KNUTH-principle in the review processes

**László Pitlik, KJU/MY-X team**

**Part I – Basic information units**

# Introduction

There is an anonymized (c.f. <<…>>) invitation for being part of a reviewing process:

**Reminder Invitation to Review:**

***<<title>>***

|  |
| --- |
|  |

Dear Dr. Pitlik,

This is a reminder you've been invited to the new manuscript submitted to *Academia Mental Health and Well-Being*, an innovative open access journal. We think you could be qualified to peer review this manuscript based on your paper *"Assessing Diversity in Learners Background And Performance"*. << [https://www.academia.edu/112969113/Assessing\_Diversity\_in\_Learners\_Background\_And\_Performance>](https://www.academia.edu/112969113/Assessing_Diversity_in_Learners_Background_And_Performance%3E)> + <[https://miau.my-x.hu/miau2009/index.php3?x=e0&string=assessing](https://miau.my-x.hu/miau2009/index.php3?x=e0&string=assessing%20) >

The manuscript's abstract is below.

**Review Deadline**: *Sun May 11, 25*.

Will you peer review this article?

|  |
| --- |
| [Yes, I'll Peer Review](https://www.academia.edu/keypass/YnU5YkRUOGxubkNJT2pvOVBSaUtTMExzOUFxVVY5bzFRSWIzZXVYY3lMQT0tLW03SklqKzZreitKT1NGRGVDL014cFE9PQ%3D%3D--5e593a922c841103547f728bc3d037616bc1314a/t/dGCrs-SysZLHz-4DV0X/journals/academia-mental-health-and-well-being/submissions/vKenAQ/peer-review-invitation?review_request_id=54153502)[I'm Unable to Peer Review](https://www.academia.edu/keypass/YnU5YkRUOGxubkNJT2pvOVBSaUtTMExzOUFxVVY5bzFRSWIzZXVYY3lMQT0tLW03SklqKzZreitKT1NGRGVDL014cFE9PQ%3D%3D--5e593a922c841103547f728bc3d037616bc1314a/t/dGCrs-SysZLHz-4DV0X/journals/academia-mental-health-and-well-being/submissions/vKenAQ/peer-review-invitation?decision=unable_to_review) |

MORE INFORMATION

This manuscript has already been pre-checked for quality and scope by the Editorial Office.

Learn more about the journal and the reviewer guidelines on the journal website: [*Academia Mental Health and Well-Being* Peer Review Guidelines](https://www.academia.edu/t/dGCrs-SysZLHz-4DV0X/journals/academia-mental-health-and-well-being/about/peer-review-guidelines).

Please contact the Editorial Office if you have any questions or need further assistance. Thank you very much for your time and interest.

Kind regards,

<<names>>
Peer Review Assistant | Editorial Office
Academia Mental Health and Well-Being*(ISSN: 2997-9196)*
Journal's homepage:[https://www.academia.edu/journals/academia-mental-health-and-well-being](https://www.academia.edu/t/dGCrs-SysZLHz-4DV0X/journals/academia-mental-health-and-well-being/about)
Contact:<<names>>@academia.edu

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|

|  |
| --- |
| SUBMISSION ARTICLE |

 |

Will you peer review this article?

|  |
| --- |
| [Yes, I'll Peer Review](https://www.academia.edu/keypass/YnU5YkRUOGxubkNJT2pvOVBSaUtTMExzOUFxVVY5bzFRSWIzZXVYY3lMQT0tLW03SklqKzZreitKT1NGRGVDL014cFE9PQ%3D%3D--5e593a922c841103547f728bc3d037616bc1314a/t/dGCrs-SysZLHz-4DV0X/journals/academia-mental-health-and-well-being/submissions/vKenAQ/peer-review-invitation?review_request_id=54153502)[I'm Unable to Peer Review](https://www.academia.edu/keypass/YnU5YkRUOGxubkNJT2pvOVBSaUtTMExzOUFxVVY5bzFRSWIzZXVYY3lMQT0tLW03SklqKzZreitKT1NGRGVDL014cFE9PQ%3D%3D--5e593a922c841103547f728bc3d037616bc1314a/t/dGCrs-SysZLHz-4DV0X/journals/academia-mental-health-and-well-being/submissions/vKenAQ/peer-review-invitation?decision=unable_to_review) |
|   |

# Background information

The following rules are given for the reviewers:

<https://www.academia.edu/journals/academia-mental-health-and-well-being/about/reviewer-guidelines>
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[person](https://www.academia.edu/login?post_login_redirect_url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.academia.edu%2Fjournals%2Facademia-mental-health-and-well-being%2Fabout%2Freviewer-guidelines)

Reviewer guidelines

Peer reviewers are[[1]](#footnote-1) the lifeline of the scientific community, who provide valuable services to authors and researchers and help to advance their respective field through the enforcement of quality standards[[2]](#footnote-2) in research and scientific publication.

Reviewer Profile

Manuscripts submitted to our journals are intended to match with experts who possess complimentary backgrounds, and who can evaluate the manuscript in a timely, transparent, and ethical manner, following the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE) [guidelines for peer reviewers](https://publicationethics.org/resources/guidelines/cope-ethical-guidelines-peer-reviewers).

To be considered as a peer reviewer[[3]](#footnote-3), academics must:

* Possess a PhD degree in the area of the submitted manuscript (preferably with postdoctoral experience), or an MD (applicable for medical journals)
* Showcase the necessary experience and expertise to assess and evaluate the scientific quality of a manuscript
* Be an active researcher with a proven publication record in the field of the submitted record, and this record must be publicly available on a reputed platform (for example in Scopus, Web of Science, etc)
* Be actively affiliated with a university or research institute
* Be free of any conflict of interest with the manuscript authors which includes not being affiliated with the same institution as the authors, and not publishing with the authors in the past 3 years

Invitation to Review

Every submitted manuscript will be reviewed by at least two[[4]](#footnote-4) reviewers who are experts in the field, and who can evaluate the veracity of the presented research.

If invited to peer review, reviewers should inform the journal if they do not feel qualified to assess a certain piece of work, or if they are aware of a conflict of interest. We also ask invited reviewers to promptly accept or decline invitations, so as not to significantly delay the review process.

Timeline of Review Process

We recommend that reviewers should aim to complete the first round of the peer review process within the requested timeframe in the invitation, if possible. If a personal matter arises that may prevent a timely review, it is the responsibility of the reviewer to notify the journal's Editorial team right away.

Please note that additional rounds of peer-review are often completed for a manuscript. Therefore, the full review time can sometimes last up to a few months, and may vary depending on the availability and response time of the authors and all involved reviewers and Editors. The full review time for our journals typically averages between 8-16 weeks.

Review Reports

All review reports are handled within the Reviewer Hub, which can only be seen by logging into your account.

1.General Guidance

Reviewers must thoroughly[[5]](#footnote-5) review the entire article, including any supplementary materials, if available, and also pay close attention[[6]](#footnote-6) to figures, tables, data, and methods.

Feedback should be provided that is detailed enough[[7]](#footnote-7) to help[[8]](#footnote-8) authors understand and accurately address. A neutral and objective tone should be maintained when providing constructive criticism, with the goal of aiding the authors in improving their work. Where possible, be specific and provide supporting evidence with appropriate references. Inappropriate or derogatory comments will not be accepted.

If a reviewer wishes for authors to not see certain comments, this can be done by reporting it as a confidential note within the review report. This note will not be seen by the authors and will only be seen by the Academic Editor/s.

Please note that reviewers should refrain from suggesting unnecessary citations of their work (self-citations), another author's work (honorary citations), or articles from the same journal where the manuscript is submitted unless it significantly enhances the manuscript's quality.

2.Rating[[9]](#footnote-9) the Manuscript

Criteria for evaluating a manuscript are typically driven by the following key benchmarks:

* The topic of the manuscript should fit[[10]](#footnote-10) the aims and scope of the journal
* The manuscript should be original, providing advancement and significant[[11]](#footnote-11) contribution to the current knowledge, with a thought-provoking hypothesis
* The main idea of the underlying science is valid[[12]](#footnote-12) and strong[[13]](#footnote-13)
* The commentary should be appropriate[[14]](#footnote-14) and relevant[[15]](#footnote-15) for the field as a whole
* The results should be significant☹, relevant☹, robust☹, and appropriately☹ interpreted, and the conclusions should be supported! by the results (see correct logical chain-sequences)
* The methods and data analysis (including tools or softwares that are used) are appropriate☹ and described in sufficient☹ detail to allow the replication! of the results
* The research design is appropriate☹ and technically sound☹, and if relevant☹, the sample size is adequate☹
* There are no! gaps of significance in the cited literature (see correct logical chain-sequences)
* Results have not been previously published
* The language and writing is articulate☹ and of high-quality☹
* The authors have clearly declared any and all conflicts of interest (both real and perceived)

Reviewers should also assess if the manuscript has adhered to ethical standards and best practices within the field. For resources that can assist with assessing if a manuscript has followed expected standards, we recommend that reviewers visit respected websites that provide details on these guidelines and standards. These websites may include:

* [STREGA](http://www.equator-network.org/reporting-guidelines/strobe-strega/) for genetic studies
* [SRQR](http://www.equator-network.org/reporting-guidelines/srqr/) for qualitative studies
* [ARRIVE](https://www.nc3rs.org.uk/arrive-guidelines) for animal experimentation
* [CONSORT](https://www.equator-network.org/reporting-guidelines/consort/) and [TREND](https://www.cdc.gov/trendstatement/) for details on standards for controlled and non-randomized trials in medical sciences
* [PRISMA](https://www.prisma-statement.org/) for structured reviews and meta-analyses should adhere
* [ENCODE Consortium](https://www.encodeproject.org/data-standards/) for methodological guidelines and analytical standards of epigenomic studies (e.g., ChIP-seq, WGBS), studies with RNA-seq, and studies with RNA binding assays

3.Overall Recommendation

Recommendations after peer review of a manuscript will be in accordance with the following paths:

* **Accept:**The manuscript in its present form is cohesive☹ and acceptable☹, and it does not require further scientific or experiment-driven changes to be made prior to publication. Minor grammatical or style changes can be accommodated in an Accept-in-Principle decision, allowing authors to make minor grammatical changes prior to publication.
* **Reject:**The manuscript has significant flaws, misleading claims, or erroneous information that does not make an impactful contribution to their field without further revisions; or requires significant re-writing of the manuscript for it to be read by academics in relevant research fields.
* **Revision:**The reviewers can request the authors to complete revisions of the manuscript before a final decision can be made. This recommendation can be for:
	+ *Minor revisions:*The paper can, in principle, be accepted after revisions are completed to a satisfactory level, based on the reviewer’s comments. C.f. Part I – chapter Copilot – suggestions for improvements
	+ *Major revisions:* The acceptance of the manuscript would depend on the revisions. The author needs to provide a point-by-point response or a rebuttal if some of the reviewer's comments cannot be addressed. A maximum of two rounds of major revision per manuscript would normally be allowed. C.f. Robot-lectors should mostly be capable of finetuning steps to correct logical chains…

Reviewer Responsibilities – The potential reviewers, editorial boards should cooperate (should have been cooperated long before) in order to develop a robot-lector!

Reviewers are responsible for assessing the quality of the manuscript and offering recommendations to the Academic Editor(s) on whether the manuscript should be accepted, revised, or rejected. However, the final decisions about publication within the journal will be made by the Academic Editor(s) and/or the Editor-in-Chief, who will take the reviewers recommendations and the author's responses into consideration during deliberation.

To ensure the integrity of the peer review process, reviewers for Academia.edu Journals are held accountable for the following responsibilities:

* Reviewers are entrusted to evaluate the veracity of the presented research, therefore they must inform the Academic Editor(s) right away if they discover that they are not qualified to do so for a specific topic.
* In the event that the content of a manuscript is deemed to be inappropriately partial, reviewers are responsible for flagging this to the Academic Editor(s) for further review.
* Reviewers must provide unbiased and constructive, quality feedback within review reports, and must adhere to the highest standards of professionalism and ethics throughout the entire review process.
* Reviewers should respect the intellectual independence of the author, be constructive and courteous in their remarks, and avoid personal comments. Academia.edu Journals reserves the right to edit out comments that will hinder constructive discussion.
* Academia.edu Journals respects the need for peer review to be conducted privately and anonymously and extends provision for this process to its reviewers. Reviewers should also be mindful of not revealing their identity to the authors, either in their comments or in metadata for reports.
* Reviewers must ensure that manuscripts are evaluated promptly and within the agreed time period. In the event that an unforeseen matter prevents a timely review after a reviewer has agreed to provide a report, it is the responsibility of the reviewer to promptly notify the Editorial Office about this delay.
* Reviewers are responsible for reading the journal's Reviewer Guidelines in their entirety, as well as familiarizing themselves with the journal's Author Guidelines, Editorial Process, Editorial Policies, and Style Guide.

Conflicts of Interest and Confidentiality – If the quality logical chains are in focus, the personal relationships are finally totally irrelevant. On the other hand: an evaluation of a publication is also a kind of publication (and should always be published / should have been ever published). An evaluation can also only be totally correct or not totally correct. Parallel: see Part II – homo homini lupus?!

Reviewers that are aware of any potential conflict of interest with the manuscript must immediately disclose this interest to the journal's Editorial Office at the point of invitation, and recuse themselves from reviewing that manuscript. Any financial, personal, or academic interest, or any other factor that may be perceived to influence the objectivity or integrity of the review process must be declared at the point of invitation.

Examples of potential conflicts of interest may include: c.f. whether a logical chain is correct or not, is (should be totally) independent from all aspects of human interactions!

* The reviewer and one or more authors are affiliated with the same institution
* The reviewer has professionally collaborated with any of the authors in the past 3 years
* The reviewer has a personal (positive or negative) relationship, competition, or animosity with any of the authors or companies/institutions connected to the manuscript
* The reviewer might experience financial gain or loss based on the publication of the paper
* The reviewer has other non-financial conflicts (religious, political, ideological, etc.) with any of the authors

All content within manuscripts seen during peer review by reviewers must be kept confidential. All details of a manuscript (including the general topic, abstract, or key points) or its review, during or after the peer-review process, beyond the information released by the journal, are intended to be kept private. Reviewers are strictly prohibited from disclosing any information about a manuscript to third parties, unless the Editorial Office and authors have given their express approval. After a review is completed, reviewers are asked to destroy any downloaded copies of the manuscript.

Furthermore, unpublished information disclosed in a submitted manuscript must not be used in any research by the reviewers or any other informed person involved in the peer review process, unless the authors have given their explicit permission or until the time of its publication.

Academia.edu Journals will treat reviewer misconduct seriously and investigate any evidence of confidentiality breach, non-declaration of conflicts of interest (both financial and non-financial), inappropriate use of confidential material, or delays to peer review for competitive advantage. Major allegations of reviewer misconduct (e.g. plagiarism) will be raised with the reviewer’s institution.
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# Copilot (case study)

Prompt:

Well this is an abstract sent to a scientific journal: Academia Mental Health and Well-Being

Abstract: <<text without title/authors – without any tasks, challenges = without any instructions>>

Answer:

Thanks for sharing your abstract! It’s a strong and well-structured summary of your study. If you're looking for feedback or suggestions, here are a few areas where I can help:

**✅ Strengths:**

* **Clear structure**: The abstract follows a logical flow—Background, Methods, Results, and Conclusion.
* **Statistical clarity**: You’ve included effect sizes, confidence intervals, and p-values, which is excellent for scientific rigor.
* **Relevance**: The focus on LMICs and the <<region>> context adds valuable insight to global cognitive health research.

**🛠 Suggestions for Improvement:**

1. **Clarify the journal formatting**: Replace HTML entities like &lt; with the actual symbols (<) unless required by the journal.
2. **Refine the conclusion**: You might consider emphasizing the practical implications a bit more—e.g., how clinicians or policymakers might use this information.
3. **Add sample size**: Including the number of participants in the Methods section would strengthen the abstract’s transparency.

**✍️ Slightly Refined Version:**

**Background**: <<text>>

**Methods**: <<text>>

**Results**: <<text>>

**Conclusion**: <<text>>

Would you like help formatting this for submission, creating a visual summary, or preparing a lay summary for a broader audience?

Full text from the COPILOT:

<https://miau.my-x.hu/miau/321/robot_lector/invitation_to_hell_bg.docx>

**Part II**

# Problem

The Knuth-principle is simple and clear (c.f. [https://miau.my-x.hu/miau2009/index\_tki.php3?\_filterText0=\*knuth](https://miau.my-x.hu/miau2009/index_tki.php3?_filterText0=*knuth)): Knowledge/Science should be able to transform the human intuitions into source codes.

A review process (see part I – chapter introduction) should also be made (not by human beings, but) robots – and LLMs are available. Human beings need textual rules. The quality of these texts (c.f. magic of words) is never acceptable – if we will speak about sciences. Words can not be explained through words needing explanation thorough undefined words… (c.f. part I – chapter: rules).

The prompts may not cause unethical influences. It means it is possible to work (let alone) without any instructions (c.f. part I – chapter: Copilot…).

A Google search says: “*Homo homini lupus, or in its unabridged form Homo homini lupus est, is a Latin proverb meaning literally 'man is a wolf to man'. It is used to refer to situations where a person has behaved comparably to a wolf. In this case, the wolf represents predatory, cruel, and generally inhuman qualities.*” It means that a review process is a kind of part of this not wanted relationship between human individuals.

# Tasks

Change tracking sing can be identified in Part I – chapter: Rules in form of footnotes – in order to demonstrate the weakest points (c.f. cliches – fuzzy terms) of the intuitive, textual rules.

Parallel: in Part I – chapter: Copilot presents a basic solution. It means review processes should be managed without any human reviewers – already without quasi any goals/tasks in the prompt. Future challenge could be as follows: the prompt can include all the intuitive/textual rules parallel to the publication needed an evaluation.

# Conclusions

The scientific community should finally be matured enough to avoid seemingly democratic “solutions”: it is irrelevant how many human individuals do accept a publication. It is only relevant: whether the publication presents the truth or not!

Parallel, it is irrelevant concerning the correctness of a publication, where a publication is published: c.f. [https://miau.my-x.hu/miau2009/index\_tki.php3?\_filterText0=\*sinicsi](https://miau.my-x.hu/miau2009/index_tki.php3?_filterText0=*sinicsi) (The science-marketing is independent from the correctness level of the publications – even in the field of the mathematics – let alone other “scientific” disciplines…)

The LLMs are capable of simulating human evaluations. They are definitively not concerned with conflicts of interests. They can be prompted quasi arbitrary exact about the expectations/rules. LLMs are capable of finetuning/improving texts. Each human effort (at least from now on - finally) should train the robot-lectors. Human activities should be involved into the development of the robot lector and not into the direct evaluation of publications (c.f. homo homini lupus?!).

1. Rather were (<>are): the new lifeline = robot-lectors! (robotized competencies for quality assurance) [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Textual rules may/can/should not be seen as standards (c.f. Wittgenstein, Derrida)! [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. A peer reviewer must finally be an algorithm! [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. It is irrelevant, whether the mass has the same opinion, if this opinion is false. It should always be enough to have one single TRUE evaluation! The question is not the volume of the mass, but the capability of deriving the TRUTH! [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Thoroughly (c.f. brute force) <> It should be enough to identify one single error in the logical chain of the publication (c.f. error-driven approximation: e.g. [https://miau.my-x.hu/miau/304/3333\_2023o.xlsx](https://miau.my-x.hu/miau/304/3333_2023o.xlsx%22%20%5Ct%20%22_blank))! [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. pay close attention = Cliché ☹ [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. detailed enough = Cliché ☹ [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. LLMs produce real finetuning: c.f. Part I – chapter „Copilot” – suggestions for improvement… [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. The logical chains can have correct sequences (1) and incorrect ones (0). [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. fit = Cliché ☹ [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. significant = Cliché ☹ [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. valid = Cliché ☹ [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
13. strong = Cliché ☹ [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
14. appropriate = Cliché ☹ [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
15. relevant = Cliché ☹ [↑](#footnote-ref-15)