

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

Noella Edelmann¹

¹ Donau-Universität Krems

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Thank you for the opportunity to revise this article. I find OA and scholarly communication very interesting and very important. There are many misconceptions and misunderstandings about OA, publish to perish, the value of publications. It is no longer a "new" topic, and it has been absorbed by the journal industry, leading to the extensive use of the OA gold format (which, as the authors correctly state is about authors paying the APCs so that it can be read for "free" by readers). A great deal has also been written about OA, its impact and value discussed. There are conferences about OA (see for example the conference organised by PKP: <https://conference.pkp.sfu.ca/>). There is much scholarly literature about it, not all available OA (sic!), some interesting articles are found here: <https://www.mdpi.com/journal/publications>).

The article for review here summarises the usual topics addressed in OA and research on it. I have made some comments regarding the statements:

"Most of the currently published research is Open Access (OA) format. That is, researchers pay to publish, with their publications immediately freely available globally for all readers"

--There are other OA formats such as green (repository) and platinum (neither authors nor readers pay) with different APCs, so be more exact in this statement and which OA you want to address.

"Proponents of Open Access (OA) publishing point out its benefits for both the audience and the researchers. They maintain"

--who are "they"?

"OA allows academics in less wealthy institutions immediate and unrestrained access to research, affording them the opportunity to enhance their knowledge and put it to use for their and their patients' benefit as soon as possible. "

--This depends on the OA format the article is published in.

"Even when physicians do pore through medical journals at length, the information gained rarely impacts their practice of medicine or public health procedures significantly. "

Different disciplines have different publication traditions. OS is much more common in the medical discipline, using this as an example may not be ideal when thinking about OA and other disciplines

"They argue too many journals today rank low in terms of publishing standards in organizing, disseminating, and

promoting high quality valuable research. ”

This is an early statement/reaction to OA and no longer holds trues.

“Given the immense profitability and scale of the OA model of publishing, there is a large variation in the quality of journals and validity of research. ”

--Generally across all journals, regardless if OA or not.

So the article points out the typical arguments for OA and makes some comparisons that are somewhat superficial or have become much more nuanced since OA became a new phenomenon.

I would suggest the authors to pick out one of the topics about OA they mention or to consider OA in context of one discipline only and analyse it in depth. At the moment, and I am sorry it sounds so harsh, it does not contribute anything new to OA, scholarship, or digital scholarship.