Neurological Surgery and Anatomy 2025, 2(2): 48-49, e-ISSN: 2966-0696
DOI: 10.37085/nsa.2025.8

Editorial

# I review, therefore I care: a brief reflection on science, technology, and equity

Antonio Cavalcanti de A. Martins[1,3], Carolina Martins[1,2]

[1]Medical School of Pernambuco, Recife, Pernambuco Brazil
[2]Federal University of Pernambuco, Recife, Pernambuco, Brazil
[3]Professor Fernando Figueira Institute of Integral Medicine, Recife, Pernambuco

Inspired by René Descartes' famous maxim "I think, therefore I am," this phrase reframes the act of reviewing as a gesture of care. In times of technological transition and editorial challenges, to review is more than to evaluate — it is to participate, to protect, to exist within science.

Peer review remains one of the pillars of scientific communication (1–4), adding value, promoting rigor, and contributing to the advancement of knowledge. Although this model has endured for nearly two centuries (1), it is not immune to criticism — especially in light of the technological transformations shaping our present.

Despite its importance, the review process faces significant challenges. Recruiting available and qualified reviewers is a struggle for journals worldwide (2-4). The time required for a thorough evaluation, combined with the lack of formal recognition or compensation mechanisms, can compromise the quality of reviews and delay editorial workflows. In some cases, the shortage of reviewers leads to overburdening a few, in superficial analyses, or publication delays — affecting authors, readers, and the credibility of science itself.

Artificial Intelligence (AI), operating over vast repositories of knowledge, is increasingly considered a potential collaborator in this process. When carefully calibrated, its use can help mitigate biases related to gender, institutional affiliation, or nationality, while offering greater speed and some consistency in manuscript evaluation. Still, AI — which may in turn introduce new and challenging problems of itself — does not replace the human gaze: empathetic, contextual, and ethical — which remains, today and tomorrow, an essential part of editorial practice.

In this context, it is important to recognize the role of the scientific reviewer as a partner to the author. Far from being a mere judge (4), the reviewer contributes to the improvement of the manuscript, offering suggestions that strengthen its clarity, methodological consistency, and scientific relevance. It is an almost silent — yet decisive — collaboration in shaping a quality editorial product — one that respects the author's effort and values the reader.

With a year and a half of trajectory, Neurological Surgery and Anatomy is establishing itself as an editorial space committed to expanding access to scientific publication in historically underrepresented regions. The questions that drive us — often rooted in local clinical, social, and structural realities — not only deserve visibility but also resonate in international debates. Research born in specific contexts can illuminate universal issues, and it is in this intersection between the local and the global that the journal finds its vocation.

Furthermore, the shift toward online publishing has quietly redefined how scientific contributions are valued. Increasingly, it is the content — its relevance, clarity, and integrity — that resonates, rather than the prestige of the journal that hosts it (5). This transformation opens space for broader participation. In this evolving landscape, each contribution helps shape the kind of science we choose to build — one that is more open, more inclusive, and more attuned to the questions that matter.

It is precisely why, in this environment, we strive to nourish a culture of inclusion, continuous learning, and proficiency-seeking. Pride in any identity we carry — whether regional, professional, or personal — should reflect not only where we come from or are based, but how we choose to grow. To do things well, with care and rigor, is integrity — dignity in itself. Scientific publishing should not be a space where sincere efforts are dismissed, but one where curiosity, collaboration, and thoughtful work are welcomed. Whether you are an experienced reviewer or just beginning to explore the world of scientific evaluation; whether you are a seasoned author or still in training — there is room for your contribution. We believe that strengthening science depends on building trustworthy, diverse networks committed to knowledge. And that is precisely what this journal aims to offer.

© Copyright 2025

# References

1. Csiszar A. Peer review: Troubled from the start. Nature 2016;532:306–8. Doi:10.1038/532306a.
2. Acreman B, Berkery P, Black C, Bourg C, Clark B, Cochran A, et al. Report from the Peer Review Workgroup. OSI 2016;1:1–10. Doi:https://doi.org/10.13021/G8K88P.
3. Global State of Peer Review. London: Publons; 2018.
4. Drubin DG. Any jackass can trash a manuscript, but it takes good scholarship to create one (how *MBoC* promotes civil and constructive peer review). Mol Biol Cell 2011;22:525–7. Doi:10.1091/mbc.e11-01-0002.
5. American Society for Cell Biology. Declaração de São Francisco sobre Avaliação da Pesquisa (DORA). 2012.

Carolina Martins
https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0197-3520
Antonio Cavalcanti de A. Martins
https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1249-8622