

Funded evaluation criteria must be provided for building an evidence base

Yoshiyasu Takefuji

An article entitled “Building an evidence base for stakeholder engagement” was published (1). The article emphasizes the importance of substantive community and stakeholder engagement (CSE). Evaluation criteria in CSE play a key role in verifying evidences. Based on provided evidences, we must determine or verify/grade a project whether it is successful or not. In order to verify evidences, evaluation criteria must be used. In other words, the evaluation criteria must be clearly defined and provided before funding a new project. Ambiguous evaluation criteria will deteriorate the evaluation quality so that eventually funding organizations will lose their reputations. The more losing their reputations will lead to the less donations. An impact factor method has been used in many funding organizations including NIH for evaluating funded projects. However, editorial states that reviews receive higher citations than original research papers (2,3,4,5). The review paper authors may not have contributed anything to the discoveries they summarized, yet they end up getting the credit for them (5). This means that using the impact factor method is not suitable/fair for evaluating funded projects (2). We need to create fair evaluation criteria for building an evidence base.

References:

1. James V. Lavery, Building an evidence base for stakeholder engagement, Science 10 Aug 2018: Vol. 361, Issue 6402, pp. 554–556
2. Y. Takefuji, <http://science.sciencemag.org/content/356/6342/997/tab-e-letters>
3. John P. A. et al., Citation Metrics: A Primer on How (Not) to Normalize, PLOS biology, September 6, 2016
<http://journals.plos.org/plosbiology/article?id=10.1371/journal.pbio.100...>
4. Citation data: the wrong impact, Nature Neuroscience 1, 641–642 (1998)
5. Blog of neuroskeptic, "Ethics of citations," March 12, 2017
http://blogs.discovermagazine.com/neuroskeptic/2017/03/12/the-ethics-of-citation
/