

Peer Review

Review of: "Navigating the Madness of Academic Publishing"

Sioux McKenna¹

1. Rhodes University, South Africa

This article uses an accessible, conversational style to explain the academic publishing process. In doing so, it clearly outlines the hypocrisies in how monies reside with publishing houses though the bulk of the work is undertaken by academics (the actual research and the review process). This means that the higher education sector funds the academic publishing industry. The two co-exist in a symbiotic relationship which is either one of commensalism, whereby the academic publishing industry is made wealthy and academia remains unharmed, or indeed one that is parasitic, whereby the academic publishing industry is made wealthy and academia is harmed by its handing over of knowledge for third-party dissemination. In particular, the article looks at the neocolonial consequences of the model in that few researchers in the Global South can afford the APCs demanded by high-impact journals.

My only niggle is with the analogy of the article being a child. This did not work for me and felt a bit 'iffy' in some way. Luckily, this pertains only to a very small section as this (in my view) ill-advised analogy was not carried through the article:

“‘child’ to which you have grown somewhat attached. Then, you circulate your child among your co-authors (such as your supervisor and other collaborators),...”

We need more and more articles calling the academic industry out for its nonsense.

Declarations

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.