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Democratisation of scientific advice

Secrecy and democracy don’t mix
Editor—Bal et al struggle to show that “concealing information from public scrutiny” is a necessary condition for “democratic function” but fail. The fault in their argument is the assumption that an advisory committee should alone decide how the question is framed, how different types of evidence should be privileged, and how the “performance” should be presented. Similar debates have been vigorously pursued in the health impact assessment community.

Dissent in the scientific community is not a problem that should be hidden from an ignorant public but a fundamental mechanism in the advancement of knowledge. It is true that knowledge of temporary or continued dissent will be used naively or even mischievously and so confuse issues, but that is no excuse for hiding the process by which conclusions are reached.

Scientific reasoning is a powerful tool for improving public decision making, but it is not sufficient. Account has to be taken of lay knowledge. Experiential evidence, which covers far more than experience of disease, is one part of this. “Irrational” concerns (better described as differently rational) and values also have to be taken into account as do all the messy considerations of political possibility. That scientists should seek to avoid the complexity of wicked problems by retreating into secrecy is understandable, but benign paternalism is no answer to mature democratic making of public policy.
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Authors advocate getting dressed for public performance, not nackedness is bad
Editor—Rather than arguing that nackedness is bad like Abbass,1 in our article on the democratisation of science we urge transparency advocates to be specific about the body parts that should be displayed publicly.2 As scientific advisory councils find themselves at the intersections of science and society, they necessarily transpose the boundaries of science. This makes them vulnerable to the politicisation of their work. Sound scientific advice is urgently needed in a time where our societies are overwhelmed with new technologies. Therefore, we think that scientific advisory boards do well in taking utmost care in shaping their relations with policy actors and the citizenry.

The experience of the Health Council of the Netherlands in dealing with scientific elements (colliding knowledge claims, etc.), can be inspiring to develop methods and procedures to allow societal elements into the advisory process. Transparency about one’s arguments, allowing your readership to join you in (or dissent from) a line of reasoning, is one of these fragile new procedures that enable the council to be both scientific and useful to policy and public debate.

Scientific journals should publish dissenting voices, as this is important for the advancement of science (although journals also have their backstage processes, as McCabe says in her rapid response). Science advisory boards, however, are to advise government on the state of the art. Debates in the committee further that goal, as this is useful in mobilising the expertise of committee members. Confidentiality of the committee process is essential for the production of such debates (public scrutiny during the process might deter openness among experts). Whereas it goes without saying that lasting dissent is not to be concealed, it seems wise to bring temporary dissent into the open, as this would be easily taken up to politicise the advice and thus render it ineffective.
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Submission to multiple journals to reduce publication times

Idea needs further evaluation
Editor—Jorgenson et al moot the idea of submission to multiple journals to reduce publication times, but their article raises more questions than it provides answers.1 Firstly, how many journals would authors be allowed to submit their article, and who will decide the number of simultaneous submissions—the authors or the journal?

Secondly, in the event of simultaneous acceptance by many journals, who would know that the accepted article should remain with which journal—the authors (who always want their article published in the best journal) or the journals themselves (which might fight for the article if it is really high quality)?

Thirdly, what would happen to low rated journals (which may not be getting the article in first place)?

Fourthly, if the article were rejected by all the journals to which it was submitted, should the authors be allowed to resubmit it?