I read David Maslach’s article *“Why Most Research Isn’t Read (And What You Can Do About It)”*, and it made me stop and think about how research actually reaches people. The main idea that stuck with me is that most research doesn’t go unread because it’s bad, but because it’s invisible. The way the system is built, researchers are rewarded for producing more papers rather than for making their work meaningful or accessible. That really resonated with me, because it feels like research should be about creating impact, not just about filling up a CV.

What I found especially interesting was Maslach’s emphasis on storytelling. He pointed out that facts alone don’t capture attention—people connect to stories. This challenged how I usually think of research as something very technical, objective, and detached. But he’s right: even the most groundbreaking findings can be forgotten if they’re not framed in a way that others can relate to. This makes me realize that if I ever pursue research, I need to think not just about accuracy but also about how to communicate my ideas in a way that sparks curiosity.

The blog also discussed the role of networks. It was eye-opening to see how much visibility depends on being in the “right circles,” rather than only on the quality of the work. That feels both frustrating and motivating. On one hand, it shows how unfair the system can be. On the other, it suggests that if I learn to connect with people and frame my research in an engaging way, I might be able to break through even without powerful networks.

For me, this ties into my own interests in learning and building projects. Whether I’m experimenting with AI or exploring robotics, it’s not enough just to make something work—I also need to explain *why it matters*. Reading this blog made me more curious about how researchers can balance technical depth with storytelling, and it gave me a new perspective on how I want to approach my own work in the future.