

Guiding Star or my personal expierence with Science

Dmitri Martila

*Institute of Theoretical Physics, Tartu University,
4 Tähe Street, 51010 Tartu, Estonia**

(Dated: July 2, 2020)

Abstract

To pass the peer-review more adequately and with intellectual, childish joy, the refereeing process in Science should be modified. In this note I present a psychological analysis of this change.

*Electronic address: eestidima@gmail.com

The goal “to find mistakes” could be a bad attitude. The final goal should be to enjoy reading the publication. If flaws are seen, they must be reported. However, this report should be given without any laughs and sadistic enjoyment. Instead, the flaws should be reported with some sadness.

The psychologists have conducted a social experiment: they told the probants that the man on the photo is a serial killer. The probants testified that he is looking like one. The next day they told another group of probants that the man on the same photo is an American national hero; these probants have confirmed his heroic look.

In conclusion, having the “mistakes desire” as your default position while reading the manuscript of an unknown author increases the chances for the paper to be unjustly rejected. The scientific skepticism should be the readiness to deal with mistakes, but not the expectation – by desire – to find them.

Why do I ask as an author for detailed reports from the referee system? The referee must convince me that I have done mistakes, otherwise I would not accept them [yes, it seems like living in an “utopian” perfect world]. This research principle is my personal “guiding star” during my quest for the objective truth.

To navigate in Science, you need to have your own point of view and convictions you should not rush to abandon. Otherwise you will soon be disoriented. Only then you will realize the objective truth. This is the subjective search for the objective truth, because you are making the choice about what is right and what is not.