper, the author stated that "It is well established that the number of publications has enormously increased in the last years." That would be true. Most likely all disciplines experienced increases in the number of publications and the advent of open access and predatory journals has also contributed to these increases. Does the author believe these increases in publications improved access to the scientific literature?
4. I liked the mention of Feyerabend in the paper. I would like to see an expansion on Feyerabend. Keep in mind that Feyerabend wrote the book, *Against Method and Science* in a Free Society defended the idea that there are no methodological rules which are always used by scientists. He argued against any single scientific method because any such method could result in limitations for the scientists. Thus, the latter would restrict scientific progress. He believed strongly that science would benefit most from a "dose" of theoretical anarchism. In addition, he believed that the notion of theoretical anarchism would not restrict the advances in science and science can provide benefits to all.
5. Another central theme of Feyerabend is the idea of incommensurability and in the paper, there is a discussion of Kuhn. Kuhn along with Feyerabend looked at incommensurability. There are quite substantial differences of incommensurability between Kuhn and Feyerabend. How would these differences relate to the themes of this paper? Is it important to note these differences between Kuhn and Feyerabend regarding incommensurability?
6. Feyerabend wrote *The Tyranny of Science* in 1993 but was not published until 2011. I thought that his challenges of modern science were quite interesting in this work. As an example, he believes that the statement 'science is successful' is a complete myth. Essentially, he argues that some very basic assumptions about science are false and substantial parts of the scientific doctrine were created based on the generalizations that led to gross misconceptions about the nature of human life. Put in another way, he does not believe that science solves our pressing problems and science tends to glorify the generalizations that does not lead to the improvements in our world like scientists would lead us to believe. How would the framework of Feyerabend in his 2011 work fit into the framework that you discussed in this paper?

**The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.**

\*

(Please insert your comments)

The authors rush through the conclusion of the paper, especially when presenting anarchism etc in the scientific community. I would ask the authors to add a couple of

paragraphs of additional discussion that clearly cover the main point. In its current form, it's too terse.

**The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.**

\*

Each in-text citation has to be included in the list of references and vice versa.  
(Please insert your comments)

Yes, the references appear to be comprehensive and appropriate.

***Please rate the TITLE of this paper.***

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

\*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

***Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.***

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

\*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

***Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.***

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

\*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

***Please rate the METHODS of this paper.***

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

\*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

**Please rate the *BODY* of this paper.**

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

\*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

**Please rate the *CONCLUSION* of this paper.**

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

\*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

**Please rate the *REFERENCES* of this paper.**

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

\*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

**Overall Recommendation!!!**

\*

- Accepted, no revision needed
- Accepted, minor revision needed
- Return for major revision and resubmission
- Reject

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

See the comments presented above