

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

Mary Brabeck¹

¹ New York University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Sangeeta Saxena, Thomas Godfrey, John Yannesss's article [Publish or perish: time for a rethink?](#) presents an argument for enhancing the quality of medical research by changing norms regarding “publish or perish” in institutions of higher education, requirements that faculty engage in both teaching and research, and the “pay to publish” requirements of many open access journals. These are important issues but some confusions in the paper limit its usefulness. Parts of the article as currently written, seem to equate open science with problems associated with publish-or-perish norms and seem to attribute low quality publications to open science.

Peer review is the process for gatekeeping the quality of journals and deserves more attention in this article. The authors could make a sharper distinction between journals that publish papers only after peer review, whether they are open access or subscription journals, and journals with no peer review required. Some open access journals (e.g., Plos One) offer high quality peer review. It would also be interesting to read the authors thoughts about the value and challenges of post-publication peer review in journals like Qeios.

The authors identify a number of ethical problems in publishing and I encourage them to unpack these ethical lapses more thoroughly. A good source for information on navigating ethical issues in publishing is the Committee on Publication Ethics ([COPE](#)). It is not clear if the authors believe that the ethical lapses they cite are the result of the pressure to publish, to the cost of pay-for -publication, predatory journals, or open access. Likewise, the practice of Article Processing Charges (APC), could be further discussed. APCs pay the costs of publications and are an alternative to the firewall that keeps out readers who do not pay to subscribe to a journal. Not all APC practices involve the author paying for publication costs and not all journals that require APCs are predatory journals. A recent special issue of *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, [Volume 45, Issue 4](#) 2021 offers a number of perspectives on the issues surrounding open access/open science.

Finally, the authors might indicate why they think that “The immense pressures on medical teachers and researchers to publish is producing a deluge of publications.” Is the field of medicine under more pressure than other fields? The authors should note that medicine, like many other fields, does have differential staffing with clinical faculty, research faculty, tenure-stream faculty, etc. having different roles and expectations regarding teaching and research responsibilities. I look forward to seeing further discussion of the issues raised here.