

Analysis of emotional polarity of reviews in the academic journal "Reviewer 2" and its spatiotemporal coupling relationship with contributors' mental health index

Momo · Lu^{1,2,*}^{1,*} Academic Vitreous Heart Rehabilitation Center, Royal University of Nonsense, fakenews@woc.edu

Abstract

This study aims to uncover the biggest unsolved mystery in the academic world: why does the comments of "Reviewer 2" (R2) always turn a sunny and cheerful scientific research dog into a late-night emo writer in an instant? We boldly hypothesize that the R2 keyboard emits a dark matter called "academic depressant particles." To capture this particle, we invented the "Comment Lacrimal Stimulation Index" algorithm, which analyzed R2 comments derived backwards from 1024 "suicide note-style" revision replies. At the same time, we recruited 50 "academic death squads", installed "facial expression recognition cameras" in front of their computers (mainly to capture pupil earthquakes and collapsed corners of the mouth), and asked them to hold "pressure potatoes" (pinch number of explosion recorders). The results were striking: when there was a "lack of innovation" in the R2 review, the area of facial collapse captured by the camera was correlated with the explosion rate of the "pressure potato" at the speed of light! The space-time coupling model shows that the moment R2 presses the "submit review" button, the "happy dopamine levels" of global contributors form a ripple of depression that spreads faster than the speed of light, which perfectly explains why we always receive rejection letters when we are in the best mood. The conclusion of this study is that R2 is the natural immune system of human civilization against the "excessive optimism of scientists".

Keywords: Reviewer 2; emotional polarity; mental health; space-time coupling; academic depressant particles; Quantum nonsense mechanics

Academic Editor: NO

Received: 20260216

Revised: 20260216

Accepted: 20260216

Published: 20260216

Copyright: © 2026 by the authors.

1. Introduction

Since the dawn of scholarship, humanity has faced two ultimate fears: the end of the universe and the review opinion of reviewer 2. The former is still observable, while the latter is like Schrödinger's cat, in a "superimposed state of heaven and hell" before clicking on the email. R2, the "academic judge" hidden behind the double-blind mask, is no longer a simple text, but a "compound spell attack" that combines linguistics, curses, and psychological strikes. Rumor has it that an excellent R2 can shorten the life of a doctoral dissertation by three years with just the sentence "Interesting but...".

Although "R2 phobia" has become a common occupational disease in laboratories around the world, the academic community is foolishly still studying "how to respond to reviewers" rather than "how to eliminate reviewers 2". This study

resolutely embarked on a deviant path: we do not intend to appease the victim, 42
we are going to dissect the "murderer". We will use the theoretical frameworks 43
of "quantum nonsense mechanics" and "emotional metaphysics" to prove that the 44
relationship between R2 and the mental health of contributors is not a correla- 45
tion, but a naked causal weapon. We predict that understanding this coupling 46
relationship will be the first step for mankind to realize the ultimate dream 47
of "direct publication of papers without revision". 48

49