Review of: "[Commentary] Taking Back Control Over Academic Publications"

Florian Naudet[1]

1 Centre Hospitalier Universitaire de Rennes

This is an opinion piece. I almost never suggest rejecting any opinion piece - unless I find it deeply flawed and not factual, and I don't think that is the case here. I will only make several comments to stimulate the discussion and perhaps help improve the manuscript.

The first part should also discuss the issue of preservation of research articles. Who (and how) should one store for posterity all this produced knowledge? What happens if a publisher has to close? etc.

I would suggest providing more details about the various open access models (gold, green, diamond) and perhaps discussing pros and cons, and maybe giving some examples (e.g., for diamond, Open Research Europe, which is a nice model, but in the end, that is powered by F1000 (a commercial entity owned by Taylor and Francis -please check-).

When the topic of predatory journals is discussed:

. Can you expand more on the scientists publishing in those entities?

. Can you elaborate more on journals that may be in the "grey zone"?

When it comes to quality insurance, I would discuss the issue of post-publication peer review:

. The fact that it is not so frequent in journals that are not doing a good job is a point in favor of your argumentation ;

. And the importance of pubpeer and similar websites ;

"This conflict often leads to a reluctance to reject low-quality submissions, which unfortunately constitute the majority of submissions to many journals." [NEEDS A REFERENCE]

This proposal needs to discuss the notion of incentives for scientists. Initiatives such as DORA and CoARA may be cited.

I think you should elaborate more on the reasons why all this is not happening despite it looking like a good and sensible solution. What can journals offer? A brand? Based on what? I would discuss a little bit more the metrics used by journals. (And again, I would refer to DORA).