

Index

- A-crises 30, 30–31, 34–35, 81
- academic freedom 114–115, 124, 129, 132
- academic incentive structures 31, 57–58, 144, 148
- adversarial collaborations 118
- altmetrics 41, 139–140, 141
- American Physical Society 29
- applicability crisis 24, 27–28, 101, 114
- applied research 50, 67–68, 67–68, 89
- Arendt, Hannah 61
- Aristotle 59–60
- Artificial Intelligence (AI) 53, 147–149
- Australian National Health and Medical Research Council 130
- authorship 110, 132, 135–136

- B-crises 30, 30–31, 35, 81
- Bacon, Francis 59–61, 151
- basic research 50, 64, 67–68, 67–69
- Bayh-Dole Act 71–72, 73
- Bem, Daryl 11, 22
- Bernal, John Desmond 105
- big team science
 - authorship 136
 - conservatism 118
 - consortia examples 109–111
 - coordination costs 120
 - funding options 126–127
 - mega-mistakes 130
 - Peirce-style coordination, relationship to 108, 112–113
 - registered reports 135, 138
 - tyranny of the majority 116
- Bik, Elisabeth 85
- biomedical research 16, 28, 31, 74–75, 87, 100, 120
- bullshit jobs 54, 54–55
- Bush, Vannevar 68

- Candolle, Alphonse de 63
- capitalization of knowledge 51, 69–70, 72
- Case, Clarence Marsh 33
- Center for Open Science 86, 93
- CERN 109, 131

- citation cartels 141
- cognitive biases 57, 82
- Cognitive Genetics Consortium (COGENT) 109
- commercial publishers 92, 136
- commercialization of academic knowledge 61, 66
- community-engaged participatory research 100–101, 101
- consensus conferences 125–126, 128–129, 135
- consensus formation 24, 102, 110, 112, 115–116, 120
- conservatism 42, 45, 95, 98, 105, 118–119, 129
- coordination costs 119–120, 127, 129
- CRedit system 135–136

- data dredging 34, 148
- Data reuse 90–92, 95
- decelerating questions 100
- Declaration on Research Assessment (DORA) 141–142
- degrowth 48, 52, 103
- Descartes, René 62
- Diamond Open Access 137
- Diamond v. Chakrabarty 71
- Disturbance and Resources Across Global Grasslands network (DRAGNet) 111–112, 116–117
- Dutch Research Council (NWO) 43, 126, 132

- eco-modernism 48
- Economic and Social Research Council (U.K.) 76
- education 49, 53, 63–64, 68, 109
 - university curricula 139–140, 143
- effect sizes 14, 16–17
- Elsevier 142
- entrepreneurial university 39–40, 51, 70
- epistemic diversity 112, 116–118, 129
- epistemic maintenance and robustness-increasing activities 31, 57, 94–95
- Error sleuths 86
- Etzkowitz 39–40, 51, 70

- European Commission 27, 49, 76–77, 76–77, 93, 125
- European Geoscience Union (EGU) 86
- European Research Council (ERC) 43, 124, 132
- Evolutionary account of scientific knowledge 96–97
- external validity 23, 95
- false positive rates 11–12
 - falsification 96, 98
 - Fast science 99–100
 - Figshare 90–91
 - Food and Drug Administration (FDA) 27
 - Freilich, Janet 18, 73–74
 - French neopositivist tradition 64
 - generalizability crisis 24, 26–27, 90, 109
 - Godin, Benoît 45–46, 47–48, 59
 - Gollum effect 87–88
 - Graeber, David 54, 54–55
 - grant applications 42, 124, 129–130
 - grant peer review 42–44, 129
 - Gross Domestic Product (GDP) 48–49, 52–53
 - h-index 139–140, 141
 - HARKing (Hypothesizing After the Results are Known) 84
 - hiring and promotion 93
 - current practices 39, 72, 139
 - proposed reforms 138, 140, 143–144
 - Horizon 2020 76–77
 - Horizon Europe 77, 123–125, 137, 142
 - Human Genome Project 109
 - Humboldt, Wilhelm von 115
 - humility 38, 151
 - indigenous knowledge 143
 - inductive reasoning 60
 - inequality 44, 50, 55–56, 88, 116–117
 - innovation
 - as progress 46, 78
 - barriers to radical/high-risk 44
 - history of the concept 62
 - impact on employment and wages 53–54
 - linear model of 67
 - link to scientific novelty 69
 - pressure on social sciences 75
 - innovation fatigue 151
 - innovation imperative 151
 - innovation-speak 49–50
 - Intellectual property 64, 72, 89
 - internal validity 22–23, 95
 - Internationale Gradmessung 106–107, 120, 127
 - Ioannidis, John 12, 12–13, 15, 28
 - journal impact factors 38, 139–142
 - Kuhn, Thomas 97–98, 105
 - Lakatos, Imre 121
 - Lakens, Daniël 20, 20–21, 27
 - linear model of innovation 50, 67–68, 71–72, 75
 - lone genius myth 64, 141, 143
 - maintenance 48–50, 49–50, 94, 139
 - Many Labs 14
 - many-analyst studies 25–26
 - ManyBabies consortium 110, 116–117
 - mega-mistakes 119, 130–131, 136, 145
 - Merton, Robert K. 37–39, 73
 - meta-science 139, 143
 - methodology and measurement crisis 22–24, 24, 25–26, 137
 - metrics 135, 137, 139–140
 - Mopping-up operations 98
 - narrative CVs 141, 144
 - National Academy of Sciences 25, 41
 - National Institutes of Health (NIH) 92, 124, 133, 150
 - National Science Foundation (NSF) 18, 66, 92, 129, 150
 - basic research funding 67, 69
 - independence from government 132
 - innovation-focused branding 43
 - linear model, adoption of 67
 - model for other agencies, as 69
 - social science funding 75
 - Nature (journal) 17–18, 34, 36, 38
 - Nelkin, Dorothy 40

- normal science 97–99, 97–98
- Nosek, Brian 16, 35, 81, 85, 134
- noxious consequences of innovation 55–56, 55–56
- Nutrient Network (NutNet) 111, 111–112, 116
- OMERACT 112–114, 112–113, 125–126, 125–126
- open access publishing 83, 92, 94
- Open research data 82, 90, 92
- Open Research Europe 136–137, 142
- Open Science 81, 133, 145
 - barriers to adoption 87–89
 - costs of 92–93
 - limitations of 78, 94–95
 - open access publishing platforms 137
 - practices and components 82–85, 87
 - under-use of shared data 90, 93
- Open Science Badges 93
- Open Science Collaboration 14
- Open Science Framework (OSF) 86–87
- Orbán, Viktor 150
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) 46–47, 65, 67
- p-hacking 84
- paper mills 147
- paradigms 57, 97–98, 97–98
- Particle Physics Project Prioritization Panel (P5) 112
- patents
 - as metric for innovation 55
 - declining quality and disruptiveness 28, 45, 73
 - legal criteria for 72
 - replicability of 18, 27
 - university-owned 40, 70–71, 73
- peer review 82, 132
 - decoupling from journals 83–84
 - open review 85–86, 94
 - suggested modifications to 133–134
- Pearce, Charles Sanders 104, 106–108, 115, 142
- Pearce-style coordination 95
 - AI-assisted prioritization 149
 - and big team science 109
 - and research programmes 121
 - definition and origin 106
 - imperfect instantiations 112
 - key elements 107–108, 113
 - objections to 129, 132
 - role of funders and institutions 123, 125
- Picard, Jacques 64
- PLoS ONE (journal) 133, 142
- Polanyi, Michael 104–105, 114–115
- Polanyi-style coordination 107, 121, 124
- political attacks on science 150
- Popper, Karl 19, 95–96, 98, 105
- Positive Predictive Value (PPV) 15
- pre-prints 83–84, 94, 131, 134, 137
- Priority rule 37, 73, 83
- privacy-sensitive data 88
- pro-innovation bias 48
- Psychological Science Accelerator (PSA) 109–110, 116–117, 120
- public-private partnerships 101
- publication bias 33–34, 57, 141
 - effect on positive predictive value (PPV) 13, 15
 - non-reporting of replications 18
 - novelty preference 35
 - reduction through pre-printing 84
- publish or perish 33–35, 33–34, 39, 57
- PubMed 35–36
- Quadruple Helix 77–78
- questionable research practices 34, 37, 73, 86, 148–149
- randomized controlled trials (RCTs) 27, 102
- red teams 131–132, 141
- registered reports 86, 134–135, 138
- reliability 19, 22, 24, 30, 74, 95, 130
- replication and reproducibility crises
 - A-crises and B-crises distinction 30
 - artificial intelligence (AI) and 148
 - big team science as response 109
 - broader implications 21
 - burden of proof, shifting of 21, 26
 - causes (neomania and publication bias) 34
 - definitions 22

- generalizability crisis, relationship to 26
 - in patent law 73–74
 - in psychology 13–14, 31
 - methodology crisis, relationship to 24
 - multidisciplinary scope 16–18
 - open science as response 81, 92, 94
- replication studies 20
 - conceptual vs. exact 22
 - funding for 43
 - low rates of data reuse for 90
 - personnel recruitment for 142, 151
 - publishing reforms to incentivize 84, 86, 134
 - under-reporting and under-representation of 19, 34, 36
- Reproducibility Project: Cancer Biology 16, 111
- Reproducibility Project: Psychology 14, 20–21, 21, 30, 81
- research data management and sharing (DMS) 92–94
- research funding 72, 89
 - current practices 123–124
 - novelty bias and neomania in 38–39, 42–45
 - proposed reforms 64, 125–128, 133, 145
- research prioritization 28, 117, 125, 149
- research programmes 121, 123, 125–127, 134, 143, 145
- revolutionary science 97–98, 97–98
- Risk aversion 43, 43–44, 45, 136
- Russell, Andrew L. 49

- Sarewitz, Daniel 101, 101–103, 103
- Schumpeter, Joseph 52, 65
- Science journalism 40–41, 150
- Science of Team Science (SciTS) 144, 151
- scientific coordination 94, 127, 143, 148
 - evaluation and recognition of 136–137, 139, 141, 144
 - models of 104–105
- scientific discovery 30, 60, 64
- scientific journals 117
 - incentives for novelty and sensationalism 38, 41
 - publication criteria 28, 133
 - reform proposals 83, 134–135, 145
 - reproducibility of findings in 16, 19, 74
 - self-coordination 104
 - sensationalism 41–42
 - seventeenth century 59–60, 78, 78–79
 - Silencing Science Tracker 150
 - slow science 45, 95, 99, 102–103, 142
 - social innovation 49, 77
 - Social Science Genetic Association Consortium (SSGAC) 109
 - social sciences and humanities (SSH) 17, 50–51, 74–77, 90
 - Solow, Robert 65
 - state interference 132, 145
 - statistical power 13, 15, 34, 86
 - Stengers, Isabelle 99–100, 101–102, 114
 - Stiglitz, Joseph 52, 52–53, 56
 - structural reforms 44, 58, 145
 - Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) 47–48

 - Taylorization 64
 - Technology Transfer Offices (TTOs) 72
 - theory crisis 24, 29
 - Thorndike, Lynn 59
 - trans-scientific questions 103
 - triple helix model 51, 67, 69–70, 71–72, 76, 78
 - trust in science 21, 31

 - unconscious priming 12, 22
 - university rankings 40, 74

 - Vinsel, Lee 49–50

 - Weinberg, Alvin 103
 - WEIRD populations 23, 26, 116
 - well-being 45, 52, 55–56, 55–56, 110, 113
 - Wellcome Open Research 136–137, 142
 - Wisnioski, Matthew 46, 65, 151
 - World Climate Research Program (WCRP) 112

 - Yarkoni, Tal 26