

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

Andriy Novikov¹

1 State Museum of Natural History of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

An interesting paper represents some thoughts on the strategy of contemporary academic publishing. However, it is far from the complete understanding of reasons and consequences and represents some dubious statements. In particular, the authors link the change of publishing model from subscription to OA with the emergence of many predatory publishers. However, this is not fully true, such publishers just use the gap of opportunity and, in fact, meet the needs of the malicious academic market. In the article, OA is represented rather in a negative light, but it is worth noting that it appeared rather as an alternative for academic publishing giants, which raised the prices for subscriptions and artificially made a deficit resulting in extended terms of publication (sometimes you should wait years before the publication of the outcomes). Many OA journals are focused on the fast publication of papers, and at the beginning, they were contradicting 'giants publishers'. Many 'oppositive' OA journals and publishers (e.,., Pensoft) appeared proposing much more convenient and faster publishing and reviving procedures. Together with the implementation of online-only publication, this was catastrophic for the publishers working with a traditional model. The number of academic journals raised so quickly, so there was no problem to choose an alternative and do not wait. Actually, this led to lowering the price of publication, the acceleration of the publication process, and further implementation of on-line preliminary view and the OA model by 'giants'. Such acceleration and 'availability' of the fast publishing, in turn, lead to an increased request from the institutions - they wanted their employees to publish as fast as they could because there were no such artificial time and place limits anymore. So, the influence of OA was rather positive.

Qeios ID: TU9E7N · https://doi.org/10.32388/TU9E7N