# Article information:

Combining experts' causal judgments - ScienceDirect  
<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0004370220301065?casa_token=sIg3xIkXTr4AAAAA%3A2SlcsLqeQthJCr0Jf39-vneL5LzHb8g3piE4DU9seU36D8OoXM1L2g4jf4mnqMpsEQGadis>

# Article summary:

1. The article discusses the need for policymakers to combine experts' causal models in order to make decisions on interventions.

2. The article introduces a notion of compatibility between models and shows how they can be merged to create a more comprehensive model.

3. The article demonstrates how probabilities can be assigned to different ways of merging models based on expert reliability, and how this can be used to determine the most effective intervention.

# 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:

该文章提出了一种将专家的因果模型合并以确定最佳干预措施的方法。然而，该文章存在一些潜在偏见和缺陷。

首先，文章假设专家提供的因果模型是可靠的，并且没有考虑到可能存在专家之间的利益冲突或认知偏差。这可能导致专家提供不准确或有偏见的信息，从而影响最终决策。

其次，文章没有充分考虑到数据缺失对结果的影响。尽管作者承认专家构建因果模型是基于数据，但他们并没有讨论如何处理数据缺失问题。这可能导致合并后的模型不够准确或不完整。

此外，文章没有探讨如何处理不同领域专家之间的差异性。例如，在处理社会学问题时，心理学专家和经济学专家可能会有不同的观点和方法。如果忽略这些差异性，则可能导致最终决策不够全面或准确。

最后，该文章似乎忽略了风险评估方面的问题。在制定政策时，必须考虑潜在风险和副作用，并采取相应措施来减轻它们。如果没有充分考虑这些问题，则可能导致政策实施后出现意外后果。

综上所述，该文章提供了一种有用的方法来合并专家的因果模型以确定最佳干预措施。然而，它存在一些潜在偏见和缺陷，需要更多的研究和讨论来解决这些问题。

# Topics for further research:

* Expert bias and conflicts of interest
* Handling missing data in causal models
* Accounting for differences between experts in different fields
* Risk assessment and mitigation in policy-making
* Need for further research and discussion
* Limitations of the proposed method
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