COAR Confederation of Open Access Repositories

COAR NARRATIVE SERIES

Repositories as Active Participants in the Scholarly Publishing Process

Confederation of Open Access Repositories

September 2026



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License

https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

The scholarly communication system has historically combined several distinct functions, including dissemination, peer review, quality endorsement, preservation, and career recognition within a single framework centred, for the most part, on scholarly journals (Fyfe et al., 2017; European University Association [EUA], 2025; Trueblood et al., 2025). This model was initially created to address the needs of print communications, but today it faces increasing difficulty aligning with a digital research environment that is rapidly expanding, globally connected, and demanding greater openness and transparency.

The consequences of the current system have been extensively documented. The binary accept-or-reject model perpetuates redundant review cycles, as manuscripts are repeatedly submitted and re-evaluated across different journals without mechanisms to share or build upon previous assessments (Trueblood et al., 2025; Hansen, 2026; Kochetkov, 2026). The peer review process routinely takes between 6 and 24 months from submission to publication (Björk & Solomon, 2013; Huisman & Smits, 2017; Baker, 2025), with evidence suggesting that the resulting improvements in manuscript quality are marginal (Jefferson et al., 2007). In 2020, it was estimated that reviewers worldwide spent 100 million hours on peer review, and the associated costs exceeded $1.5 billion in the United States alone (Aczel et al., 2021). All the while, the volume of research outputs continues to grow exponentially without a corresponding growth in the human capacity required to review them, leading to an unsustainable reviewer burden (Gregory et al., 2026; Pinfield et al., 2026).

Beyond delay, the traditional system is also marked by a lack of transparency in how editorial decisions are reached. Most decision letters and reviewer reports are never made public, so authors and the wider community have little insight into how or why a given outcome was reached (Aczel et al., 2025). This opacity makes editorial processes difficult to hold accountable, and it can obscure inconsistencies in how similar evidence is judged across different journals or reviewers.

Many of these issues have been caused, or at least exacerbated, by the consolidation of the journal market over the past several decades, whereby a large portion of scholarly journals are now owned by five large publishers. An analysis of 45 million documents indexed in the Web of Science between 1973 and 2013 shows that these publishers have steadily increased their share of published output, especially since the advent of digital

publishing in the mid-1990s (Larivière et al., 2015). This market concentration has driven substantial price increases and has also contributed to a significant decline in bibliodiversity, as local, national, and multilingual publishing venues are absorbed, outcompeted, or starved of visibility by journals affiliated with major commercial publishers. Because prestige metrics and rankings increasingly reward publication in these venues, researchers worldwide face growing pressure to publish in English-language, internationally indexed journals – even when locally significant, high-quality non-English scholarship is being produced elsewhere (Butler et al., 2023; van Bellen et al., 2025).

All of these issues are raising questions about whether the current system's governance, business models, and use of resources in terms of time, public funds, and researchers' efforts are justified by its outcomes (Baker, 2025; Kochetkov, 2026), leading many stakeholders to reconsider the traditional publishing model and seek out more effective alternatives.

An exciting alternative: Publish-Review-Curate

One of the most promising new approaches to publishing is referred to as the "Publish, Review, Curate" (PRC) model, which proposes that the functions which were traditionally under the same umbrella – dissemination, peer review, quality endorsement, and preservation – be separated and distributed across specialised infrastructure and services.

In the PRC model, a research object (such as an article or dataset) is first made openly available, typically in a repository or on a preprint server. Then, it is reviewed by independent services and, finally, curated or endorsed by editorial communities. Each function can be performed independently while remaining connected through linkages across the ecosystem (Priem & Hemminger, 2012; Stern & O'Shea, 2019; Corker et al., 2024).

Because responsibility for each function can be distributed across independent services rather than concentrated within a single organisation, PRC offers much greater flexibility than the traditional journal model. It can support a wide range of research outputs, disciplines, and editorial workflows, from arrangements that closely mirror a conventional journal to more modular configurations in which separate services handle

a single stage of the process (Sever, 2023; Jung & Ahn, 2025). This flexibility allows communities to adopt the elements of PRC that best fit their needs rather than requiring wholesale adoption of a single fixed model. This separation also means that each function becomes more transparent. By making all research objects, reviews, and editorial endorsements openly accessible, the model helps reduce distortions caused by publication bias and arbitrary evaluations (Nosek et al., 2018; Corker et al., 2024; Aczel et al., 2025). With every stage of the publishing process open to scrutiny, it greatly strengthens scientific integrity.

This separation of functions offers several other concrete advantages. Because review and curation are no longer bundled into a single editorial decision made by one entity, a work can be evaluated and endorsed by multiple communities in parallel rather than receiving a single binary accept-or-reject verdict (Corker et al., 2024; Hansen, 2026). Costs are also distributed across the specialised services that perform each function, which allows editorial and review activities to be run more economically than in a full-service traditional journal (Grossmann & Brembs, 2021; Sever, 2023). Because publication happens first, researchers gain immediate, citable visibility for their work rather than waiting months or even years for a final editorial decision, while reviews and endorsements continue to accumulate around the object over time (Priem & Hemminger, 2012; Stern & O'Shea, 2019; Corker et al., 2024).

Furthermore, relying on a distributed, repository-based publishing infrastructure offers a more sustainable and reliable foundation for scholarly communication than one built around a handful of commercial entities. Repositories are overwhelmingly run by universities (and their libraries) and public research organisations – institutions with public mandates and a mission to preserve knowledge, often lasting many decades or even centuries, and without shareholders and quarterly earnings targets to satisfy. This distributed structure also builds in resilience that a centralised commercial model cannot provide. With thousands of repositories worldwide rather than a handful of dominant platforms, there is no single point of failure: the loss, sale, or policy shift of any one institution does not jeopardise the broader scholarly record (Sharma et al., 2025). This redundancy becomes increasingly important as open science governance navigates a more complex geopolitical landscape (European Parliament, 2025), where reliance on a small number of commercially owned, often foreign-headquartered platforms

introduces risks of paywalling, discontinuation, or policy dependency (Jansen et al., 2023) that a public, distributed infrastructure is far less exposed to.

Current state of PRC

Despite these benefits, PRC currently represents a relatively small portion of the total published research (Rzayeva et al., 2026). Of the three functions, the "P" in PRC, typified by early and open dissemination of research outputs, is the most well-established. Preprint servers such as arXiv, bioRxiv, and medRxiv have made preprint sharing a common practice across their respective disciplines, and other types of repositories (institutional, national, generalist) increasingly offer the same function for researchers in other fields, for other types of research objects, and for other languages (COAR, 2021). There are also a number of newer platforms that have been designed specifically for hosting open content and reviews, such as Open Research Europe (n.d.), launched in 2021, and F1000Research (n.d.), launched in 2012.

The benefits of early sharing of research outputs have been extensively documented (McKiernan et al., 2016). Preprints often attract more scholarly and public attention than articles published only after peer review (Fraser et al., 2020; Fraser et al., 2021). During the COVID-19 pandemic, for example, preprints accounted for about 12% of COVID-19 publications but captured nearly 27% of citations, highlighting their impact on scientific communication and the spread of knowledge (Fraser et al., 2021; Baker, 2025). A 2023 community survey of bioRxiv and medRxiv users, which received over 7,000 responses, found that among preprint authors (N = 4,042), the leading reasons for preprinting were to increase awareness of one's research (82%), to benefit science (64%), and to stake a priority claim (56%) (Sever et al., 2026).

Early sharing extends to data as well as manuscripts. An analysis of gene expression datasets found that studies that made their underlying data available in a public repository received, on average, 9% more citations than comparable studies that did not, after controlling for other factors known to influence citation rates (Piwowar & Vision, 2013). Later studies found the same broad pattern in different samples, with repository-linked data associated with up to 25% more citations across more than half a million PLOS and BMC articles (Colavizza et al., 2020), and with about 4% more citations across approximately 122,000 mostly PLOS publications from 2018 to 2023 (Colavizza et al., 2024). The 2013 study also found that third-party reuse of shared datasets continued

to accumulate for at least six years after deposit, well beyond the window in which the original authors themselves published follow-up work – evidence that the value of early, open sharing compounds over time rather than being captured only by the depositing researcher.

In terms of review and curation functions (the "R" and "C" in PRC), these are at an earlier stage of development, with fewer services fulfilling these roles, and many researchers are not yet using them. This limited uptake is reflected in a survey of bioRxiv and medRxiv contributors, which found that most feedback authors receive about their papers comes in the form of informal communications, through email (36%) or direct conversations with colleagues (34%), rather than on publicly accessible review platforms or commenting sections (9%) (Sever et al., 2026). Despite these findings, these types of services are steadily growing and are quite diverse in their approaches, ranging from comprehensive peer review with editorial decisions to open, community-driven commentaries that function more like journal clubs. Similarly, the curation function associated with PRC, which involves independent editorial communities performing evaluative curation, selection, and endorsement of works through editorial judgment (Tennant et al., 2017; Corker et al., 2024), is not yet widespread – although it is often provided in tandem with a review service.

That said, a growing number of journals have begun to formally recognise reviews conducted outside their own editorial process. Review Commons (n.d.), for example, now transfers refereed preprints on behalf of authors to 28 affiliate journals spanning EMBO Press, eLife, the American Society for Cell Biology, The Company of Biologists, Rockefeller University Press, PLOS, the Biochemical Society, and FEBS Press, all of which have agreed to consider a manuscript on the basis of the transferred reviews rather than restarting peer review from scratch. Similarly, Peer Community In (PCI, 2026) is affiliated with several "PCI-friendly journals" that have agreed to consider the PCI evaluation in their assessment of articles for publication. This kind of arrangement is a practical bridge between the PRC model and the current journal system: it allows authors to capture the benefits of portable review while still retaining the option of publishing in a familiar, recognised venue.

Interoperability

Because the PRC landscape is so distributed, there is a need for a standardised mechanism that enables different services to connect with each other. The principal mechanism currently enabling this is the COAR Notify protocol, built on W3C Linked Data Notifications and Activity Streams (COAR, n.d.). Rather than requiring every participant to be integrated into a single platform, it offers a shared communication mechanism that enables independent services to interact with each other. The protocol allows repositories and review services to exchange structured messages related to the publication workflow, such as submission, request for revision, review completion, or endorsement. The COAR Notify protocol is in stable release and has been adopted by a growing number of repositories and platforms, including HAL, PCI, Cambridge's repository, Apollo, DSpace, bioRxiv, DIGITAL.CSIC, Episciences, ePrints, and Open Preprint Systems, among others (COAR, n.d.). The standardisation enabled through COAR Notify allows any repository, review, or curation service to participate in the distributed publishing workflow without negotiating directly with every single infrastructure or service about how they will communicate (Hochstenbach et al., 2025).

Addressing barriers to PRC adoption

The scarcity of services is not the only barrier to PRC participation. One of the most important obstacles for researchers is that PRC publishing is excluded from research assessment systems in many countries, since most research assessment systems rely on the number of publications in traditional journals as a key criterion (Biagioli, 2018; EUA, 2025; Pennington et al., 2026). Quantifiable indicators such as citation counts and impact factors have become embedded in evaluation and tend to function as targets rather than as measures of quality (Biagioli, 2018). This works actively against researchers who want to publish using new models such as PRC because they may not be formally recognised for their contributions.

This issue is illustrated well in the challenges experienced by eLife, an early adopter of PRC. In 2023, eLife shifted from a simple accept-or-reject process to publishing reviewed preprints with reviewer comments. Evidence indicates that the quality and consistency of editorial assessments were preserved, and many institutions and funders continued to acknowledge eLife's outputs (Behrens et al., 2026). However, because of the change in its publishing process, Clarivate, which operates Web of Science, one of the

major indexes used by research assessment systems to evaluate researchers, removed eLife's impact factor. As a result, the number of articles reviewed and published decreased from an average of 143 per month in 2024 to 84 in 2025. Many open review services have partnered with journals, which incentivises authors to use their services because they also have the opportunity to publish in a traditional journal, which is more likely to be counted in research assessment processes (PCI, 2026).

Despite this situation, new developments in research assessment policies may start to change these dynamics. The cOAlition S Strategy 2026–2030 identifies PRC alongside diamond open access and preprints as supported publishing models (cOAlition S, 2025). The European University Association has identified PRC and diamond open access as two key approaches for universities seeking to reduce dependence on commercial publishers (EUA, 2025), and the Universities of the Netherlands have called for investment in federated repositories and open review infrastructure (Universities of the Netherlands, 2026), and the Dutch Open Science NL has funded a dedicated PRC infrastructure project led by Leiden University (Open Science NL, 2025). Assessment reform is also gaining traction: the Coalition for Advancing Research Assessment, with more than 800 signatory organisations, is committed to moving evaluation away from journal-based metrics toward qualitative, multidimensional criteria (Arentoft et al., 2022). In parallel, COAR and ASAPbio are launching a PRC Alliance in October 2026 to raise the visibility of PRC and advocate for its adoption (COAR, 2026). These developments indicate growing momentum and enthusiasm for PRC in the ecosystem.

A new role for repositories

For more than two decades, repositories have been a core component of the scholarly communication infrastructure. Since the Budapest Open Access Initiative (2002) first recognised them as essential for open access to research, repositories, which are mostly non-commercial and hosted by long-lived institutions and public organisations, have been building capabilities to host, preserve, and provide persistent and open access to research outputs.

PRC introduces a new role for repositories that will require them to adopt new practices and support novel workflows and technologies. The PRC model reverses the current pattern of publication, in which the repository receives a final, already validated version only after the publishing process has been completed elsewhere.

In the PRC scenario, repositories must be able to support new practices and protocols, such as versioning (Jung & Ahn, 2025) and providing visible links to peer review reports and endorsement or curation decisions from external overlay journals or other review services, turning the repository into the record of evaluation, not just the record of output. Over the last several years, COAR, through the COAR Notify project, has been developing the good practices and protocols that will be needed for repositories to participate in the PRC ecosystem.

Conclusion

The traditional journal-centred model was built for a print era, and its costs – redundant review, months-long delays, opaque decisions – have grown harder to justify as the volume and pace of research have outstripped it. PRC helps to address these problems by reorganising the functions journals used to bundle together into a distributed, interoperable ecosystem, in which preprinting, review, and curation can each be performed by the specialised service best suited to it, rather than by a single gatekeeping entity.

Repositories sit at the centre of this shift. In the PRC model, they are becoming the persistent, networked infrastructure that carries a research object through every stage of its evaluation and endorsement. Realising that role fully will depend on continued investment in new practices, the adoption of technologies like COAR Notify, and a broader willingness across the research community to recognise the many benefits PRC can bring to scholarly publishing. The non-commercial character of the repository network is foundational for this model – repositories are governed by universities, libraries, and public research organisations whose commitment to scholarship does not depend on it generating revenue.

Although preprinting is well established, the ecosystem is still uneven: review and curation remain nascent, and researchers still lack strong incentives to participate. Despite these challenges, momentum for PRC is growing as more members of the community come to recognise its many benefits: transparency, openness, efficiency, and low cost – all of which contribute to strengthening the integrity of the scholarly commons.

Acknowledgements

The narrative was prepared by Diana Furcila, COAR Consultant, and Kathleen Shearer, COAR Executive Director, and was reviewed by the COAR Executive Board.

References

Aczel, B., Barwich, A.-S., Diekman, A. B., Fishbach, A., Goldstone, R. L., Gomez, P., Gundersen, O. E., von Hippel, P. T., Holcombe, A. O., Lewandowsky, S., Nozari, N., Pestilli, F., & Ioannidis, J. P. A. (2025). The present and future of peer review: Ideas, interventions, and evidence. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, *122*(5), Article e2401232121. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2401232121

Aczel, B., Szaszi, B., & Holcombe, A. O. (2021). A billion-dollar donation: Estimating the cost of researchers' time spent on peer review. *Research Integrity and Peer Review*, *6*(1), Article 14. https://doi.org/10.1186/s41073-021-00118-2

Arentoft, M., Berghmans, S., Borrell-Damian, L., Bottaro, S., Faure, J.-E., Gaillard, V., Glinos, K., Albacete, J. L., Morais, R., Morris, J., Schiltz, M., & Stroobants, K. (2022). *Agreement on Reforming Research Assessment*. Zenodo. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.13480728

Baker, M. A. (2025). *Beyond gatekeeping: Reassessing peer review and establishing preprints as the future of scientific communication* [Preprint]. SocArXiv. https://osf.io/preprints/socarxiv/69uhe_v1

Behrens, T. E., Dalal, Y., & Harper, D. M. (2026). Scientific publishing: Rethinking how research is reviewed and published. *eLife*, *15*, Article e110392. https://doi.org/10.7554/eLife.110392

Biagioli, M. (2018). Quality to impact, text to metadata: publication and evaluation in the age of metrics. *KNOW: A Journal on the Formation of Knowledge*, *2*(2), 249–275. https://www.journals.uchicago.edu/doi/10.1086/699152

Björk, B.-C., & Solomon, D. (2013). The publishing delay in scholarly peer-reviewed journals. *Journal of Informetrics*, *7*(4), 914–923. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joi.2013.09.001

Budapest Open Access Initiative. (2002). *Budapest Open Access Initiative*. https://www.budapestopenaccessinitiative.org/

Butler, L.-A., Matthias, L., Simard, M.-A., Mongeon, P., & Haustein, S. (2023). The oligopoly's shift to open access: How the big five academic publishers profit from article processing charges. *Quantitative Science Studies*, *4*(4), 778–799. https://doi.org/10.1162/qss_a_00272

Colavizza, G., Cadwallader, L., LaFlamme, M., Dozot, G., Lecorney, S., Rappo, D., & Hrynaszkiewicz, I. (2024). An analysis of the effects of sharing research data, code, and preprints on citations. *PLOS ONE*, *19*(10), Article e0311493. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0311493

Colavizza, G., Hrynaszkiewicz, I., Staden, I., Whitaker, K., & McGillivray, B. (2020). The citation advantage of linking publications to research data. *PLOS ONE*, *15*(4), Article e0230416. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0230416

cOAlition S. (2025). *Strategy 2026–2030*. https://www.coalition-s.org/coalitions-strategy-2026-2030/

COAR. (2021, October 26). *Expanding our global capacity for preprint sharing*. https://coar-repositories.org/news-updates/expanding-our-global-capacity-for-preprint-sharing/

COAR. (2026, February 17). *COAR Notify and the launch of a Publish, Review, Curate Alliance*. https://coar-repositories.org/news-updates/coar-notify-and-the-launch-of-a-publish-review-curate-alliance/

COAR. (n.d.). *COAR Notify Protocol*. Retrieved September 7, 2026, from https://coar-notify.net/

Corker, K. S., Waltman, L., & Coates, J. A. (2024). *Understanding the Publish-Review-Curate (PRC) Model of Scholarly Communication* [Preprint]. MetaArXiv. https://doi.org/10.31222/osf.io/h7swt

European Parliament, Panel for the Future of Science and Technology. (2025, October 1). *Data sovereignty in research: Global dependencies, risks, and the European response.* [Workshop]. European Parliament, Brussels. https://www.europarl.europa.eu/stoa/en/events/details/data-sovereignty-in-research-global-depe/20250910WKS06502

European University Association. (2025). *Reclaiming academic ownership of the scholarly communication system.* https://eua.eu/publications/briefings/reclaiming-academic-ownership-of-the-scholarly-communication-system.html

F1000Research. (n.d.). *About F1000Research*. Retrieved September 7, 2026, from https://f1000research.com/about

Fraser, N., Brierley, L., Dey, G., Polka, J. K., Pálfy, M., Nanni, F., & Coates, J. A. (2021). The evolving role of preprints in the dissemination of COVID-19 research and their impact on the science communication landscape. *PLOS Biology*, 19(4), Article e3000959. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pbio.3000959

Fraser, N., Momeni, F., Mayr, P., & Peters, I. (2020). The relationship between bioRxiv preprints, citations and altmetrics. *Quantitative Science Studies*, 1(2), 618–638. https://doi.org/10.1162/qss_a_00043

Fyfe, A., Coate, K., Curry, S., Lawson, S., Moxham, N., & Røstvik, C. M. (2017). *Untangling academic publishing: A history of the relationship between commercial interests, academic prestige and the circulation of research.* Zenodo. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.546100

Gregory, K., Brasil, A., Kolarz, P., Pinfield, S., & Waltman, L. (2026). *Questioning peer review: Understanding peer review system-wide* (RoRI Working Paper No. 21). Research on Research Institute. https://doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.32685546

Grossmann, A., & Brembs, B. (2021). Current market rates for scholarly publishing services [version 2; peer review: 2 approved]. *F1000Research*, 10, Article 20. https://doi.org/10.12688/f1000research.27468.2

Hansen, T. (2026). Symbolic scarcity and epistemic waste: A systems theory of academic publishing failure. *Research Integrity and Peer Review*, 11, Article 7. https://doi.org/10.1186/s41073-026-00193-3

Hochstenbach, P., Verborgh, R., & Van de Sompel, H. (2025). Event notifications and event logs: Transparent sharing of artifact life cycle data. *International Journal of Digital Curation*, 19(1). https://doi.org/10.2218/ijdc.v19i1.920

Huisman, J., & Smits, J. (2017). Duration and quality of the peer review process: The author's perspective. *Scientometrics*, 113(1), 633–650. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-017-2310-5

Jansen, B., Kadenko, N., Broeders, D., van Eeten, M., Borgolte, K., & Fiebig, T. (2023). Pushing boundaries: An empirical view on the digital sovereignty of six governments in the midst of geopolitical tensions. *Government Information Quarterly*, 40, 101862. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.giq.2023.101862

Jefferson, T., Rudin, M., Brodney Folse, S., & Davidoff, F. (2007). Editorial peer review for improving the quality of reports of biomedical studies. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews*, 2, Article MR000016. https://doi.org/10.1002/14651858.MR000016.pub3

Jung, Y., & Ahn, S. R. (2025). Publish-Review-Curate modelling for data paper and dataset: A collaborative approach. *Learned Publishing*, 38(4), Article e2024. https://doi.org/10.1002/leap.2024

Kochetkov, D. (2026). Peer review at the crossroads. *Learned Publishing*, 39, Article e2046. https://doi.org/10.1002/leap.2046

Larivière, V., Haustein, S., & Mongeon, P. (2015). The oligopoly of academic publishers in the digital era. *PLOS ONE*, 10(6), Article e0127502. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0127502

McKiernan, E. C., Bourne, P. E., Brown, C. T., Buck, S., Kenall, A., Lin, J., McDougall, D., Nosek, B. A., Ram, K., Soderberg, C. K., Spies, J. R., Thaney, K., Updegrove, A., Woo, K. H., & Yarkoni, T. (2016). Point of view: How open science helps researchers succeed. *eLife*, 5, Article e16800. https://doi.org/10.7554/eLife.16800

Nosek, B. A., Ebersole, C. R., DeHaven, A. C., & Mellor, D. T. (2018). The preregistration revolution. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 115(11), 2600–2606. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1708274114

Open Research Europe. (n.d.). *About Open Research Europe*. Retrieved September 7, 2026, from https://open-research-europe.ec.europa.eu/about

Open Science NL. (2025, December 16). *45 projects strengthen Dutch open science infrastructure.* https://www.openscience.nl/en/news/45-projects-strengthen-dutch-open-science-infrastructure

Peer Community In. (2026, January 14). *PCI and Peer Community Journal: Highlights of 2025.* https://peercommunityin.org/2026/01/14/pci-and-peer-community-journal-highlights-of-2025/

Pennington, C. R., Norris, E., Skubera, M., Ba, Y., Moffat, R., Amaral, O. B., Adamkovi, M., Adgzel, A., Almeida, R. A., Baldwin, J. R., Ballou, N., Behrens, L. M. P., Bertram, M. G., Bjerke, I. E., Blackwell, S. E., Bochynska, A., de Boer, M. R., Buljan, I., Canales-Aguirre, C. B., … Clark, K. (2026). Awareness and use of open research practices: An international survey of researchers across disciplines [Preprint]. *PsyArXiv*. https://osf.io/preprints/psyarxiv/edzxf_v1

Pinfield, S., Waltman, L., Kolarz, P., Gregory, K., & Brasil, A. (2026). *The future of peer review: A system-wide perspective*. Research on Research Institute. https://doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.32685351

Piwowar, H. A., & Vision, T. J. (2013). Data reuse and the open data citation advantage. *PeerJ*, 1, Article e175. https://doi.org/10.7717/peerj.175

Priem, J., & Hemminger, B. M. (2012). Decoupling the scholarly journal. *Frontiers in Computational Neuroscience*, 6, Article 19. https://doi.org/10.3389/fncom.2012.00019

Review Commons. (n.d.). *The preprint peer review platform*. Retrieved September 7, 2026, from https://www.reviewcommons.org/

Rzayeva, N., Pinfield, S., & Waltman, L. (2026). *Adoption of preprinting across scientific disciplines and geographical regions* (1991–2023) [Preprint]. SocArXiv. https://osf.io/preprints/socarxiv/xdwc4_v3

Sever, R. (2023). Biomedical publishing: Past historic, present continuous, future conditional. *PLOS Biology*, 21(10), Article e3002234. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pbio.3002234

Sever, R., Hindle, S., Roeder, T., Fereres, S., Fernández Gayol, O., Ghosh, S., Proietti Onori, M., Croushore, E., Black, K.-J., Sussman, L., Argentine, J., Manos, W., Muñoz, M., Sinanan, J., Teal, T. K., & Inglis, J. R. (2026). *bioRxiv: The preprint server for biology* [Preprint]. bioRxiv. https://doi.org/10.1101/833400

Sharma, G., Munteanu, V., Ghiasi, N. M., Banerjee, J., Varma, S., Foschini, L., Ellrott, K., Mutlu, O., Ciorbă, D., Ophoff, R. A., Bostan, V., Mason, C. E., Moore, J. H., Sousoni, D., Krishnan, A., Mason, C. E., Dimian, M., Stolovitzky, G., Liberante, F. G., … Mangul, S. (2025). *A decentralized future for the open-science databases* [Preprint]. arXiv. https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2509.19206

Stern, B. M., & O'Shea, E. K. (2019). A proposal for the future of scientific publishing in the life sciences. *PLOS Biology*, *17*(2), Article e3000116. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pbio.3000116

Tennant, J. P., Dugan, J. M., Graziotin, D., Jacques, D. C., Waldner, F., Mietchen, D., Elkhatib, Y., Collister, L. B., Pikas, C. K., Crick, T., Masuzzo, P., Caravaggi, A., Berg, D. R., Niemeyer, K. E., Ross-Hellauer, T., Mannheimer, S., Rigling, L., Katz, D. S., Greshake Tzovaras, B., … Colomb, J. (2017). A multi-disciplinary perspective on emergent and future innovations in peer review. *F1000Research*, *6*, Article 1151. https://doi.org/10.12688/f1000research.12037.3

Trueblood, J. S., Allison, D. B., Field, S. M., Fishbach, A., Gaillard, S. D. M., Gigerenzer, G., Holmes, W. R., Lewandowsky, S., Matzke, D., Murphy, M. C., Mausslick, S., Popov, V., Roskies, A.L., ter Schure, J., & Teodorescu, A. R. (2025). The misalignment of incentives in academic publishing and implications for journal reform. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 122(5), Article e2401231121. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2401231121

Universities of the Netherlands. (2026). *Vision on publication culture: Position paper.* https://www.universiteitenvannederland.nl/files/publications/UNL-21066-01-Position%20paper%20-%20Vision%20on%20Publication%20Culture_v4.pdf

van Bellen, S., Alperin, J. P., & Larivière, V. (2025). Scholarly publishing's hidden diversity: How exclusive databases sustain the oligopoly of academic publishers. *PLOS ONE*, *20*(6), Article e0327015. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0327015