

Understanding the role of open peer review and dynamic academic articles

Authors' reply to "Problems with natural selection of academic papers"

Pandelis Perakakis · Michael Taylor · Marco G. Mazza ·
Varvara Trachana

Received: 14 April 2011 / Accepted: 25 April 2011 / Published online: 6 May 2011
© Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest, Hungary 2011

Abstract We welcome the commentary by L. Egghe (Scientometrics, [this issue](#)) stimulating discussion on our recent article "Natural selection of academic papers" (NSAP) (Scientometrics, 85(2):553–559, [2010](#)) that focuses on an important modern issue at the heart of the scientific enterprise—the open and continuous evaluation and evolution of research. We are also grateful to the editor of Scientometrics for giving us the opportunity to respond to some of the arguments by L. Egghe that we believe are inaccurate or require further comment.

Keywords Academic publishing · Open peer review

L. Egghe claims that our article presents an unbalanced criticism of the current peer review (PR) system and that it negatively associates PR with commercial publishing. The aim of our article was not to provide a detailed description of academic publishing and the PR

P. Perakakis (✉)
Department of Personality, Evaluation and Psychological Treatment, University of Granada,
Campus Cartuja, 18071 Granada, Spain
e-mail: peraka@ugr.es

P. Perakakis
Laboratory of Experimental Economics, University Jaume I, Avda. Sos Baynat s/n,
12071 Castellón, Spain

M. Taylor
Institute for Space Applications and Remote Sensing (ISARS), National Observatory of Athens
(NOA), Vas. Pavlou & I. Metaxa, 15236 Penteli, Greece

M. G. Mazza
Stranski-Laboratorium für Physikalische und Theoretische Chemie, Technische Universität Berlin,
Straße des 17. Juni 135, 10623 Berlin, Germany

V. Trachana
Institute of Biological Research and Biotechnology (IBRB), National Hellenic Research Foundation
(NHRF), 48 Vas. Constantinou Ave., 11635 Athens, Greece

submit to ISI journals out of obligation, in the hope of raising the impact factor of their CVs. The question authors should ask is this: what is the added value that journals give to academic articles that justifies prohibitive publication fees, extortionate journal bundle subscription costs, and four figure open access options? With LaTeX templates, online repositories, an open PR system, and scientometrists and librarians on their side, authors can now do the job themselves for free, faster, and with a higher chance of being cited. Commercial journals are no longer the fittest species on the academic landscape, and as Darwin taught us, only the fittest survive. The question is not if, but when, natural selection of academic papers will become a reality.

References

1. Egghe, L. Problems with "natural selection of academic papers". *Scientometrics*. doi:[10.1007/s11192-011-0395-9](#).
2. Perakakis, P., Taylor, M., Mazza, M., & Trachana, V. (2010). Natural selection of academic papers. *Scientometrics*, 85(2), 553–559.
3. Perakakis, P., Taylor, M., Mazza, M., & Trachana, V. (2010). The roads to open access. In: *World Social Science Report 2010* (pp. 307–309). UNESCO
4. Swan, A., & Brown, S. (2004). Authors and open access publishing. *Learned Publishing*, 17(3), 219–224.
5. Harnad, S., Brody, T., Vallières, F., Carr, L., Hitchcock, S., Gingras, Y. et al. (2008). The access/impact problem and the green and gold roads to open access: An update. *Serials Review*, 34(1), 36–40.
6. Xia, J. (2007). Disciplinary repositories in the social sciences. In: *ASLIB Proceedings New Information Perspectives* (Vol. 59, pp. 528–538). London: Aslib.
7. Chan, L., & Costa, S. (2005). Participation in the global knowledge commons: Challenges and opportunities for research dissemination in developing countries. *New Library World*, 106(3/4), 141–163.
8. Evans, J. A., & Reimer, J. (2009). Open access and global participation in science. *Science*, 323(5917), 1025.
9. Barcinski, M. A. (2003). Disruption to science in developing countries. *Nature*, 423(6939), 480–480.
10. Kirsop, B., & Chan, L. (2005). Transforming access to research literature for developing countries. *Serials Review*, 31(4), 246–255.
11. Habib, A. (2010). Challenging the international academic publishing industry. In: *World Social Science Report 2010*. UNESCO, p. 311.
12. Taylor, M., Perakakis, P., & Trachana, V. (2008). The siege of science. *Ethics in Science and Environmental Politics (ESEP)*, 8(1), 17–40.
13. Moed, H.F. (2005). *Citation analysis in research evaluation*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Pub.
14. Seglen, P. O. (1997). Why the impact factor of journals should not be used for evaluating research. *British Medical Journal*, 314(7079), 497.
15. Scully, C., & Lodge, H. (2005). Impact factors and their significance; overrated or misused?. *British Dental Journal*, 198(7), 391–393.
16. Gura, T. (2002). Scientific publishing: Peer review, unmasked. *Nature*, 416(6878), 258–260.
17. Godlee, F. (2002). Making reviewers visible. *The Journal of the American Medical Association*, 287(21), 2762.
18. Wilson, R. (2006). 'Referee factor' would reward a vital contribution. *Nature*, 441(7095), 812.
19. Raymond, E. S. (1999). *The Cathedral & the Bazaar*. Sebastapol: O'Reilly (in press).
20. Lehmann, S., Jackson, A., & Lautrup, B. (2005). Life, death and preferential attachment. *Europhysics Letters*, 69, 298.
21. Mandavilli, A. (2011). Trial by twitter. *Nature*, 469, 286–287.