

Editorial comments to paper published in this issue on pgs. 135–138

## The article: "New valve–mechanical model of urinary tract function: the theory of biological dual valves"

### Do we need novel and innovative hypotheses in urology?

Tomasz Drewa<sup>1,2</sup>, Georg Steinhauser<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Urology, Institute of Oncology, Bydgoszcz, Poland

<sup>2</sup>Department of Tissue Engineering, Nicolaus Copernicus University, Toruń, Poland

<sup>3</sup>Vienna University of Technology, Atominstitut, Vienna, Austria

Scientific papers presenting innovative hypotheses may appear very attractive, but pose difficulty for peer review. In scientific publishing, peer review is intended to ensure the quality of scientific content. However, innovative studies, by definition, are very often controversial studies and thus face problems in the course of review. A controversial manuscript may run the risk of being rejected. An unconventional article is very likely to be conventionalized in the peer review process – indeed a selection towards the average [1]. Even if such a paper is finally accepted after thorough peer review and one or more revisions, it often appears no longer as innovative as the originally submitted version, because the authors had to fulfill the referees' conditions for acceptance. As a matter of fact, a scientific paper only appears in print as the final, accepted version that the reviewers agree with; the uninfluenced – and perhaps sometimes "better" – original manuscript disappears forever. Moreover, David Horrobin noticed that "peer review in the grant-giving process is so restrictive that most innovative scientists know they would never receive funding if they actually said what they were going to do. Scientists therefore have to tell lies in their grant applications" [2]. One can speculate that such mechanisms may occur in scientific publishing as well: researchers may feel forced to be dishonest about their result just to get a paper accepted. In this respect, one may wonder whether peer review, when performed uncautiously, should be regarded as a tool of general quality control. Could it be that just the opposite is the case: peer review as an instrument stimulating scientific fraud?

All reviewers have to be susceptible to true and original values while rating an article. A good example is a paper prepared by Arpad Dani and Peter Szendrő entitled „New Valve-Mechanical Model of Urinary Tract Function: The Theory of Biological Dual Valves" [3]. Dani and Szendrő presented an interesting idea of a „New Model of

Urinary Tract Function" which is based on a structural point of view that the urinary tract may be considered to consist of dual-valves. The dual-valve mechanism combined with peristalsis allows better explanation of the function of the upper urinary tract in particular. Dani and Szendrő concluded that the flow in the urinary tract must be studied integrally within the body [3].

It is very difficult to assess a paper, due to the fact that the reviewer usually only has one of three options after evaluating a scientific article: to accept the paper in its present form, to request revisions to the article, or ultimately to suggest its rejection. A reviewer cannot incorporate any comments into the manuscript or add statements of concern that the hypothesis may be incorrect. When reading such a visionary article, like this one, it is difficult to definitively judge „accept" or „reject". It is even much more difficult to request revisions, but, after all, these types of articles are surely needed. They put in motion the scientific discussion and development: not only in general sciences, but in the field of urology too.

#### REFERENCES

1. Thurner S, Hanel R: *Peer-review in a world with rational scientists: towards selection of the average*. 2010; arXiv:1008.4324v.
2. Horrobin DF: *The philosophical basis of peer review and the suppression of innovation*. JAMA 1990; 263: 1438-1441.
3. Dani A, Szendrő P: *New valve-mechanical model of urinary tract function: the theory of biological dual valves*. CEJUrol 2011; 3: 135–138.

#### Correspondence

Tomasz Drewa, FEBU, prof. NCU  
tomaszdrewa@wp.pl