

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

Nino Wili

nino.wili@phys.chem.ethz.ch

Received and published: 15 December 2020

Dear Prof. Bodenhausen, dear Geoffrey,

Let me start of by thanking you and everybody involved for launching Magnetic Resonance (MR). I think it is a very important initiative for the magnetic resonance community, and I am very happy that I could contribute during its first year.

One of the nice things about MR is that even Editorials can be discussed.

Unfortunately, I am not entirely sure what the main point of it is. The title includes “Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats” (SWOT), which is a common part of strategic planning and evaluations, for example in companies, but also Universities. On first sight, I hoped that you would do such an analysis for MR, but I do not think

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



this is really the case. Then I recognized that the title and abstract actually suggest that a SWOT analysis would be performed for “Open Access” in general. This would also be valuable (although it would not be in the usual sense of SEOT), but again I think the editorial is not substantial enough for this. It does address some points, but sometimes rather superficially. At times it reads more like a “book review” of the mentioned ‘opinion’ of the Ethics Committee of the French CNRS.

To the points regarding MR in particular:

- It would be nice to give some numbers to the general feelings. i.e. you mention that “Most papers received so far come from European laboratories”. I could look it up myself and count, but why not give numbers?

- As mentioned by Prof. Daniella Goldfarb, it is unclear who “we” is. It suggests that it is the Editorial Board, but this is apparently not the case.

- You attribute the fact that there are less Biology papers in MR (are there? Numbers?) to a “unbridled passion for impact factors” in the biomolecular community. First, this sounds like your feeling. It might be true, but can you put numbers to this? Did anybody look at this in more detail? Second, it sounds like a cheap shot. If someone works on a biological problem, uses NMR, maybe cryoEM on top, and uses biochemical studies as well, why would that scientist hand in an article to MR? Was this the case in, e.g. the Journal of Magnetic Resonance (JMR)? To me it simply sounds like such studies are “out of scope”, which is not problematic at all. At the same time, you discredit such studies and assess that “their creativity is not always on a par with the founding fathers of magnetic resonance” (I think that is a rather high bar. . .). I am not sure what you want to say. Do you want more biology papers in MR, or not?

- In general, the tone is sometimes rather irritating. I assume this was on purpose, and I do not think it is inappropriate for an Editorial, but I am not convinced that you gain authors for MR like this.

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



- Unfortunately, there were no words regarding the development of MR. Do you or Copernicus Publications intend to implement some changes? Did everything in the editorial processes run smoothly this year or were there problems? Did anybody ask for waivers of the publication fees? Was this granted (of course anonymous information would suffice here)? i.e. does MR contribute to less inequality in the publication process?

Regards, Nino Wili

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

MRD

Interactive
comment

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

