

# Review of: "Publish or perish: time for a rethink?"

Fabio B. Meira<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul

**Potential competing interests:** No potential competing interests to declare.

Thank you for the opportunity to review your article. At the beginning I was wondering what would be relevant in the discussion, since the so-called aphorism "publish or perish" is not new and the problem has been discussed for a long time, at least in the Brazilian academy, together with references to rigor and relevance. But I had a pleasant surprise while reading, although it would be better if you decided to include the foundations of free science in the arguments. As far as I can see, the only way to improve the "scientificity" of articles is to find a way to dissuade scientists from falling into the mermaid singing of the editorial industry. And this will never be achieved by suggesting how to manage the editorial business as if it cared about the quality of publications. The higher profitability of OA journals comes from the "innovative" business model of getting money from authors and not from readers - it is a fundamental change in the target market that makes it easier to activate the interest of the "customer", because scientists will try hard to publish everything they can. So the question is not to expect some "reform" or "market regulation", but to move towards a new institutional logic based on the science that the scientific community wants to build, and so the main problem lies not in the expectations we have of editorial practices, but in the role of making research publishable for the science we want. For example, the proliferation of collective efforts such as peer community initiatives (PCI) or free platforms sponsored by public universities or national scientific institutions would be of great value. In short, I would like to see a more precise understanding of the difference between doing science and publishing papers in the argumentation strategy of the article, since you have very successfully pointed out that we are dealing with business interests on both sides! So the real problem is a concern about science, and the question would be: where the hell is the science in all this?