

The scientific publishing conundrum: A perspective from chemistry

Stephen A. Matlin,* Goverdhan Mehta, Alain Krief and Henning Hopf

References

1. The future of scholarly scientific communication. Report of a conference held 20–21 April 2015. London: The Royal Society 2015. <https://royalsociety.org/~media/events/2015/04/FSSC1/FSSC-Report.pdf>
2. *Philosophical Transactions* – the world's first science journal. London: The Royal Society 20 <http://rstl.royalsocietypublishing.org/>
3. Mabe, M. *The E-Resources Management Handbook – UKSG 2008, 1*, 56–66. doi:10.1629/9552448-0-3.6.1 (first online 5 July 2006)
4. Llewellyn, R. D.; Pellack, L. J.; Shonrock, D. D. *Issues Sci. Technol. Librarianship* **2002**, *35*, 1–9. doi:10.5062/F41V5BZM
5. Tadesse, R. Research dissemination using social media: your chance to “go viral”. ConTEXT for advancing science. Published online 25 August 2016. <http://nursing7106.blogspot.de/2016/08/>
6. Using the internet to disseminate information. Population Reference Bureau 2016. www.prb.org/pdf04/UsingInternetDissemInfo.pdf
7. Solomon, D. J. *ecancer* **2014**, *8*, ed44. doi:10.3332/ecancer.2014.ed44
8. Learn more about scholarly information. AAP - Association of American Publishers, 2015. <http://publishers.org/our-markets/professional-scholarly-publishing/learn-more-about-scholarly-information>
9. Larsen, P. O.; von Ins, M. *Scientometrics* **2010**, *84* (3), 575–603. doi:10.1007/s11192-010-0202-z
10. Naisbitt, J. *Megatrends: Ten new directions transforming our lives*; Warner Books: New York, 1982, ISBN 0446356816.
11. Bournem P. E.; Clark, T.; Dale, R.; de Waard, A.; Herman, I.; Hovy, E.; Shotton, D. (Eds.) FORCE11 Manifesto, 28 October 2011. www.force11.org/about/manifesto
12. Harnad, S. *Publ.-Access Comput. Syst. Rev.* **1991**, *2* (1), 39–53. <http://cogprints.org/1580/1/harnad91.postgutenberg.html>
13. National Research Council (US) Chemical Sciences Roundtable; Heindel, N. D.; Masciangioli, T. M.; von Schaper, E. (Eds.). *Are chemical journals too expensive and inaccessible? A workshop summary to the chemical sciences roundtable*. Washington (DC): National Academies Press (US); 2005. www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK22127/
14. Björk, B.-C.; Roos, A.; Lauri, M. *Information Research* **2009**, *14* (1) paper 391. [Available from 12 January, 2009 at <http://InformationR.net/ir/14-1/paper391.html>]

15. Björk, B.-C.; Roos, A.; Lauri, M. Global annual volume of peer reviewed scholarly articles and the share available via different open access options. In *Proceedings ELPUB 2008 Conference on Electronic Publishing*, Toronto, Canada 25–27 June 2008. Chan, L.; Mornati, S., Eds. ISBN 978-0-7727-6315-0, 2008, pp. 178–186. http://elpub.scix.net/cgi-bin/works/Show?178_elpub2008
16. Jinha, A. E. *Learn. Publ.* **2010**, *23* (3), 258–263 doi:10.1087/20100308
17. Hull, D. O'Really? How many journal articles have been published (ever)? 15 July 2010. <https://duncan.hull.name/2010/07/15/fifty-million/>
18. Boon, S. 21st century science overload. *The CSP Blog*, 2016. www.cdnsiencepub.com/blog/21st-century-science-overload.aspx
19. Ware, M.; Mabe, M. The STM report: An overview of scientific and scholarly journals publishing. Oxford: International Association of Scientific, Technical and Medical Publishers 2009. www.stm-assoc.org/2009_10_13_MWC_STM_Report.pdf
20. Bornmann, L.; Mutz, R. *J. Assoc. Inf. Sci. Technol.* 8 May 2014, v3. <https://arxiv.org/abs/1402.4578v3>
21. Editorial. *Nat. Chem.* **2011**, *3*, 649. doi:10.1038/nchem.1141
22. Van Noorden, R. Global scientific output doubles every nine years. *Nature News Blog*, 2014. <http://blogs.nature.com/news/2014/05/global-scientific-output-doubles-every-nine-years.html>
23. Petruzzi, J. M. Editorial. Scientific Journals proliferate despite shrinking library budgets. *Anal. Chem.* **1981**, *53*, 918A–920A. <http://pubs.acs.org/doi/abs/10.1021/ac00231a710>
24. Shepherd, P. T. *Science* **1998**, *281* (5380), 1143–1146. doi:10.1126/science.281.5380.1143c
25. UK House of Commons Science and Technology Committee. Scientific Publications: Free for all? Tenth Report of Session 2003–04, Volume I: Report, 7 July 2004. <https://publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm200304/cmselect/cmsctech/399/39902.htm>
26. Fox, J. Academic publishing can't remain such a great business. *Bloomberg View*, 2015. www.bloomberg.com/view/articles/2015-11-03/academic-publishing-can-t-remain-such-a-great-business
27. Bachrach, S. M. *J. Cheminf.* **2009**, *1*:2. doi:10.1186/1758-2946-1-2
28. Bauerlein, M.; Gad-el-Hak, M.; Grody, W. McKelvey B.; Trimble, S. W. We Must Stop the Avalanche of Low-Quality Research. *The Chronicle of Higher Education* 13 June 2010. www.chronicle.com/article/We-Must-Stop-the-Avalanche-of/65890
29. Vickery, B., *J. Doc.* **1999**, *55* (5), 476–527. doi:10.1108/EUM0000000007155
30. Subramanyam, R. V. *J. Oral Maxillofac. Pathol.* **2013**, *17* (1), 65–70. doi:10.4103/0973-029X.110733
31. Björk, B.-C. *J. Electronic Publishing* **2000**, *6* (2). doi:10.3998/3336451.0006.202
32. Schevitz, T. A new chapter for libraries: Preference for online research has its price. *San Francisco Chronicle*, 2002. www.sfgate.com/cgi-bin/article.cgi?file=/chronicle/archive/2002/02/10/MN169969.DTL
33. Matlin S. A.; Abegaz, B. M. Chemistry for development. In *The Chemical Element: Chemistry's Contribution to Our Global Future*; Garcia-Martinez, J.; Serrano-Torregrosa, E. (Eds.), Wiley-

- VCH: Weinheim, 2011, Chapter 1, 1–70.
www.forjweb.com/thechemicalelement/content/3527328807_c01.pdf
34. de Solla Price, D. J. Little science, big science; Columbia Paperback Edition 1965, p. 9, Figure 1.2. http://www.andreasaltelli.eu/file/repository/Little_science_big_science_and_beyond.pdf
 35. Eveleth, R. Academics write papers arguing over how many people read (and cite) their papers. *Smithsonian.com*, 2014. www.smithsonianmag.com/smart-news/half-academic-studies-are-never-read-more-three-people-180950222/
 36. Remler, D. Are 90% of academic papers really never cited? Reviewing the literature on academic citations. London School of Economics, *LSE Impact Blog*, 23 April 2014. <http://blogs.lse.ac.uk/impactofsocialsciences/2014/04/23/academic-papers-citation-rates-remler/>
 37. Tenopir, C.; King, D. W.; Edwards, S.; Wu, L. *Aslib Proc.* **2009**, *61* (1), 5–32. doi:10.1108/00012530910932267
 38. Tenopir, C.; King, D. W. What do we know about scientists' use of information? 2001. Cited in: Hogan, D. B. Challenges, Strategies, and Tools for Research Scientists: Using Web-Based Information Resources. *Electronic Journal of Academic and Special Librarianship* **2002**, *3* (3). http://southernlibrarianship.icaap.org/content/v03n03/Hoggan_d01.htm
 39. Bigdeli, Z.; Kokabi, M.; Rajabi, G. M.; Gazni, A. *Scientometrics* **2013**, *96*, 103–131. doi:10.1007/s11192-012-0885-4
 40. Bohannon, J. Uprising: Less prestigious journals publishing greater share of high-impact papers. *Science*, 2014. www.sciencemag.org/news/2014/10/uprising-less-prestigious-journals-publishing-greater-share-high-impact-papers
 41. Hoffman, R.; Kabanov, A. A.; Golov, A. A.; Proserpio, D. M. *Angew. Chem., Int. Ed.* **2016**, *55* (37), 10962–10976. doi:10.1002/anie.201600655
 42. Pickerell, J. Why publish science in peer-reviewed journals? *Genomes Unzipped*, 2011. <http://genomesunzipped.org/2011/07/why-publish-science-in-peer-reviewed-journals.php>
 43. Hannay, T. Stop the deluge of science research. *The Guardian*, 2014. www.theguardian.com/higher-education-network/blog/2014/aug/05/why-we-should-publish-less-scientific-research
 44. Blair, J. The publication imperative. *New Scientist*, 2012. www.newscientist.com/article/dn21738-the-publication-imperative/
 45. Agarwal, A.; Durairajanayagam, D.; Tatagari, S.; Esteves, S. C.; Harlev, A.; Henkel, R.; Roychoudhury S.; Homa, S.; Garrido Puchalt, N.; Ramasamy, R.; Majzoub, A.; Dao Ly, K.; Tvrda, E.; Assidi, M.; Kesari, K.; Sharma, R.; Banihani, S.; Ko, E.; Abu-Elmagd, M.; Gosalvez, J.; Bashiri, A. *Asian J. Androl.* **2016**, *18* (2), 296–309. doi:10.4103/1008-682X.171582
 46. Fox, J. Advice: how to decide where to submit your paper. *Dynamic Ecology*, 2013. <https://dynamicecology.wordpress.com/2013/01/24/advice-how-to-decide-where-to-submit-your-paper/>
 47. Jones, M. Middle-author publications: do they matter for promotion? *Johns Hopkins Medicine*, 2013. www.hopkinsmedicine.org/research/advancements-in-research/fundamentals/in-depth/middle-author-publications-do-they-matter-for-promotion
 48. Corbyn, Z. A threat to scientific communication: Do academic journals pose a threat to the advancement of science? *Times Higher Education Supplement*, 2009. www.timeshighereducation.com/features/a-threat-to-scientific-communication/407705.article

49. Lane, J. *Nature* **2010**, *464*, 488–489. doi:10.1038/464488a
50. Watson, R.; Pickler, R.; Noyes, J.; Perry, L.; Roe, B.; Hayter, M.; Hueter, I. *J. Advanced Nursing* **2014**, *70*, 2457–2460. doi:10.1111/jan.12600
51. Smolčić, V. Š. *Biochem. Med. (Zagreb)* **2013**, *23* (3), 237–241. doi:10.11613/BM.2013.030
52. Arney, K. Science is broken. Here's how to fix it. *Little Atoms*, 2017. <http://littleatoms.com/science/science-broken-heres-how-fix-it>
53. Pressure to publish: How globalization and technology are increasing misconduct in scholarly research. iThenticate White Paper 2011. <https://publicationethics.org/news/ithenticate-publish-white-paper-how-globalization-and-technology-are-increasing-misconduct>
54. Editorial. *Nat. Mater.* **2005**, *4*, 1. doi:10.1038/nmat1305
55. Belefant-Miller, H.; King, D. W. *Sci. Technol. Libr.* **2001**, *19*, 91–112. doi:10.1300/J122v19n02_08
56. Mabe M.A.; Amin, M. *Aslib Proc.* **2002**, *54*, 149–175. doi:10.1108/00012530210441692
57. Greenberg, J. The web will either kill science journals or save them. *Wired*, 2015. www.wired.com/2015/06/web-will-either-kill-science-journals-save/
58. Schmitt, J. Can't disrupt this: Elsevier and the 25.2 billion dollar a year academic publishing business. Harvard University Center for Hellenic Studies 13 January 2016. <http://wp.chs.harvard.edu/sunoikisis/2016/01/13/cant-disrupt-this-elsevier-and-the-25-2-billion-dollar-a-year-academic-publishing-business-medium-com/>
59. Swoger, B. Is Elsevier really for-science? Or just for-profit? *Scientific American*, 2013. <https://blogs.scientificamerican.com/information-culture/is-elsevier-really-for-science-or-just-for-profit/>
60. The price of information. *The Economist*, 2012. www.economist.com/node/21545974
61. Davis, P. Scientific reports on track to become largest journal in the world. *The Scholarly Kitchen*, 2016 <https://scholarlykitchen.sspnet.org/2016/08/23/scientific-reports-on-track-to-become-largest-journal-in-the-world/>
62. Buranyi, S. Is the staggeringly profitable business of scientific publishing bad for science? *The Guardian*, 2017 www.theguardian.com/science/2017/jun/27/profitable-business-scientific-publishing-bad-for-science?CMP=Share_AndroidApp_Gmail
63. Thomson, W. Lecture on "Electrical units of measurement". Popular Lectures and Addresses. London: Macmillan & Co., 1889, Vol. I, p. 73. <https://archive.org/stream/popularlecturesa01kelvuoft#page/72/mode/2up>
64. Cameron, W. B. Informal sociology: A casual introduction to sociological thinking. New York: Random House, 1963. <http://www.worldcat.org/title/informal-sociology-a-casual-introduction-to-sociological-thinking/oclc/577993802>
65. Hayes, J. Quoted in Li, C. Open Leadership: How Social Technology Can Transform the Way You Lead. Wiley, 2010, p. 76. www.wiley.com/WileyCDA/WileyTitle/productCd-0470597267.html
66. DiBartola, S. P.; Hincheliff, K. W. *J. Vet. Intern. Med.* **2017**, *31* (3), 629–632. doi:10.1111/jvim.14732

67. McIntyre, M. E. 2000. Cambridge University, Personal Homepage. 17 October 2001
www.atm.damtp.cam.ac.uk/mcintyre/papers/LHCE/goodhart.html
68. Campbell, D. T. Assessing the impact of planned social change. Hanover, NH: The Public Affairs Center, 1976, p. 49.
69. Garfield, E. *Int. Microbiol.* **2007**, *10*, 65–69. doi:10.2436/20.1501.01.10
70. Ware, M.; Mabe, M. The STM Report: An overview of scientific and scholarly journal publishing. International Association of Scientific, Technical and Medical Publishers 2015, 4th Edition, updated November 2015. www.stm-assoc.org/2015_02_20_STM_Report_2015.pdf
71. Cross, J. *The E-Resources Management Handbook – UKSG*. Published online 3 February 2009. doi:10.1629/9552448-0-3.17.1
72. Garfield, E. *Croat. Med. J.* **2000**, *41* (4), 368–374. www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/11063757
73. Akre, O.; Barone-Ades, F.; Pettersson, A.; Pearce, N.; Merletti, F.; Richiardi, L. *J. Epidemiol. Community Health* **2011**, *65*, 119–123. doi:10.1136/jech.2009.088690
74. Larivière, V.; Ni, C. Gingras, Y.; Bibliometrics: Cronin, B.; Sugimoto, C. R. Global gender disparities in science. *Nature* **2013**, *504*, 211–213.
www.nature.com/polopoly_fs/1.14321!/menu/main/topColumns/topLeftColumn/pdf/504211a.pdf
75. Pierson, E. In science, it matters that women come last. *FiveThirtyEight*, 2014.
<https://fivethirtyeight.com/features/in-science-it-matters-that-women-come-last/>
76. Mihaljević-Brandt, H.; Santamaría, L.; Tullney, M. *PLoS ONE* **2016**, *11* (10): e0165367. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0165367
77. UK House of Commons Science and Technology Committee. Peer Review in Scientific Publications. Eighth Report of Session 2010–12, Volume I: Report, 18 July 2011.
www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm201012/cmselect/cmsctech/856/856.pdf
78. Ross, E. Gender bias distorts peer review across fields. Editors are more likely to select reviewers of the same gender. *Nature*, 2017. www.nature.com/news/gender-bias-distorts-peer-review-across-fields-1.21685
79. Campbell, P. *Ethics Sci. Environ. Polit.* **2008**, *8*, 5–7. doi:10.3354/esep00078
80. San Francisco Declaration on Research Assessment. Putting science into the assessment of research. 16 December 2012. <http://www.ascb.org/files/SFDeclarationFINAL.pdf>
81. San Francisco Declaration on Research Assessment. ASCB-DORA website (accessed 07 September 2017). www.ascb.org/dora/
82. Smaldino, P. E.; McElreath, R. *R. Soc. Open Sci.* Published online 21 September 2016. doi:10.1098/rsos.160384
83. Hirsch, J. E. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* **2005**, *102* (46), 16569–16572. doi:10.1073/pnas.0507655102
84. Explainer: what is an H-index and how is it calculated? *The Conversation*, 2015.
<http://theconversation.com/explainer-what-is-an-h-index-and-how-is-it-calculated-41162>
85. Impact Factor. Wikipedia (accessed 23 June 2017). https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Impact_factor
86. van Wesel, M. *Sci. Eng. Ethics* **2016**, *22* (1): 199–225. doi:10.1007/s11948-015-9638-0

87. Khaled, M. *Sci. Eng. Ethics* **2015**, *21*, 139–142. doi:10.1007/s11948-014-9517-0
88. Curtis, B. *Glob. Soc. Educ.* **2008**, *6*, 174–179. Published online: 20 Aug 2009. doi:10.1080/14767720802061488
89. Kansa, E. It's the neoliberalism, stupid: Why instrumentalist arguments for open access, open data, and open science are not enough. London School of Economics, *LSE Impact Blog*, 2013. <http://blogs.lse.ac.uk/impactofsocialsciences/2014/01/27/its-the-neoliberalism-stupid-kansa/>
90. Cabello, F.; Rascón, M. T. The Index and the moon. Mortgaging scientific evaluation. *International Journal of Communication* **2015**, *9*, 1880–1887. <http://ijoc.org/index.php/ijoc/article/download/3629/1407>
91. The future of scholarly scientific communication. Report of a conference held 20–21 April 2015. London: The Royal Society 2015. p 14. <https://royalsociety.org/~media/events/2015/04/FSSC1/FSSC-Report.pdf>
92. Elsevier response to an inquiry by the UK House Of Commons Select Committee on Science and Technology into peer review, 10 March 2011. www.elsevier.com/__data/assets/pdf_file/0006/78468/Elsevier_response_to_STC_inquiry_on_peer_review_Final.pdf
93. Activities, costs and funding flows in the scholarly communications system. Research Information Network Report 2008. www.rin.ac.uk/our-work/communicating-and-disseminating-research/activities-costs-and-funding-flows-scholarly-commu
94. Mattheier, J. *ChemistryViews Mag.* 06 June 2017. doi:10.1002/chemv.201700021
95. Campbell, H. Peer review on controversial science issues letting all of us down. *Genetic Literacy Project*, 2014. <https://geneticliteracyproject.org/2014/10/13/peer-review-on-controversial-science-issues-letting-all-of-us-down/>
96. Orazbayev, S. Sequential order as an extraneous factor in editorial decision. *EconPapers*, 2017. <http://econpapers.repec.org/paper/febnatura/00606.htm>
97. Hassink, L. How do publishers choose editors, and how do they work together? A senior publisher at Elsevier describes the role and importance of a good journal editor. *Elsevier*, 2013. www.elsevier.com/connect/how-do-publishers-choose-editors-and-how-do-they-work-together
98. Editor roles and responsibilities. Council of Science Editors 2017. www.councilscienceeditors.org/resource-library/editorial-policies/white-paper-on-publication-ethics/2-1-editor-roles-and-responsibilities/
99. Graf, C.; Wager, E.; Bowman, A.; Fiack, S.; Scott-Lichter, D.; Robinson, A. *Int. J. Clin. Pract. Suppl.* **2007**, *61* (Suppl 152), 1–26. doi:10.1111/j.1742-1241.2006.01230.x
100. Editor guidelines. Guidelines to publication of geophysical research. First adopted April 1988 [Most recently revised May 2006]. American Geophysical Union 2017. <http://publications.agu.org/journals/editors/publication-guidelines/>
101. Rennie, D. *Health Serv. Res.* **2010**, Jun; *45* (3): 885–896. doi:10.1111/j.1475-6773.2010.01088.x
102. Südhof, T. C. *PLOS Biology* **2016**, *14* (8): e1002547. doi:10.1371/journal.pbio.1002547.
103. Careers: meet our free-lance editors. Enago 2017. www.enago.com/careers/our-editors.htm

104. Holland, K.; Duncombe, D. Dyas, E.; Meester, W. Frequently asked questions: the role of an editor. Elsevier Scopus Team September 2014.
www.elsevier.com/___data/assets/pdf_file/0005/95117/SC_FAQ-Role-of-an-Editor-22092014.pdf
105. Neylon, C. Peer review: What is it good for? *Science in the open*, 2010.
<http://cameronneylon.net/blog/peer-review-what-is-it-good-for/>
106. Schiermeier, Q. Monument to peer review unveiled in Moscow. Cornerstone of modern science immortalized in concrete. *Nature*, 2017. www.nature.com/news/monument-to-peer-review-unveiled-in-moscow-1.22060
107. Nielsen, M. Three myths about scientific peer review. *Michael Nielsen Blog*, 2009
<http://michaelnielsen.org/blog/three-myths-about-scientific-peer-review/>
108. Smith, R. *Breast Cancer Res.* **2010**, *12* (Suppl. 4), S13. doi:10.1186/bcr2742
109. Bergstrom, C. West, J. How do you know a paper is legit? *Calling Bullshit*, 2017.
http://callingbullshit.org/tools/tools_legit.html
110. Triggler, C. R.; Triggler, D. J. *Vasc. Health Risk Manag.* **2007**, *3* (1): 39–53.
www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC1994041/
111. Scientific publishing: Peer review is a thankless job. One firm wants to change that. *The Economist*, 2017. www.economist.com/news/science-and-technology/21722822-publons-wants-scientists-be-rewarded-assessing-others-work-peer-review
112. Brembs, B.; Button, K.; Munafò, M. *Front. Hum. Neurosci.* 24 June 2013.
doi:10.3389/fnhum.2013.00291
113. Kingsley, D. A. The peer review paradox: An Australian case study. **2016**.
doi:10.17863/CAM.708
114. Colquhoun, D. Publish-or-perish: Peer review and the corruption of science. *The Guardian* published online 5 September 2011. www.theguardian.com/science/2011/sep/05/publish-perish-peer-review-science
115. The future of scholarly scientific communication. Report of a conference held 20–21 April 2015. London: The Royal Society 2015. p. 8–9; 13.
<https://royalsociety.org/~media/events/2015/04/FSSC1/FSSC-Report.pdf>
116. Moylan, E. Are there alternatives to peer review? *BioMed Central blog*, 2014.
<http://blogs.biomedcentral.com/bmcblog/2014/04/28/are-there-alternatives-to-peer-review/>
117. List, B. *Nature* **2017**, *546*, 9. doi:10.1038/546009a
118. Shema, H. An Introduction to open peer review. *Scientific American*, 2014.
<https://blogs.scientificamerican.com/information-culture/an-introduction-to-open-peer-review/>
119. Swoger, B. Vestiges of print publication in scientific journals. *Scientific American*, 2013.
<https://blogs.scientificamerican.com/information-culture/vestiges-of-print-publication-in-scientific-journals/>
120. Kriegeskorte, N. *Front. Comput. Neurosci.* **2012**, *6*:79. doi:10.3389/fncom.2012.00079
121. Harnad, S. Crowd-Sourced Peer Review: Substitute or supplement for the current outdated system? London School of Economics, *LSE Impact Blog*, 2014.
<http://openaccess.eprints.org/index.php?/archives/1121-Crowd-Sourced-Peer-Review-Substitute-or-Supplement.html>

122. Southwick, F. All's not fair in science and publishing: False credit for scientific discoveries threatens the success and pace of research. *The Scientist*, 2012. www.the-scientist.com/?articles.view/articleNo/32287/title/All-s-Not-Fair-in-Science-and-Publishing/
123. Lee, C. Journal tries crowdsourcing peer reviews, sees excellent results. *Ars Technica UK*, 2017. <https://arstechnica.co.uk/science/2017/06/journal-tries-crowdsourcing-peer-reviews-sees-excellent-results/>
124. Roig, M. *Biochemica Medica* **2010**, 20 (3). doi:10.11613/BM.2010.037
125. Vergano, D. Fake cancer study spotlights bogus science. *National Geographic*, 2013. <http://news.nationalgeographic.com/news/2013/10/131003-bohannon-science-spoof-open-access-peer-review-cancer/>
126. Eisen, M. Open access is not the problem – my take on Science’s peer review “sting”. *Berkeley Blog*, 2013. <http://blogs.berkeley.edu/2013/10/04/open-access-is-not-the-problem/>
127. Mandelbaum, R. F. Sting operation reveals science's insane fake news problem. *Gizmodo*, 2017. <http://gizmodo.com/sting-operation-reveals-sciences-insane-fake-news-probl-1793523135>
128. Science reporter spoofs hundreds of open access journals with fake papers. *Retraction Watch*, 2013. <http://retractionwatch.com/2013/10/03/science-reporter-spoofs-hundreds-of-journals-with-a-fake-paper/>
129. Seife, C. For Sale: “Your name here” in a prestigious science journal. *Scientific American*, 2014. www.scientificamerican.com/article/for-sale-your-name-here-in-a-prestigious-science-journal/
130. Second retraction for psychologist reveals clues about culprit behind misconduct. *Retraction Watch*. <http://retractionwatch.com/>
131. Graf, C. Pay to play? Three new ways companies are subverting academic publishing. *Discover the Future of Research*, 2017. <https://hub.wiley.com/community/exchanges/discover/blog/2017/03/13/pay-to-play-three-new-ways-companies-are-subverting-academic-publishing?referrer=exchanges>
132. Fang, F. C.; Steen, R. G.; Casadevall, A. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* **2012**, 109, 17028–17033, doi:10.1073/pnas.1212247109
133. Rice, C. Why you can’t trust research: 3 problems with the quality of science. *Science in Balance*, 2013. <http://curt-rice.com/2013/02/06/why-you-cant-trust-research-3-problems-with-the-quality-of-science/>
134. A new record: Major publisher retracting more than 100 studies from cancer journal over fake peer reviews. *Retraction Watch*, 2017. <http://retractionwatch.com/2017/04/20/new-record-major-publisher-retracting-100-studies-cancer-journal-fake-peer-reviews/>
135. Author scandal. The week in science, 28 July–3 August 2017. *Nature*, 2017. www.nature.com/news/exomoon-candidate-fake-peer-review-and-a-telescope-problem-1.22389?WT.ec_id=NATURE-20170803&spMailingID=54624039&spUserID=NDg0OTkxMDc3MwS2&spJobID=1220321744&spReportId=MTIyMDMyMTc0NAS2
136. How science goes wrong. *The Economist*, 2016. www.economist.com/news/leaders/21588069-scientific-research-has-changed-world-now-it-needs-change-itself-how-science-goes-wrong
137. Biagioli, M. *Nature* **2016**, 535: 201. doi:10.1038/535201a

138. Laframboise, D. How many scientific papers just aren't true? Enough that basing government policy on 'peer-reviewed studies' isn't all it's cracked up to be. *The Spectator*, 2016. www.spectator.co.uk/2016/10/how-many-scientific-papers-just-arent-true/
139. Laframboise, D. Peer review. Why skepticism is essential. The Global Warming Policy Foundation 2016, Report 20. www.thegwpf.org/content/uploads/2016/10/PeerReview.pdf
140. Scully, R. P. How the pressure of publish or perish affects us all. *Medical Republic*, 2015 <http://medicalrepublic.com.au/how-the-pressure-of-publish-or-perish-affects-us-all/1134>
141. Kebede, M.; Schmaus-Klughammer, A. E.; Tesfaye Tekle, B. *J. Korean Med. Sci.* **2017**, 32 (5): 709–712. doi:10.3346/jkms.2017.32.5.709
142. Ahmed, E. "Predatory" journals are distorting the brave new world of open science. *New Statesman*, 2015. www.newstatesman.com/2015/10/predatory-journals-are-distorting-brave-new-world-open-science
143. Burdick, A. "Paging Dr. Fraud": The fake publishers that are ruining science. *The New Yorker*, 2017. www.newyorker.com/tech/elements/paging-dr-fraud-the-fake-publishers-that-are-ruining-science
144. Miche, I. M. J. Six reasons you can't trust science anymore. *Cracked*, 2015. www.cracked.com/article_22712_6-ways-modern-science-has-turned-into-giant-scam.html
145. Beall's list of predatory journals and publishers. Last updated December 31, 2016 <http://beallslist.weebly.com/>
146. Silver, A. Pay-to-view blacklist of predatory journals set to launch. *Nature*, 2017. www.nature.com/news/pay-to-view-blacklist-of-predatory-journals-set-to-launch-1.22090?WT.ec_id=NEWS-20170601&spMailingID=54186234&spUserID=NDg0OTkxMDc3NwS2&spJobID=1180127509&spReportId=MTE4MDEyNzUwOQS2
147. Kolata, G. Scientific Articles Accepted (Personel Checks, Too). *New York Times*, 2017. www.nytimes.com/2013/04/08/health/for-scientists-an-exploding-world-of-pseudo-academia.html?pagewanted=all&_r=0
148. Open access research. Higher Education Funding Council for England 31 March 2017. <http://www.hefce.ac.uk/rsrch/oa/whatis/>
149. Finch, J. Accessibility, sustainability, excellence: how to expand access to research publications. Report of the Working Group on Expanding Access to Published Research Findings. *Research Information Network UK*, 2012. www.acu.ac.uk/research-information-network/finch-report-final
150. Why open access? The Right to Learn Coalition 2010. www.righttoresearch.org/learn/whyoa/index.shtml
151. Benefits of open access journals. *PLOS*, 2017. www.plos.org/open-access/
152. Research, publications, pricing and incentives. Pearson: *The Sloman Economics News Site*, 2015. <http://pearsonblog.campaignserver.co.uk/?p=4576>
153. Poynder, R. Interview With Stevan Harnad. A Prophet Whose Time Has Come. *Information Today*, **2010**, 27 (2). www.infotoday.com/IT/feb10/Poynder.shtml
154. About DOAJ. Directory of Open Access Journals, 2017. <https://doaj.org/about>

155. Platinum open access. *Beilstein Journal of Organic Chemistry* 2017. www.beilstein-journals.org/bjoc/openAccess
156. Arkivoc (Archive for Organic Chemistry). Arkat USA, 2017. www.arkat-usa.org/about-arkat-usa/
157. Morrison, H. *First Monday* **2007**, *12* (10). <http://firstmonday.org/article/view/1965/1841>
158. Open access policy. Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, 2017. www.gatesfoundation.org/How-We-Work/General-Information/Open-Access-Policy
159. Editorial. Openness costs. *Nature* **2012**, *486*, 439. doi:10.1038/486439a
160. Schekman, R.; Patterson, M.; Watt, F. Weigel, D. Scientific publishing: Launching eLife, Part 1. *eLife*, 2012. <https://elifesciences.org/articles/00270>
161. eLife: open-access publishing of outstanding research in the life sciences and biomedicine. *AIMS*, 2016. <http://aims.fao.org/activity/blog/elife-open-access-publishing-outstanding-research-life-sciences-and-biomedicine>
162. Callaway, E. Open-access journal eLife gets £25-million boost. *Nature* 03 June 2016. doi:10.1038/534014a
163. Butler, D. Open-access journal *eLife* to start charging fees. *Nature* 29 September 2016. doi:10.1038/nature.2016.20700
164. Harnad, S.; Carr, L.; Swan, A.; Sale, A.; Bosc, H. *Wissenschaftsmanagement* 2009, *15* (4), pp.36–41. https://halshs.archives-ouvertes.fr/sic_00493057/document
165. Harnad, S. The post-Gutenberg open access journal. In *The future of the academic journal*; Cope, B.; Phillips, A., Eds.; Chandos: Cambridge, 2008; Chapter 6. doi:10.1016/B978-1-84334-416-2.50006-9
166. Khomami, N. All scientific papers to be free by 2020 under EU proposals. *The Guardian*, 2016. www.theguardian.com/science/2016/may/28/eu-ministers-2020-target-free-access-scientific-papers
167. Enserink, M. In dramatic statement, European leaders call for ‘immediate’ open access to all scientific papers by 2020. *Science*, May 2016. www.sciencemag.org/news/2016/05/dramatic-statement-european-leaders-call-immediate-open-access-all-scientific-papers
168. Johnson, R.; Fosci, M.; Chiarelli, A.; Pinfield, S.; Jubb, M. Towards a Competitive and Sustainable Open Access Publishing Market in Europe - A Study of the OpenAIRE 2020 project, on behalf of the European Commission. *Research Consulting*, 2017. <https://blogs.openaire.eu/wp-content/uploads/2017/03/OA-market-report-28Final-13-March-201729-1.pdf>
169. Open Science: Towards a Horizon 2020 platform for open access publishing. European Commission Directorate for Research and Innovation 2017. <https://ec.europa.eu/research/openscience/index.cfm>
170. Enserink, M. European Commission considering leap into open-access publishing. *Science*, 2017. www.sciencemag.org/news/2017/03/european-commission-considering-leap-open-access-publishing
171. Aitkenhead, D. Peter Higgs: I wouldn't be productive enough for today's academic system. *The Guardian*, 2013. www.theguardian.com/science/2013/dec/06/peter-higgs-boson-academic-system