

The abstracts presented below are sourced or adapted from published research articles and are included with appropriate attribution in accordance with their respective licensing terms. The accompanying peer reviewer comments and author responses are hypothetical and have been constructed for analytical purposes; in most cases, the author responses are intentionally phrased to illustrate common shortcomings in addressing reviewer feedback. The evaluation of these responses reflects a critical assessment conducted by a human expert with interdisciplinary expertise spanning economics, sociology, art, statistics, and law.

Case Number	Abstract	Peer Reviewer Feedback	Author Response	Problems with Author Response (Based on Human Expert Evaluation)
1	<p>“In this current knowledge-based economy, firms' productivity and competitive advantage are no longer based on physical and financial assets but on intangible assets. This has compelled knowledge-intensive firms to look for a more reliable source for higher productivity and competitive advantage by focusing on their intellectual capital, which cannot be easily imitated. As banks are classified as knowledge intensive, this study examines investment in intellectual capital by banks and examines how it has improved bank productivity measured in terms of asset turnover (ATO) and employee productivity (EP). Using a panel of 73 commercial banks in India for a 12-year period (2006–2017), the</p>	<p>“Why did you focus on banks? Were they not knowledge-intensive firms? The case is non-compelling. Also, you have mentioned advantage. Further, the asset turnover ratio can be inflated from divisor so is there a trade off between productivity and competitive advantage?”</p>	<p>“Thank you for your feedback. First, I would like to clarify this is not a one-off “case study” but is about banks in general. We focus on banks because they are a part of the knowledge economy. They are known to look for more reliable sources for higher productivity and competitive advantage, as discussed previously. For example, financial institutions are using artificial intelligence (AI), machine learning, and natural language processing to convert unstructured data into actionable insights. Banks are implementing advanced, centralized platforms to store and share institutional knowledge, breaking down departmental silos to improve operational efficiency and</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This is problematic: “this is not a one-off ‘case study’ but is about banks in general” – the reviewer used “case study” loosely (as a synonym for case/context), so this point did not require clarification and shouldn’t have been addressed.</li> <li>• The reviewer used rhetorical phrasing: “were banks not knowledge intensive?” This signals agreement that banks <i>are</i> knowledge-intensive, so the explanation of why the author believes they are knowledge-intensive is redundant.</li> <li>• The likely intent of the reviewer was different: if banks are already well-established as knowledge-intensive, <b>what is the novel contribution of the study?</b> This becomes especially important</li> </ul>

Case Number	Abstract	Peer Reviewer Feedback	Author Response	Problems with Author Response (Based on Human Expert Evaluation)
	<p>study found that some components of intellectual capital improves productivity, and others do not.”</p> <p>Source: <a href="#">Does investing in intellectual capital improve productivity? Panel evidence from commercial banks in India</a> by Oppong and Pattanayak</p>		<p>decision-making. A significant percentage of financial institutions (65%) are ramping up their digital asset programs in 2025/2026 to create new revenue streams and drive innovation. Investment banks are focusing on converting employee "know-how" and experience into codified, actionable intelligence through personal intelligent assistants. We have now added this information to the manuscript in lines 14-20. We have added citations to emphasise the link between productivity and competitive advantage in lines 14-23. Also, we have revised the ATO to a more reliable metric of working capital turnover, which indicates both competitive advantage and productivity according to literature (Smith et al.,2017). This is a better ratio in our opinion because it considers net sales, which is a more reliable measure of productivity that naturally ties</p>	<p>because the first line of the abstract implies a focus on firms <i>transitioning</i> towards knowledge-intensive arrangements, whereas banks have long operated in that mode.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “We have added citations to emphasise the link between productivity and competitive advantage in lines 14–23” – this does not resolve the issue. The opening line states: “In this current knowledge-based economy, firms' productivity and competitive advantage are no longer based on physical and financial assets but on intangible assets.” This frames productivity and competitive advantage as parallel outcomes. If competitive advantage is instead being treated as a secondary variable (indirectly affected via productivity), then the <b>overall framing of the study needs revision</b>, not just additional citations.</li> <li>• This is unconvincing: “Also, we have</li> </ul>

Case Number	Abstract	Peer Reviewer Feedback	Author Response	Problems with Author Response (Based on Human Expert Evaluation)
			<p>in rather than trades off with competitive advantage. Thank you for bringing this salient point to our attention.”</p>	<p>revised the ATO to a more reliable metric of working capital turnover... this is a better ratio... because it considers net sales...” The reviewer’s concern was with the <b>divisor (denominator)</b>, which can be inflated to artificially increase the ratio. The response shifts focus to the numerator (net sales), which remains the same in both ATO and working capital turnover. As a result, it is still unclear how this revision addresses the reviewer’s concern about <b>ratio distortion</b>.</p>
2	<p>“The article is a review of the part of the research conducted in the framework of the grant of the Russian Foundation for Basic Research “Urban well-being of people with disabilities”. The immediate subject of the article is professional self-realization as a factor of urban well-being of a person with a disability. Well-being is understood as a subjectively constructed phenomenon, that is,</p>	<p>“I fail to understand ‘self-reported survey.’ In statistical outputs, did you address model specifications and all? If the five factors have not been discussed in the paper, they should not be a part of its body as it will simply confuse readers.”</p>	<p>“By “self-reported survey,” we refer to data collected through a structured questionnaire in which participants provided anonymized responses about their own experiences and perceptions. The instrument included Likert-scale items measuring job satisfaction, self-actualization at work, and perceived well-being. Regarding the statistical analysis, we have clarified the model specification</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The reviewer’s statement “I fail to understand ‘self-reported survey’” is likely rhetorical (possibly sarcastic), questioning the <b>methodological justification</b>, not the definition itself—i.e., why self-reports were chosen. For a construct like well-being.</li> <li>• The author, however, interprets this literally and explains what self-reports are. This risks sounding <b>condescending</b>, as reviewers are</li> </ul>

Case Number	Abstract	Peer Reviewer Feedback	Author Response	Problems with Author Response (Based on Human Expert Evaluation)
	<p>through the prism of people with disabilities' own perceptions of the sufficiency of conditions created in the urban environment for their professional self-realization and, as a consequence, for well-being in general. Professional self-realization has become one of the six factor groups that directly or indirectly influence the urban well-being of citizens with disabilities. Along with professional self-realization, the factors of urban well-being in the framework of the study were: trust in the government and involvement in management processes; the level of implementation of basic values; psychological comfort; accessibility of the spatial environment; and finally, the quality of social services. The five factor groups listed above are not discussed in the article, but the reader should have an idea of the context in which professional self-realization is studied. The study included two</p>		<p>and addressed potential identification issues. In particular, we tested for multicollinearity using variance inflation factors (VIF), all of which were within acceptable thresholds. We also conducted standard residual diagnostics to assess model assumptions (linearity, homoscedasticity, and normality), and no significant violations were detected. Corresponding coefficients and R<sup>2</sup> values have now been included in the revised manuscript. Finally, we agree that including the five additional factor groups without discussing them may create confusion. These have been removed to improve clarity and focus.”</p>	<p>likely already familiar with the concept. The expected justification would be that well-being is inherently subjective and thus best captured through self-reports.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Endogeneity concerns are not addressed, despite the mention of “identification issues” in the response. This leaves a key econometric issue unresolved.</li> <li>• The author had already clarified in the original abstract that the five additional constructs were outside the study’s scope and included only for context. The reviewer’s concern was about their placement in the main body; instead of removing them entirely, they could (and arguably should) have been <b>relocated to background/contextual discussion.</b></li> <li>• Removing these factors also raises a potential issue: if variables previously presented as relevant are now excluded, should they also check for omission bias?</li> </ul>

Case Number	Abstract	Peer Reviewer Feedback	Author Response	Problems with Author Response (Based on Human Expert Evaluation)
	<p>sub-samples, reflecting the specifics of a megalopolis (Moscow) and a regional center (Saratov).”</p> <p>Source: <a href="#"><i>Professional self-realization of disabled persons in an urban environment</i></a> by Sergeevich et al.</p>			
3	<p>“To address limitations in existing video colorization methods, this study proposes an approach that integrates a fine-tuned latent diffusion model with an autoregressive conditioning mechanism. The method demonstrates notable improvements on standard evaluation metrics (e.g., PSNR, SSIM, etc.) and self-reports (80% of cases). Video colorization remains relatively underexplored compared to image-based approaches; many existing</p>	<p>“Benefits of the brain trying to stitch continuity assigning motion where none exists aren’t addressed. Environmental and financial constraints with respect to the technology references are not covered. Have you mapped objective to subjective measures?”</p>	<p>“Thank you for bringing these pointers to our attention. We have covered the aspect of spatiotemporal prediction in the following sentence in the results section: “our technology also helps overcome the false assignment of motion where none exists and inaccurate stitching of continuity.” Feasibility and environmental constraints have been recognised in our background section now: “ AI-generated video colorization can cost between \$0.50 to \$30 per</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The reviewer highlights <b>human ability to tolerate or reconstruct motion</b>, questioning whether perfect temporal consistency (or the author’s product that enables this) is necessary/relevant.</li> <li>• In other words, while the authors treat temporal discontinuity (flicker, motion stitching errors) as purely negative, the reviewer highlights that the human visual system can <b>construct coherent motion even from noisy or inconsistent frames</b>, suggesting that such “imperfections” may not</li> </ul>

Case Number	Abstract	Peer Reviewer Feedback	Author Response	Problems with Author Response (Based on Human Expert Evaluation)
	<p>techniques rely on frame-by-frame processing, resulting in flickering or abrupt color transitions.”</p> <p>Source: Adapted from <a href="#">LatentColorization: Latent Diffusion-Based Speaker Video Colorization</a> by Ward et al.</p>		<p>minute in 2026 for automated tools, whereas traditional, professional manual colorization ranges from \$1,000 to over \$50,000 per minute.” Following your suggestion, we have mapped the objective and subjective measures by merging our self-report measure section with our reports on PSNR, SSIM, FID, FVD, NIQE and BRISQUE; under each of these, we explain how it is equivalent to an 80% increase.”</p>	<p>always be detrimental.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The response misinterprets this point. Instead of engaging with the relevance question, the author explains how their method prevents humans from stitching motion together. This is counterproductive, as the reviewer explicitly framed this perceptual stitching as a <b>benefit</b>, meaning the response inadvertently suggests the product may be removing something useful/beneficial.</li> <li>• Environmental constraints are not addressed at all.</li> <li>• The financial discussion is generic and range-based, rather than being <b>specific to the proposed method</b>, limiting its usefulness in evaluating feasibility.</li> <li>• Finally, combining the objective and subjective measure sections is not equivalent to mapping them. Proper mapping would require <b>demonstrating a relationship (e.g., correlation or alignment)</b> between objective metrics and subjective</li> </ul>

Case Number	Abstract	Peer Reviewer Feedback	Author Response	Problems with Author Response (Based on Human Expert Evaluation)
				user perceptions, which is not done here.
4	<p>“The article reveals the importance of space for national security. The points of interaction between space activities and national security are identified, which reflect the growing importance of outer space for ensuring the security of States and emergency management, the growth of international cooperation in the field of space technologies. The newest possibilities of space to ensure national security (warning and military intelligence systems; communication systems and means of coordination; systems of space monitoring of the environment and resource management; systems of border and maritime surveillance; development of other technologies; development of global cooperation) are revealed. The problems of ensuring the</p>	<p>“Which set of countries does this study cover? Are they representative of geographical tensions and how so? You’ve covered a laundry list of aspects including warning systems, intelligence, border surveillance, resource management, international cooperation, and militarization risks. Your discussion does not refer to previous studies.”</p>	<p>“Thank you for your feedback. We have included Spain, France, Italy, Germany, and Greece as a part of the EU treaty. We have also expanded on the concepts to illustrate the importance of each of them rather than just listing these: Warning systems in the context of space-based national security refer to satellite-enabled technologies designed to detect and provide early alerts about potential threats such as missile launches, natural disasters, or environmental hazards, allowing states to respond rapidly and reduce damage. Intelligence refers to the collection and analysis of information gathered from space assets, such as imaging satellites and signal interception systems, to support military planning, situational awareness, and strategic decision-making. Border surveillance</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Only country names are provided, without any explanation of the <b>rationale for their inclusion</b> or how they relate to specific geopolitical tensions. As a result, the issue of representativeness remains unaddressed.</li> <li>• Simply expanding each item into definitions does not resolve the “laundry list” problem; it <b>describes</b> the elements but does not structure or prioritize them analytically.</li> <li>• What is needed is prioritization. For example, the study could foreground <b>military intelligence and surveillance systems as the primary national security application of space technologies</b>, and then position other aspects—such as resource management or environmental monitoring—as secondary or supporting domains. This would provide a clearer</li> </ul>

Case Number	Abstract	Peer Reviewer Feedback	Author Response	Problems with Author Response (Based on Human Expert Evaluation)
	<p>priority of national security in the use of space resources have been formed, with the formation of a global strategy that geopolitical stability and prevention of the militarization of space should become key aspects for ensuring the national security of any State.”</p> <p>Source: <a href="#"><i>Space and National Security: Points of interaction, Opportunities and Issue of Priority</i></a> by Neskorozenyi et al.</p>		<p>involves the use of satellite imaging and tracking technologies to monitor terrestrial and maritime boundaries for illegal crossings, trafficking, or unauthorized activities, enhancing a state’s ability to enforce sovereignty over its territory. Resource management describes the application of space technologies, particularly Earth observation satellites, to monitor and optimize the use of natural resources such as water, minerals, agriculture, and forests, supporting both economic planning and environmental sustainability. International cooperation refers to collaborative efforts between states and organizations in developing, sharing, and regulating space technologies and data, aimed at promoting peaceful use of outer space and addressing shared challenges like debris mitigation and disaster</p>	<p>analytical hierarchy rather than an unstructured list.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The literature review remains superficial. It functions as an acknowledgement of existing work but does not explain <b>how prior studies lead to the present research</b>, what limitations they have, or <b>what specific gap this study is addressing</b>.</li> </ul>

Case Number	Abstract	Peer Reviewer Feedback	Author Response	Problems with Author Response (Based on Human Expert Evaluation)
			<p>response. Militarization risks denote the potential escalation of space activities into armed conflict scenarios, including the deployment of offensive capabilities in orbit, anti-satellite weapons, and the transformation of space into a contested warfighting domain, raising concerns about global stability and security. We have also cited recent security-focused literature, including work by scholars like Joan Johnson-Freese (2016) and Michael Krepon (2018), which highlights how space assets have become indispensable for military operations through communications, navigation (e.g., GPS), and intelligence gathering, effectively making space a “warfighting enabler” rather than a purely scientific domain. At the same time, research in strategic studies and international relations has emphasized intensifying great-power competition—</p>	

Case Number	Abstract	Peer Reviewer Feedback	Author Response	Problems with Author Response (Based on Human Expert Evaluation)
			<p>particularly among the United States, China, and Russia—through anti-satellite weapon development, space situational awareness systems, and doctrine shifts toward space as a contested domain. Complementary studies in space policy and sustainability literature further address the risks of orbital congestion, debris creation, and the fragile governance framework, arguing that international cooperation remains essential to prevent escalation and ensure long-term usability of outer space for both civilian and security purposes.”</p>	
5	<p>“This study aimed to compare the width, the length, the length per width ratio, and the stretch index between the first and the second halves in official soccer matches, and to compare the spatial exploration index between players from different positions. Seventeen professional soccer players from a Brazilian club</p>	<p>“To what extent might individual player changes have contributed to the uniform findings? What was the finding about wing forwards? Were any methodological limitations related to positional tracking considered when evaluating the findings?”</p>	<p>“Thank you for your questions. We accounted for paired design (or repeated measures logic) and for the mean, median, mode, range, interquartile differences, confidence intervals to ensure we covered sufficient base. The same players completed both halves (and none were excluded as there were no changes), and no</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The reviewer’s concern is whether <b>within-player deviations cancelled each other out</b>, leading to the “uniform findings” (i.e., similar averages across the two halves). The author’s emphasis on means and other summary statistics directly reflects the <b>same limitation</b> being pointed out—</li> </ul>

Case Number	Abstract	Peer Reviewer Feedback	Author Response	Problems with Author Response (Based on Human Expert Evaluation)
	<p>participated in the study and were monitored during six official matches by a GPS device. Collective positional data were compared between the two halves using a paired t-test, while the spatial exploration index was compared between the playing positions and within the halves by a mixed two-way ANOVA. The results revealed no differences between the two halves for the collective variables. The highest values of spatial exploration index were reported for central midfielders and wing forwards. We conclude that the tactical behavior of professional soccer players is position-dependent, and midfielders are the most exploratory players on the pitch.”</p> <p>Source: <a href="#">Effects of match period and playing position on the individual and collective dynamics in professional soccer: a case study</a> by Praça et al.</p>		<p>substitutions occurred. We also ensured that there was no omission of data. One of the greatest spatial exploration index values was observed in wing forwards (significant at <math>p &lt; 0.01</math>), which was comparable to midfielders, and we have added the test statistic in parenthesis after the result of “the highest values of spatial exploration index were reported for central midfielders and wing forwards.” We took readings from various GPS devices to account for inaccuracies from specific devices and have added the specifications of these in our revised manuscript. Thank you once again!”</p>	<p>since means aggregate values, opposing deviations can cancel out and mask underlying variation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The clarification about wing forwards is statistically fine, but it does not address the reviewer’s likely concern. Wing forwards are included in the results (“highest values... central midfielders and wing forwards”) but <b>excluded from the conclusion</b>, which states that midfielders are the most exploratory. Adding a test statistic to the results does not resolve this <b>inconsistency between results and interpretation</b>.</li> <li>• “We took readings from various GPS devices...” can be a red flag. If different devices were used <b>within the same match</b>, this raises concerns about measurement consistency; if they were used across different matches, this needs to be clearly specified.</li> <li>• More importantly, using multiple devices does not address the reviewer’s underlying concern</li> </ul>

Case Number	Abstract	Peer Reviewer Feedback	Author Response	Problems with Author Response (Based on Human Expert Evaluation)
				<p>about <b>inherent limitations of GPS tracking</b>, such as distortions due to atmospheric conditions or signal noise. The response focuses on device-specific inaccuracies rather than engaging with these <b>systematic methodological constraints</b>.</p>