

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

Daniel Dunleavy

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The authors have provided an overview of the "publish or perish" phenomenon in academic research and scholarship. The themes touched on (research integrity, publication and dissemination, evaluation, etc.) are important and deserve greater scrutiny. I hope the following comments, questions, and suggestions help strengthen the quality and utility of the manuscript. And of course, any and all references in this review are strictly suggestive and should not be viewed as compulsory.

The greatest weakness of the manuscript, in its current form, is its line of argumentation. As a reader, its not quite clear to me who the audience is, or what the main takeaway/message is. What starts out as a discussion of the "publish or perish" (PoP) phenomenon seems to get sidetracked by a discussion of issues in scholarly publishing. One could write about the growth and profitability of commercial open access publication and point toward PoP as a driver of this growth - but I think what you're really after here is a discussion of factors contributing to PoP and its consequences for research, academia, and society.

In this regard I am largely in agreement with the comments made by another reviewer: Sarah Rose Fitzgerald. (2023). Review of: "Publish or perish: time for a rethink?". Qeios. doi:10.32388/4THHYZ. Specifically, there seems to be a conflation of the open access format with APCs and predatory publishing (though, to be sure, the two are often linked with some subset of the broader "open access" phenomenon) and its overall relation to PoP.

The manuscript might be strengthened from a more in-depth examination about the causes of PoP and a detailed discussion about how other types of output and activities can be incentivized and rewarded.

See references in Moher, D., Bouter, L., Kleinert, S., Glasziou, P., Sham, M. H., Barbour, V., ... & Dirnagl, U. (2020). The Hong Kong Principles for assessing researchers: Fostering research integrity. PLoS Biology, 18(7), e3000737 for literature that might also help further bolster the manuscript.