

# Review of: "[Commentary] To Publish Scientific Journals: For Some, the Big Business of the Century"

Marta Pulido

Potential competing interests: no potential competing interests to be declared

I read with interest the comment posted by Dr. Domingo on the increasing problem posed by well-established article processing charges (APC) imposed by the majority of biomedical journals and the fact that experts (reviewers) still remained unpaid. There are a lot of hybrid (transformative) journals that offer authors the choice of open access or standard non-open access modalities of publication. Just some considerations: 1) there is no obligation to select the open access approach; 2) APCs can be paid by third parties independently of the authors; 3) many editorials have agreements with governmental/university bodies that can effectively pay the APCs (just check information regarding your country on the website of journals); 4) it is uncertain whether the quality of reviewers' reports will be better if they receive fees for it; and 5) paying reviewers does not ensure selecting the best either. Strengthening the relationships of the editorial board with the reviewers, having good feedback, sincerely thanking them for their work, organizing training courses, and prioritizing the quality of human relations could be a quite simple way to engage good experts in the assumption of the relevance of their role in the peer review process. I have acted as a reviewer many times, doing my best, but I have never received a couple of words: "Thank you."