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# Article summary:

1. The importance of promoting public engagement with science has been a topic of debate for decades, with the focus shifting from "understanding" to "engagement". However, there is a lack of systematic reflection on the achievements of public engagement initiatives.

2. The move from a deficit model to dialogue in public engagement has been widely recognized, but deeper changes in the governance of science have been limited. There is a need to view engagement in its wider political context and consider the broader project of dialogic governance.

3. Evaluating individual engagement exercises is important, but there should also be a focus on critical research that examines the overall impact and effectiveness of public engagement as part of the experimental apparatus. The legitimacy of public engagement depends not only on its inputs but also on its outputs.

# Article rating:

May be slightly imbalanced: The article presents the information in a generally reliable way, but there are minor points of consideration that could be explored further or claims that are not fully backed by appropriate evidence. Some perspectives may also be omitted, and you are encouraged to use the research topics section to explore the topic further.

# Article analysis:

这篇文章探讨了为什么应该促进公众参与科学的问题。然而，文章存在一些潜在的偏见和片面报道。

首先，文章提到了1987年Thomas和Durant的一篇有影响力的文章，但没有提及其他可能存在的观点或研究。这可能导致读者对于公众参与科学的必要性只得到了一个方面的看法。

其次，文章强调了从“理解”到“参与”的转变，并指出现在更多关注参与过程而不是目标。然而，文章没有提供足够的证据来支持这种转变是否真正取得了成果。它没有提供任何具体例子或数据来说明公众参与科学确实带来了积极的结果。

此外，文章还提到了一些批评声音，认为现有的对话过程仍然存在缺陷。然而，它没有深入探讨这些缺陷是什么以及如何解决它们。它只是简单地指出了问题存在，并没有提供任何解决方案或建议。

最后，文章没有平等地呈现双方观点。它主要集中在支持公众参与科学的论点上，并忽略了可能存在的反对意见或质疑。这种偏袒可能导致读者对于公众参与科学的必要性产生怀疑，并丧失了对辩论的全面理解。

综上所述，这篇文章存在一些潜在的偏见和片面报道。它没有提供足够的证据来支持其主张，并忽略了可能存在的反对意见。为了更全面地理解公众参与科学的重要性，我们需要更多平衡和客观的报道。

# Topics for further research:

* 公众参与科学的必要性
* 公众参与科学的成果和效果
* 现有对话过程的缺陷和解决方案
* 反对公众参与科学的观点和质疑
* 公众参与科学的平衡报道
* 公众参与科学的重要性的全面理解
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