

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

César Orlando Pallares Delgado

Potential competing interests: I work in a firm that operates a consortium. I manage the Transformative Agreement for Colombia

I have the following comments for the authors of the article

- Eliminate
- Modify
 - When providing data on number of papers published, it should be mentioned for which period
 - In the second paragraph, the authors correlate open access with “researchers pay to publish”. That's not entirely truth, since it ignores the “diamond model” where neither authors or readers have to pay, but the costs are funded by publishers.
 - The references, around 12 and 13, should be updated. It is not a good signal that the authors use a paper from 2010 to support their analysis of APC
 - It is not clear the transitions between the sections. For example, the authors go from APC to ethical risks without outlines or subtitles
- Improve
 - The description of open access should be highly improved. It seems incomplete and ignores current trends and discussions.
 - The discussions on models to fund open access. For example, it does not describe the “subscribe to open” model
 - The assessment impact.
- Give more relevance
 - The discussion about the risks to quality from higher publishing numbers.

General comment

The authors need to improve their text to make it clear for the readers about the sections that it contains. It is not clear which is the goal of the article, and which is its novelty.

