

# Review of: "Behavioral optimization in Scientific Publishing"

Julienne Brabet<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Université Paris-Est Créteil Val de Marne - Université Paris 12

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

Dear Milind,

Sorry I reviewed a former version and am about to travel.

This is a very interesting article. I agreed to review it because I have great admiration for the Open Science movement as a whole and for the Qeios project, which I have just discovered. Moreover, your call for a psychology-based approach appealed to me, as this is a field that is too often ignored. However, even as a professor emeritus, I'm swamped with work, producing a review requires a much greater investment of time than commenting on a product bought on the Amazon platform, and of course reviewing will bring me little benefit. The open and rewarded evaluation of articles, while important, will not be enough to solve the problem of article inflation, certainly caused by the democratization of higher education and the number of scholars, but above all by a "publish or perish" policy driven by the publishing oligopoly, the most profitable industry in the world. While the evaluation of articles has its biases, which you have analyzed very well, it is the ranking of higher education institutions (where the number of articles published in starred journals plays a central role) that feeds this inflation of articles and the pressure on scholars. They seem to be ill-equipped to resist, even if texts like yours are needed to encourage them to do so. In my opinion, one of the most interesting open science initiatives is that of the French CNRS, which evaluates researchers to manage their careers based on the presentation of a very limited number of scientific productions available on an open platform.

I regret that you didn't take a closer look at the players, recommendations and initiatives of Open Science to put your proposals in this context.

I also found your approach in terms of optimization questionable, and sometimes at odds with your comments on rationalization. Perhaps it would be useful if, when you look at human behavior, you didn't just look at an abstract homo academicus, but tried to situate this behavior in the processes of socialization and the interplay of actors, in the inter-structuring of the macro, meso and micro levels.

I'm convinced that if we don't succeed in developing a culture of cooperation, not only science but also our planet will sink, and that aligning the interests of all players means recognizing a long-term general interest.

