

Peer Review

Review of: "Navigating the Madness of Academic Publishing"

Jacinto Dávila¹

1. CESIMO, Universidad de Los Andes, Venezuela, Bolivarian Republic of

It is a very good summary of the process of science and the publication of results. However, it fails to deepen our understanding of possible solutions. Preprints and publishing processes led by scientists are already used but struggle to be accepted as a final solution. A good deal of the academic community is still focused on that traditional way, a bad copy of the paper publishing industry (the one with "best sellers") and an even worse copy of the way that landowners dealt with their business. I particularly missed a wider explanation of impact factors and their ridiculous role in the evaluation of science, especially in the South. I would recommend referring to previous detailed analyses, such as

Tennant, J.P.; Crane, H.; Crick, T.; Davila, J.; Enkhbayar, A.; Havemann, J.; Kramer, B.; Martin, R.; Masuzzo, P.; Nobes, A.; et al. Ten Hot Topics around Scholarly Publishing. *Publications* **2019**, *7*, 34. <https://doi.org/10.3390/publications7020034> or

Terán, O.; Dávila, J. Simulating and Contrasting the Game of Open Access in Diverse Cultural Contexts: A Social Simulation Model. *Publications* **2023**, *11*, 40. <https://doi.org/10.3390/publications11030040>

Declarations

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.