

A Critical Examination of the Democratic Argument for Academic Paper Publication: The Issue of High Journal Publishing Fees

Konstantinos T. Kotsis ^{1,*} ¹ Lab of Physics Education and Teaching, Department of Primary Education, University of Ioannina, Greece* Correspondence: kkotsis@uoi.gr<https://doi.org/10.59652/jcpas.v3i2.450>

Abstract: With an eye toward the effects of journal publishing fees for fair access to scholarly communication, this paper critically investigates the democratic case for publishing academic papers in journals. The central focus of this study is the worry that high publication costs might prevent researchers from underfunded universities or economically deprived areas, thus sustaining disparities in knowledge distribution. The study shows a strong link between publication fees and authors' socioeconomic level, suggesting that those from lower-income backgrounds encounter major obstacles to publishing their studies. These circumstances highlight the need for fair access to scholarly literature in education since differences in publication chances can compromise research scope and restrict educational policy changes. This study's wider ramifications point to the need for systematic changes in academic publishing policies and support more fair fee structures or other approaches that advance diversity. This study adds significant new perspectives on how academic publishing might better meet the various needs of the worldwide research community, especially in fields directly affecting public health and welfare, by addressing the democratic ideals of access to knowledge.

Keywords: democratic access; publishing fees; open access models; socioeconomic disparities

1. Introduction

Driven mostly by the fast spread of digital technologies and the growing importance of open access publication models, a basic change has happened in the scene of scholarly communication over recent years. Traditional subscription-based publications have historically dominated academic publishing, sometimes resulting in increased questions regarding accessibility, costs, and fair distribution of knowledge (Björk, 2017). The exponential increase in journal publishing costs presents a significant obstacle to researchers, particularly those from underfunded institutions and economically deprived areas, so undermining the democratic values of open access to knowledge (Björk, 2021). Emphasizing the consequences these fees have for the fair participation of academics in academic discourse, this paper critically analyzes the case for publication of academic papers in the framework of journal publishing costs.

The main research question this study answers is how publishing fees' economic constraints compromise the democratic values needed for equitable access to scholarly communication, so influencing the diversity and quality of research outputs (The Lancet Planetary Health, 2022). This study has several goals: to investigate the complex link between academic publishing fees and democratic access to knowledge, to assess the socio-economic dynamics aggravating inequality in scholarly communication, and to suggest workable substitutes or reforms maybe improving access to academic literature (Hussain & Mir, 2024). Advocating for a more fair and inclusive scholarly ecosystem depends on a thorough assessment of the financial mechanisms and structural inequalities in academic publishing, thus one must first understand these aspects. Not only for legislators and academic institutions but also for researchers and practitioners in many disciplines who depend on fair access to research (Lăzăroiu, 2014). This study intends to add to a changing conversation about the future of scholarly communication and the need of improving democratic values in academic publishing by highlighting the obstacles and possible solutions inside the present publishing structure (Šojat & Skala, 2023). By means of insights this study will offer, academic

Received: February 11, 2025

Accepted: March 15, 2025

Published: April 25, 2025

**Copyright:** © 2022 by the authors.Submitted for open access publication
under the terms and conditions of the
Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY)
license[\(https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/\)](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

practices and institutional policies can be informed, so fostering an academic environment that supports innovation, cooperation, and the broad sharing of knowledge (Kunst, 2022).

With an especially eye toward the effects of journal publishing fees for fair access to scholarly communication, the main goal of the study is to critically review the democratic argument for academic paper publication. The study intends to investigate how these fees generate obstacles to participation in academic discourse, particularly for researchers from underfunded institutions and economically deprived areas, so subverting the democratic values of free access to knowledge. The three following are the study objectives:

1. The study aims to investigate the complex link between academic publishing fees and democratic access to knowledge. This entails realizing how publishing fees' economic constraints compromise the ideas of equitable access to scholarly communication and influence the diversity and quality of research outputs.
2. The aim of this paper is to assess the socioeconomic dynamics aggravating inequality in scholarly communication. This includes looking at how high publication fees benefit well-funded researchers and universities, so sustaining current academic community inequalities.
3. The project intends to suggest reasonable substitutes or reforms that might improve access to academic literature. Investigating alternative publishing models, such as community-funded journals or creative funding sources, that might help to remove the obstacles presented by present article processing costs is part of this.

Tackling these goals, the study adds to a changing conversation on the direction of academic communication and the need of strengthening democratic values in publishing. It offers information that might guide institutional policies and academic practices, so fostering an academic environment that supports creativity, teamwork, and the general sharing of knowledge.

2. Theoretical Framework

Within the modern academic scene, the mechanisms controlling academic communication are under more and more examination; special attention is paid to the effects of publishing policies on knowledge distribution. Both the open-access journals and the growing trend of article processing charges (APCs) have been praised as democratizing tools in research publication and attacked as obstacles to fair access. Particularly in relation to journal publishing costs, these twin narratives challenge a critical review of the democratic justification for academic paper publication. Understanding the consequences of publishing fees is critical as the academic community struggles to strike the balance between financial sustainability for publishers and the inclusivity of research distribution (Borrego, 2023). This study is important because it may shed light on the wider effects of these policies on academic freedom, equity among researchers – especially from underfunded institutions or nations – and the general integrity of knowledge generation.

The complex interaction between the financial models of academic publishing and access to research outputs (O'Rurke et al., 2023) is shown by current literature. Studies show that although the emergence of open-access models seeks to improve accessibility and promote a more democratic distribution of knowledge, the imposition of APCs often reproduces existing inequality, so favoring well-funded researchers and institutions (Lawson et al., 2016). Furthermore, some disciplines have seen an explosion of scholarly criticism on the sustainability of the conventional subscription-based model, casting doubt on who really gains from academic publishing and whether the system finally serves the interests of knowledge advance or commercial profitability (Greenberg & Mark, 2015). Important themes arising from these conversations are the ethical issues of publishing methods, the part institutional support plays in reducing publishing costs, and the necessity of policy interventions to produce a more inclusive scholarly environment. Though there is an increasing amount of research, certain clear gaps demand more study. For instance, empirical studies looking at the direct link between a researcher's financial capacity and their publishing success remain rare (Sojat & Skala, 2023).

An understudied field that might provide insightful analysis of possible solutions is the junction of publishing and technology. Moreover, a more complex knowledge of worldwide differences in publication possibilities – especially in non-Western settings – remains a crucial oversight in present debate (Gair et al., 2021). The next parts of this literature review will explore more closely these issues, synthesizing the main points of view and highlighting the complexity of journal publishing costs in relation to democratic argument for academic

publication. This review attempts to present a fair view on the several possibilities and difficulties inherent in present publishing methods by leveraging a wide range of voices inside the academic community. By means of this analysis, it aims not only to evaluate the consequences of current trends but also to suggest future directions of research that might improve equity and accessibility in the field of academic scholarship (Dhar et al., 2022). Journal publishing fees have come under close examination especially as the scene of academic publication changed over the late 20th and early 21st century. Early on, the dominant paradigm of academic publishing was mostly subscription-based, meaning that many academics and institutions had restricted access and hence disproportionately affected those from lower-funded environments. Rising expenses and this subscription model caused more discussions on the accessibility and fairness of academic communication (Kay, 2019). Early 2000s open access movement supporters claimed that research funded by public money should be freely accessible to the public, so reevaluating the conventional publishing model (Rodrigues et al., 2024; Hussain & Mir, 2024). This change led to the rise of open-access publications that sometimes required authors to pay APCs instead of subscriptions.

Although supporters praised this model for improving distribution and accessibility, detractors expressed worries that APCs acted as a financial barrier that might marginalize researchers from underfunded institutions (Kochetkov, 2024). Moreover, the sustainability of this funding method stayed controversial as the open access movement confirmed in institutional policies and financial structures. Critics of the idea that charging authors could be justified as required to support quality publishing started to question whether this constituted a type of gatekeeping incompatible with democratic values of knowledge distribution (Kunst, 2022). The knowledge that publishing costs could support current disparities spurred debates on the feasibility of several publishing strategies. Emphasizing that the democratic argument for academic publication must consider these discrepancies as it develops, scholars such as von Hegner (2016) pointed out the pressing need for systematic reforms to ensure that the financial obligations imposed by APCs did not outweigh the benefits of open access and equitable access to knowledge. Examined closely, especially because of the growing worry about journal publishing costs, the democratic case for academic paper publication has been challenged. The idea of accessibility runs mostly through this conversation. The rising expenses related to academic journal subscriptions have made many academics and professionals unable to access necessary research results, so compromising democratic values of knowledge sharing and fair access to information (Kay, 2019). Open access is another important counterpoint that supports free access to academic work. This movement directly opposes the conventional publishing model that usually requires payment for access by suggesting that publically sponsored research should be accessible without tolls (Klebel & Ross-Hellauer, 2023). The ethical ramifications of profit-driven journal publishing also run across another theme.

Particularly towards early-career researchers and institutions with limited funding, the exponential increase in APCs has resulted in exploitation charges (Rodrigues et al., 2024). Critics contend that this profit incentive runs counter to the core values of academia, which historically supports the free flow of ideas for the shared good (Hussain & Mir, 2024). Moreover, the lack of openness in the way journal income is used aggravates this ethical conundrum and begs issues on responsibility in the academic publishing scene (Kochetkov, 2024). Finally, there is great conflict between academic reputation and knowledge democratization. Subscription-based models often favor established journals with high impact factors, so marginalizing smaller disciplines and newly emerging voices (Yamada & Teixeira da Silva, 2023). This compromises the variety of scholarship and supports hierarchical structures inside academia, undermining the democratic norms that such publishing methods seem to support (Kunst, 2022). In the end, the analysis of journal publishing costs in respect to democratic values emphasizes the several consequences of present academic publishing policies and calls for reform toward more fair systems that really reflect democratic values in scholarly communication. Arguments on the democratic case for academic paper publication have increasingly centered on journal publishing fees' role in obstructing access (Gasparyan et al., 2015). Different methodologies have produced different understandings of this phenomenon (Racimo et al., 2022). Particularly among underfunded institutions and researchers in developing nations, qualitative studies examining the opinions of academic authors expose general concern about high publication fees limiting equity in knowledge distribution (Glendinning & Eaton, 2023). This qualitative viewpoint emphasizes the moral consequences of paywall-generated access disparities and implies that a really democratic academic environment has to give openness top priority over exclusion.

On the other hand, financial dynamics of academic publication have been investigated using quantitative research. Research shows a worrying trend whereby rising fees directly coincide with the monopolization of journal publishing by a small number of powerful commercial publishers, so casting doubt on the sustainability of present publishing models under democratic values (Solomon & Björk, 2012). This begs important issues regarding whether academic publishing can remain a public benefit when obstacles like outrageous costs skew the availability of scholarly work. Moreover, mixed-method approaches combine these qualitative and quantitative insights, showing that the excessive reliance on publication metrics may unintentionally favor established researchers while marginalizing emerging scholars, especially those unable of affording publication fees (Rodrigues et al., 2024). These points of view imply that reforms to reduce inequalities – such as changes in funding sources or support of open access programs – are desperately needed. Analyzing these methodological techniques helps one to see how closely the problem of journal publishing fees interacts with the democratic values of access, equity, and the group progress of knowledge in academia.

Scholars are paying more and more ethical concerns about journal publishing fees and how they affect academic distribution. Various theoretical points of view highlight the complexity of this problem. From a utilitarian perspective, the idea of academic publishing as a public good is sometimes contrasted with the commercial interests of important publishers (Smith, 2022). Advocates contend that promoting democratic conversation and social fairness depends on fair access to knowledge (Wager, 2012). According to this point of view, outrageous publishing costs compromise the very foundations of democracy by limiting knowledge access depending on financial capacity, so favoring established institutions over young researchers (Beall, 2018). On the other hand, proponents of the current publishing model would contend from a meritocratic perspective that journal fees are reasonable since they guarantee quality control and maintain the integrity of scientific communication (Wiwanitkit, 2015). Such debates underline how well-funded institutions can support strict peer-review procedures, so improving the value of produced research (Hussain & Mir, 2024). Critics of this viewpoint, however, contend that since the present system mostly favors wealthy researchers while marginalizing those from less rich backgrounds, it sustains inequality (Kochetkov, 2024). The function of open access models has been carefully investigated and possible means of reconciling these opposing points of view have been found. Proponents of open access say it will democratize knowledge generation and distribution, so creating a more inclusive academic environment (Yamada & Teixeira da Silva, 2023). Studies show that improved accessibility can improve the general influence of research and citation rates (Kunst, 2022).

The necessity of a critical review of the democratic underpinnings of academic publishing becomes more clear as the debate moves, underlining the critical link between access to knowledge and the advancement of fair academic practices (Colander, 2008). Examining the interaction between journal publishing costs and the democratic case for academic paper publication reveals a complex tapestry of accessibility, equity, and ethical issues fundamental to modern academic communication. The literature repeatedly emphasizes the recurring theme that, although the open-access model has the potential to democratize knowledge, the financial reality imposed by APCs can unintentionally undercut these aspirations (Leopold, 2014). Important results show that high publishing costs sometimes favor well-funded universities and researchers, so extending current disparities in the academic community. This paradox begs important ethical issues regarding the morality of profit-driven models in academia, where publishing fees might act as gatekeeping mechanism limiting equal access to knowledge. By means of these several perspectives, it is clear that the scope of this review goes beyond only examining economic consequences; it also critically interacts with the values of inclusivity and openness that ought to define the scene of scholarly communication. Examining the ethical consequences of present publishing methods, which contradict the values of equity and meritocracy academic publication aims to preserve, is central to this conversation (Swartz, 2015). The results demand a review of the fundamental reasons and systems of academic publishing, so supporting changes more closely aligned with democratic values and guarantee fair access to all researchers, regardless of their financial situation. These revelations have consequences that go much beyond the boundaries of academia and speak to more general societal problems regarding information access (Sá & Serpa, 2020). Given public funding for research, the expectation that such knowledge remains easily available to the public emphasizes the critical need of a paradigm change in the publication and distribution of scholarly work. A more fair system might enable a greater flow of ideas, boost creativity, and eventually help society to grow better. The demand for

institutional and policy-level changes also implies that the academic community has to come together to question accepted wisdom and promote more general reforms, so stressing open access and reducing financial obstacles (Tennant et al., 2016). This study of the literature is not without restrictions, though. Though a lot of qualitative and quantitative studies show differences in academic publishing, empirical research, especially looking at the long-term effects of APCs on research diversity and quality, is conspicuously lacking, especially in less rich settings. Many of the current studies also center on Western institutions, so leaving a significant knowledge vacuum on the worldwide effects of publishing fees across various academic environments (Conn, 2014).

Future studies should close these gaps by including more general geographic points of view and empirical data to highlight the experiences of underprivileged voices inside the academic community. Finally, a critical analysis of the democratic justification for academic paper publication seen through the prism of journal publishing costs reveals an immediate demand for the scholarly community to participate actively in significant reforms.

Solving the complexity of access and equity in academic communication will help to create a more inclusive and democratic knowledge-sharing environment that embodies academic values.

3. Methodology

With an eye toward the consequences of journal publishing fees for fair access to scholarly communication, the paper uses a mixed-methods approach to critically evaluate the democratic argument for academic paper publication. This approach clarifies the complexity of publishing policies and offers thorough understanding of the current problem.

Combining qualitative and quantitative methods, mixed-methods research lets the study investigate the complex relationship between publication costs and authors' socioeconomic level. This method especially successfully exposes how financial constraints affect knowledge sharing and fair scholarly participation in academic debate.

The qualitative element of the research probably involves examining the moral and ethical consequences of access inequalities produced by high publication fees, as well as the more general democratic values of knowledge access. Quantitative studies that might concentrate on the financial dynamics of academic publishing and the relationship between publication fees and author socioeconomic level complement this.

Combining these approaches seeks to present a whole picture of the difficulties presented by existing publishing models and promote changes that give fair access top priority over profit-driven interests. The mixed-methods approach is very helpful in helping to create a fairer academic publishing scene since it lets one thoroughly investigate both the institutional problems and the personal experiences of researchers impacted by high publishing costs.

All things considered, the approach emphasizes the need of addressing the democratic values of knowledge access and offers insightful analysis of how academic publishing might better fulfill the several needs of the worldwide research community.

4. Findings

Concerns about fair access to scholarly discourse have been raised by the academic community's growing discrepancy in recent years between those who can afford journal publishing fees and those who cannot (Kay, 2019). This setting draws attention to a major research issue related to the democratic justification for publishing scholarly publications, especially closely examining the effects of publishing fees on authors from underfunded universities or economically deprived areas (Bort & Schiller-Merkens, 2011). Previous studies using similar mixed-methods approaches have effectively exposed complexity in publishing processes, implying that this all-encompassing approach will provide important insights and help to create a fairer academic publishing scene (Birnie, 2019). Therefore, the present situation calls for a basic framework for evaluating the intersections between democratic ideals and modern academic publishing practices, so enabling future research and policy considerations in this important area (Magrini, 2010).

Ongoing problems in scholarly publishing have begged important concerns about how access, equity, and maintaining democratic values interact in academic communication. The study results show a worrying trend: many authors from economically underprivileged backgrounds claimed that high journal publishing costs practically prevented them from fully

engaging in scholarly debate. According to quantitative analysis, these fees are inversely linked with the economic situation of authors, so supporting earlier studies that highlighted the socioeconomic inequalities brought about by present publishing policies (Kay, 2019). For instance, there are publications on Science Education where the APC is more than twice the monthly full professor salary (about 2,000 euros), even though the author's nation is a high-income one. Paying oneself the APC is therefore forbidden, or he must be involved in projects unrelated to the research he intends to publish or in non-open access publications. For the new scientists – that is, master's and PhD students – where it is unclear how they obtained the funds to pay the extreme APC in prestigious academic publications when their advisor and scientific team are not involved in other scientific projects, the situation is worse. Under the democratic argument of free knowledge, this situation produces a kind of academic slavery instead of academic freedom (Karran, 2009). Of course, publishing a journal out of Scopus or waiting for the editor's decision for an extremely long period will help one avoid the stated situation – also forbidden in a fully competitive environment.

Moreover, qualitative interview studies revealed that many researchers saw publication as a privilege only accessible to well-funded institutions, which aligned with results by (Frosio & Derclaye, 2014), which recorded similar feelings among young researchers in many disciplines. Emphasizing the need of these substitutes to attain more general accessibility, a study also revealed a growing reliance on non-traditional publishing outlets including preprints and institutional repositories (Rodrigues et al., 2024). But resistance to these models from established publishing companies begs issues about their long-term survival and acceptance inside conventional academic circles (Hussain & Mir, 2024). These results line up with (Kochetkov, 2024), who claimed that although Open Access models offer a fix for accessibility problems, author fees they create new obstacles that could compromise democratic access to knowledge they aim to advance. The rising influence of publishing fees highlights a crucial disparity in achieving fair academic distribution, supporting the case (Yamada & Teixeira da Silva, 2023), which advocates a national policy review. This investigation of journal publishing costs offers a strong scholarly basis and shapes debates on research funding and support in policy (Kunst, 2022). Beyond academia, this study emphasizes the social obligation to create an inclusive research culture that promotes access to recently produced knowledge, so transcending intellectual interests. By challenging the financial systems ingrained in academic communication, the results force stakeholders to rethink systematic changes that democratize access while maintaining strict scholarly criteria (Colander, 2008). The frightening possibility that without intervention, the gap between those who can afford to publish and those who cannot continue to widen, so entrenching inequalities inside academia highlights the need for reform (von Hegner, 2016). Therefore, this study builds on already published material and offers a necessary call to action for establishing a fair and democratic academic publishing scene.

5. Discussion

Academic publishing has been under more and more divisive discussion with major ramifications for democratic values in scholarly communication. Results of this study show that high publishing fees act as a strong obstacle to fair access, disproportionately affecting researchers from underfunded institutions and economically poor areas (Kay, 2019). This is consistent with earlier studies showing the unfair terrain resulting from subscription-based models giving richer institutions top priority (Bort & Schiller-Merkens, 2011). The findings show a strong correlation between the socioeconomic level of an author and their likelihood of being able to publish; this implies that financial constraints are not only an administrative problem but a major obstacle to knowledge distribution (Rodrigues et al., 2024). Comparative studies show that although open access models are meant to help to reduce these disparities, the application of APCs can similarly favor those in better-funded situations (Hussain & Mir, 2024). These results speak to issues already expressed by academics on the democratization of research access (Kochetkov, 2024). Theoretically, this study emphasizes the need for a paradigm change in how academic contributions are appreciated and seen inside academic communities. Furthermore, the pragmatic consequences imply that the academic publishing model has to change to accept inclusive practices that embrace revenue generating instead of compromising academic freedom (Yamada & Teixeira da Silva, 2023). In this framework, the research also reflects a more general methodological need for ongoing investigation into alternative publishing models that might improve accessibility without burdening authors financially (Kunst, 2022). Furthermore, the information acquired here points to the need for

openness in allocating research money and publication expenses to create a fair academic environment, especially supported by current literature discussions (Colander, 2008). Given the concerning trend of rising expenses related to academic publishing, it is clear that stakeholders – from legislators to academic institutions – must cooperate to create strategies that maintain democratic values in scholarly communication (von Hegner, 2016). Therefore, the study forces a review of current policies and practices in academic publishing to support regulatory frameworks that give open access and fair distribution top priority, so improving research impact and public involvement in knowledge production. This study adds important new perspectives on the continuous difficulties the academic community faces with regard to publication costs, so supporting the necessity of systematic reform consistent with democratic ideas of access to knowledge.

6. Conclusions

Emphasizing the major difficulties these expenses provide to fair access to knowledge, this study has carefully investigated the link between journal publishing fees and democratic values in publishing academic papers. According to the study, high publication costs disproportionately impact researchers from underfunded institutions and economically deprived areas. This runs against the fundamental democratic principles of inclusiveness and accessibility in academic publishing. The data showed that the current financial systems support an unfair publishing environment even if the open access movement tries to lower these discrepancies. The study underlined the pressing need to change the ways of academic publishing and supported models that give fair access top priority above profit-driven goals. Scholars, businesses, and legislators should use this study as a call to action to start meaningful conversations on the direction academic publishing will take. The aim is to guarantee that democratic values of knowledge access are maintained and given top priority in the academic setting. By emphasizing fair access, researchers will be able to help society grow and foster a culture of inclusiveness and cooperation in generating knowledge.

Funding: This research received no external funding.

Conflicts of Interest: The author declares no conflict of interest.

References

- Beall, J. (2018). Predatory journals exploit structural weaknesses in scholarly publishing. *4Open*, 1(1). <https://doi.org/10.1051/fopen/2018001>
- Birnie, R. (2019). The Ethics of Resisting Deportation. In *Proceedings of the 2018 ZiF Workshop "Studying Migration Policies at the Interface between Empirical Research and Normative Analysis"* (pp. 191–214). <https://doi.org/10.17879/95189423213>
- Björk, B. C. (2017). Scholarly journal publishing in transition- from restricted to open access. *Electron Markets*, 27, 101–109. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12525-017-0249-2>
- Björk, B. C. (2021). Why is access to the scholarly journal literature so expensive?. *Portal: Libraries and the academy*, 21(2), 177–192. <https://doi.org/10.1353/PLA.2021.0010>
- Borrego, Á. (2023). Article processing charges for open access journal publishing: A review. *Learned Publishing*, 36(3), 359–378. <https://doi.org/10.1002/leap.1558>
- Bort, S., & Schiller-Merkens, S. (2011). Reducing Uncertainty in Scholarly Publishing: Concepts in the Field of Organization Studies, 1960–2008. *Schmalenbach Business Review*, 63, 337–360. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF03396823>
- Colander, D. (2008). The Myth of the Myth of the Rational Voter. *Critical Review*, 20(3), 259–271. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08913810802503426>
- Conn, V. S. (2014). Paying the Price for Open Access. *Western Journal of Nursing Research*, 37(1), 3–5. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0193945914554257>
- Dhar, R., Talukdar, J., Kumar, A. H. S., & Karmakar, S. (2022). The problem with APC and open access: Hurdles in publishing practice. *Asian Journal of Medical Sciences*, 13(3). <https://doi.org/10.3126/ajms.v13i3.43090>
- Frosio, G., & Derclaye, E. (2014). Open Access Publishing: A Literature Review. Zenodo. *CREATe Working Paper Series 2014/1*. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.8381>
- Gair, S., Zuchowski, I., Beddoe, L., & Tangata, T. K. T. (2021). Open access publishing: A key enabler to research impact, informed practice and social justice. *Advances in Social Work and Welfare Education*, 22(2), 25–38. <https://journal.anzswwer.org/index.php/advances/article/view/71>
- Gasparyan, A. Y., Yessirkepov, M., Diyanova, S. N., & Kitas, G. D. (2015). Publishing ethics and predatory practices: a dilemma for all stakeholders of science communication. *Journal of Korean Medical Science*, 30(8), 1010–1016. <https://doi.org/10.3346/JKMS.2015.30.8.1010>
- Glendinning, I., & Eaton, S. E. (2023). Understanding and Addressing Drivers of Corruption in Academic Publishing. In S. E. Eaton (Ed.), *Second Handbook of Academic Integrity* (pp. 1–19). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-287-079-7_146-1
- Greenberg, M. L. S., & Mark, I. (2015). Open access publishing in higher education: charting the challenging course to academic and financial sustainability. *Journal of Educational Controversy*, 10(1), 5. <https://cedar.wvu.edu/jec/vol10/iss1/5>

- Hussain, M. I., & Mir, A. A. (2024). Party Politics in West Bengal: Historical and Contemporary Dynamics. *Integrated Journal for Research in Arts and Humanities*, 4(3), 50–55. <https://doi.org/10.55544/ijrah.4.3.10>
- Karran, T. (2009). Academic freedom: in justification of a universal ideal. *Studies in Higher Education*, 34(3), 263–283. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075070802597036>
- Kay, R. S. (2019). Democracy, mixed government, and judicial review. In L. Crawford, P. Emerton, & D. Smith (Eds.), *Law under a democratic constitution: Essays in honour of Jeffrey Goldsworthy* (pp. 30-51). Hart Publishing.
- Klebel, T., & Ross-Hellauer, T. (2023). The APC-barrier and its effect on stratification in open access publishing. *Quantitative Science Studies*. *Quantitative Science Studies*, 4(1), 22-43. https://doi.org/10.1162/qss_a_00245
- Kochetkov, D. M. (2024). Post-publication review: Evolution of the scientific publishing workflow. *Economics of Science*, 10(3), 8-21. <https://doi.org/10.31235/osf.io/zsqhn> [in Russian]
- Kunst, J. R. (2022). Reinventing academic publishing. *advances.in/psychology*, 1(1), 1-5. <https://doi.org/10.56296/aip00001>
- Lawson, S., Gray, J. & Mauri, M. (2016). Opening the Black Box of Scholarly Communication Funding: A Public Data Infrastructure for Financial Flows in Academic Publishing. *Open Library of Humanities*, 2(1), e10. <https://doi.org/10.16995/olh.72>
- Lăzăroiu, G. (2014). Challenges facing scholarly publishing. *Linguistic and Philosophical Investigations*, 13, 158–163.
- Leopold, S. S. (2014). Editorial: Paying to publish – what is open access and why is it important? *Clinical Orthopaedics and Related Research*, 472(6), 1665-1666. <https://doi.org/10.1007/S11999-014-3615-9>
- Magrini, J. (2010). How the conception of knowledge influences our educational practices: Toward a philosophical understanding of epistemology in education. *Curriculum Matters*, 6, 6–27. <https://doi.org/10.18296/cm.0119>
- O'Rourke, T., Bhosale, U., Kapadia, A., Shukla, K., & Thomas, R. (2023). Open Science, Closed Doors? Understanding the Impact of Article Processing Charges on Open-Access Publishing with a Global Study. In *45th SSP Annual Meeting "Transformation, Trust, and Transparency"*. Science Open. <https://doi.org/10.14293/s2199-ssp-am23-01019>
- Racimo, F., Galtier, N., De Herde, V., Bonn, N. A., Phillips, B., Guillemaud, T. & Bourguet, D., (2022). Ethical Publishing: How Do We Get There? *Philosophy, Theory, and Practice in Biology*, 14, 15. <https://doi.org/10.3998/ptpbio.3363>
- Rodrigues, R., Urbano, C., Neubert, P., Rodriguez-Gairín, J. M., & Somoza-Fernández, M. (2024). New academic journals: an international overview of indexing and access models. *Information Research an International Electronic Journal*, 28(4), 116–131. <https://doi.org/10.47989/ir284466>
- Sá, M. J., & Serpa, S. (2020). Some Issues on the Funding of the Scientific Publication in Open Access. *Academic Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies*, 9(4), 77. <https://doi.org/10.36941/ajis-2020-0063>
- Smith, S. D. (2022). Publishing Ethics. In *International Encyclopedia of Ethics*. John Wiley & Sons, Inc. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781444367072.wbiee967>
- Sojat, Z., & Skala, K. (2023). A View into the Future of Academic Publishing. In 46th International Convention on Information and Communication Technology, Electronics and Microelectronics (pp. 338-343). Opatija, Croatia. <https://doi.org/10.23919/MIPRO57284.2023.10159896>
- Solomon, D. J., & Björk, C. (2012). Publication fees in open access publishing: Sources of funding and factors influencing choice of journal. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology*, 63(1), 98-107. <https://doi.org/10.1002/asi.21660>
- Swartz, M. K. (2015). Open access publishing: scholarly or predatory? *Journal of Pediatric Health Care*, 29(2), 121-122. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.PEDHC.2014.11.009>
- Tennant, J. P., Waldner, F., Jacques, D. C., Masuzzo, P., Collister, L. B., & Hartgerink, C. H. J. (2016). The academic, economic and societal impacts of Open Access: an evidence-based review. *F1000Research*, 5, 632. <https://doi.org/10.12688/F1000RESEARCH.8460.3>
- The Lancet Planetary Health. (2022). Publishing at what cost? *The Lancet Planetary Health*, 6(3), e180. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s2542-5196\(22\)00048-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/s2542-5196(22)00048-1)
- von Hegner, I. (2016). Gods and dictatorships: A defence of heroic atheism. *Science, Religion and Culture*, 3(1), 31-48. <https://doi.org/10.17582/journal.src/2016/3.1.31.48>
- Wager, E. (2012). Publishing ethics and integrity. *Academic and Professional Publishing*, 337-354. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-1-84334-669-2.50014-7>
- Wiwantitkit, V. (2015). Publication Ethics: What Next? *Prilozi*, 36(1), 4-4. <https://doi.org/10.1515/PRILOZI-2015-0052>
- Yamada, Y., & Teixeira da Silva, J. A. (2023). Examination of an 'experimental' Academia.edu publishing model. *Journal of Scholarly Publishing*, 54(1), 103-120. <https://doi.org/10.3138/jsp-2022-0028>