

# Review of "Open Science"

Simone Sacchi<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> European University Institute

I believe that Watson's definition matches two criteria for an appropriate definition of terms and associated concepts (like "Open Science") that necessarily might have different practical implications in different research domains: it is complete in the principles that it implies but also not too specific to create impediments when "practically instantiated" in different research contexts.

I do however prefer the version that can be extrapolated from the abstract of Watson's paper: "Open science describes the practice of carrying out scientific research in a completely transparent manner, and making the results of that research available to everyone".

The pros of the latter version of the definition is that it avoids "everything" and "fully" which are impractical requests (what does everything even mean in this case?). It still associates "completely" with "transparent" which might carry an unnecessary burden if applied literally. Especially in such a transition period, and to become even more "down to the ground", I think that all Open Science definitions out there should borrow a little bit from the FAIR principles perspective and adopt a more "as open as possible but as closed as necessary" approach.