

## Peer Review

# Review of: "Navigating the Madness of Academic Publishing"

Seyedeh Sara Rouhi<sup>1</sup>

1. AIP Publishing, Director Open Science/Publishing Innovation, American Institute of Physics, College Park, United States

This is a great overview of “the madness” that is academic publishing. (I do agree with other reviewers that it's more of an editorial/persuasion piece than a “research” piece as such.) It's especially accessible to readers outside of the publishing industry or academia. I commend the author for making this available to the layperson. Note: I reviewed an earlier version, so I hope the author will forgive me if there are redundancies in my feedback.

I've rated the article 3/5 because of the gaps in citation/context that would more accurately round out the complexities of the landscape the author is describing. There's quite a bit of existing literature/documentation that the author does not reference or mention. Much of it could just be footnotes pointing to alternative arguments or other pieces of research that corroborate the author's points.

Key gaps:

1. The tenure and promotion paradigm really needs to be called out explicitly as the primary driver of why this process is “madness.” While the author alludes to it in certain sections, I suggest calling it out much earlier and in more depth earlier in the piece.
2. When speaking about APCs, it's important to bring a bit more nuance about how they actually work. It's not “pay to publish.” It's “pay to make open access,” and the fees should cover the cost of peer review. The strictly “pay to publish” paradigm is where “predatory” journals come in. Bringing up predatory journals is a good idea, but it's important to mark that good open access journals rigorously peer review the content. “Pay to play” journals are considered predatory because they accept papers with little or no peer review. Many publishers – especially commercial and “high prestige” journals – charge much higher APCs than they need to. There's context to call out here that I've highlighted in my marginalia.

I've attached a PDF with inline feedback. Apologies for the smushed annotations in between the lines. Anything in yellow is a recommendation based on context or missing citations. Anything in pink/red is a strong recommendation to change/correct.

I really encourage the author to share this widely in the author community once the additional comments are integrated to the extent they want to change them. Researchers need education on this topic, and this is a very accessible paper for a high-level overview. The author should just be clear that it's an editorial/persuasion piece, as there are quite a bit of counter-arguments/context that can persuade in other ways. I appreciate the opportunity to review!

**Attachments:** available at <https://doi.org/10.32388/QDQB24>.

## **Declarations**

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