

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

Nuno Crespo¹

¹ ISCTE-Instituto Universitário de Lisboa

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The topic discussed in this paper is important and interesting, although not new. In fact, the discussion on the idea of “publish or perish” has been widely debated on the literature, covering different dimensions of the problem.

First, I agree (and presume that most of us agree as well) that this is a critical problem. From my point of view, the question is above all a trade-off between quantity and quality. Therefore, a valid debate on this question should discuss how we can avoid the current situation (publication model and evaluation system) in which the researchers feel that publish a lot is better than quality.

A first move, in the context of bibliometric analysis, from publications to citations (and other dimensions of impact) is a positive step. But that is not enough because the incentive to publish a lot remains, although not in a direct way.

Another interesting possibility is of course the evaluation by the peers. However, this approach is not without problems, and the current position (with which I agree) seems to be a mixed one – objective measures and subjective evaluation.

Regarding the paper itself, I have some simple comments:

- I don't understand the direct link that seems to be established by the author between open access and unethical behavior.
- It is not clear to me if the author is talking about scientific research as a whole or just in a specific field.
- The style of the paper is too generic, its scientific nature is scarce. It seems more the opinion (valid of course) of the author about a given problem in science.
- The paper lacks the discussion on the dominant ways in which scientific evaluation is conducted nowadays.