

To publish or (not) to publish?!

Group 4

Vancho, Iwona, Jim, Thanayut, Josephina

Department of Physics and Astronomy

Incentives for scientific work

- Science is about truth-seeking
- Publish or perish
- Career, future possibilities
- High impact factors

Prestigious journals

- Judged by their impact factor
- Highly cited papers may not necessarily be the most important
- Strive for eye-catching articles
- Only positive results
- Novel results required - no replications
- Restricted sharing of scientific results

Open Access journal

- Opportunity to share
- Lower threshold for publication
- Replication studies
- Negative results
- Problems
 - Quality control
 - Questionable journals
- Moral consensus (e.g. CODUS norm)

Quality control

- Good research practice
- Peer-review
 - What is expected from reviewers?
- Open-peer review
- Make raw-data available
 - Not always possible
 - Redo the experiments is (almost) impossible, but redoing the analysis is possible

Conclusions

- Different pressures on scientists
 - Distorts scientific work and practice
 - Prestigious journals force us to pick eye-catching and popular topics
 - Bad reputation of open access journals, but sharing the results is important

References

- Who's afraid of Peer Review? – Science vol. 342, 2013
- How journals like Nature, Cell and Science are damaging science- the guardian, dec 2013
- Trouble at the lab – the economist, oct 2013
- International Council for Science (2008)
Freedom, Responsibility and Universality of Science