

Interactive comment on “Open Access: Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats. An Editorial” by Geoffrey Bodenhausen

Daniella Goldfarb (Referee)

daniella.goldfarb@weizmann.ac.il

Received and published: 8 December 2020

This editorial touches upon open access along with related topics, which are currently at the center of extensive discourse among scientists. How do we use bibliometrics to evaluate science? The power of the impact factor, the high APC costs of the so-called high impact factor journals, which adds to the high subscriptions costs and its consequences. It is an interesting read and it gives a valuable personal perspective along with relation to more general studies, like the one of the CNRS, which is quoted extensively. While most of the editorial is not strongly related to MR specifically, it does fit in MR discussion because it promotes discussion and thinking, particularly when MR represents the pretty face of open access. I think that this editorial should remain as part of the MR discussion and not as regular article because it does not report scientific

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



results and is an opinion manuscript. I do have a few specific comments: 1. I was very surprised at the 60,000 Euro expenses on OA during the first year of a personal grant. I knew OA can be very expensive, but that high ? WOW 2. The APC of Scientific Reports is not so high, a better example would be Nature Communications. 3. The paragraph on p. 7 starting with “Magnetic resonance. . .” is written in plural. Not clear who “we” are . Particularly disturbing is the sentence “In our jaded assessment, their creativity is not always on a par with the founding fathers of magnetic resonance, save a few breakthroughs, such as the pursuit of minor conformations in proteins and nucleic acids.” To whom “our” refer? This should be changed to “my” so it is clear that it is the personal view of the author.

Interactive comment on Magn. Reson. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/mr-2020-28>, 2020.

MRD

Interactive
comment

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

