

OFFICIAL REBUTTAL TO THE ARTICLE “LA AMENAZA VELADA AL ACCESO ABIERTO DIAMANTE” PUBLISHED IN CIÊNCIA DA INFORMAÇÃO EXPRESS

Gali Halevi

SCImago Lab, Granada, Spain

gali.halevi@scimago.es

<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3478-8804>

Rodrigo Sánchez-Jiménez

Universidad Complutense de Madrid

Facultad de Ciencias de la Documentación

Santísima Trinidad, 37

28010 Madrid, Spain

rodsanch@ucm.es

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3685-7060>

Vicente P. Guerrero-Bote

Universidad de Extremadura

Facultad de Ciencias de la Documentación y la

Comunicación

Badajoz, Spain

guerrero@unex.es

<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4821-9768>

Félix De-Moya-Anegón

SCImago Lab, Granada, Spain

felix.moya@scimago.es

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0255-8628>

REBUTTAL

We recently read your article, “*La amenaza velada al acceso abierto diamante*,” published in *Ciência da Informação Express* (<https://doi.org/10.60144/v6i.2025.152>), and appreciate your engagement with the current discourse around scholarly publishing models. However, we must address several key misunderstandings and factual inaccuracies regarding the methodology, intent, and implications of our study, “*Estimating the financial value of scientific journals and APCs using visibility factors: A new methodological approach*.”

We provide the following clarifications to ensure the discussion proceeds on a foundation of scholarly accuracy and integrity:

1. Nature of the publication in *Ciência da Informação Express*

Contrary to how it is presented, the piece in *Ciência da Informação Express* is not a research article, but rather a manifesto, an opinion-based commentary offering policy recommendations. As such, it cannot be considered a direct counterpoint to our peer-reviewed and published article, which presents a methodological framework for assessing the financial value of journals in relation to their visibility. The manifesto does not address this methodology and thus does not substantively engage with our research.



2. The Manifesto does not address our methodology

It is important to clarify that the manifesto does not open a debate with us about the research methodology proposed in our article. There is not a single comment in the manifesto that critiques or engages with the methodological model we developed. Instead, the criticism is directed solely at the fact that the estimated values are publicly accessible through the SCImago portal. The central concern expressed by the authors and signatories of the manifesto is not about the scientific approach we applied, but about the publication of the estimated APC values themselves. This is a fundamental distinction that must be recognized in any constructive critique.

3. Misattribution of SCImago Journal Rank (SJR) Involvement

The article incorrectly links our research with the SCImago Journal Rank (SJR) indicator, suggesting that our work influences or is informed by SJR's methodology. This is factually incorrect. The methodology of SJR has remained unchanged since 2012 (<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joi.2012.07.001>). Our research is entirely independent of SJR and should not be interpreted as reflecting or altering its algorithm, scope, or editorial practices.

4. Misrepresentation of intent

Our article does not promote aligning APCs with citation metrics or journal prestige. On the contrary, we explicitly caution against overreliance on rankings and warn about the inflation of APCs in highly ranked journals. The intent of our work is to reveal how visibility correlates, or fails to correlate, with publication costs, and to promote more informed, evidence-based publishing choices.

5. Support for ethical, transparent publishing

We are strong advocates of equitable and transparent scholarly communication models, including diamond open access. Our methodology seeks to increase transparency around costs and visibility, allowing authors and institutions to make better-informed decisions. Far from harming diamond journals, our work highlights their value, cost-efficiency, and role in bibliodiversity. Our upcoming improvements to the SCImago portal, including clearer labelling for diamond OA journals, further reflect this commitment.

6. Clarifying financial implications

We do not equate financial value with editorial quality. Our estimations of APC values are intended as transparency tools, not judgments. Many high-APC

journals offer little visibility or impact, and we believe exposing this misalignment is key to creating a more equitable and efficient publishing ecosystem. The manifesto does not engage with this argument, which we believe is central to the ongoing reform of the system.

7. On Ideological positions

We do not engage in ideological or political debates over models like “cognitive capitalism.” These are important philosophical and policy discussions, but they do not belong in critiques of empirical, methodological research. Our focus is on providing robust, data-driven tools to inform decisions made by policymakers, authors, and institutions.

8. Call for responsible engagement

We reiterate our full commitment to open science, bibliodiversity, and transparent publishing practices. We welcome critique, but only when it engages accurately and constructively with our work. Mischaracterizing our research, by conflating it with SJR, or ignoring its empirical basis, does not serve the goals of equity, accountability, or open access.

REFERENCES

GODÍNEZ-LARIOS, S. Una propuesta de evaluación desde el acceso abierto diamante. *In*: DELGADO, Martha Patricia Zarza *et al.* **Acceso abierto diamante**: global summit on diamond open access: Cimeira Global sobre Acceso Abierto Diamante, Ciudad Autónoma de Buenos Aires: CLACSO, 2024. p. 100-106. Disponible en: <https://biblioteca-repositorio.clacso.edu.ar/handle/CLACSO/251498>. Acceso el: 13 ago. 2025.

GUERRERO-BOTE, Vicente P.; MOYA-ANEGÓN, Félix. A further step forward in measuring journals' scientific prestige: The SJR2 indicator. **Journal of Informetrics**, v. 6, n. 4, p. 674-688, out. 2012. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joi.2012.07.001>

HALEVI, Gali et al. Estimating the financial value of scientific journals and APCs using visibility factors: A new methodological approach. **El Profesional de la información**, Madrid, v. 33, n. 5, e330512, 2024. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3145/epi.2024.0512>.

Históry

Received on: 2025-08-11

Accepted on: 2025-08-13

Published on: 2025-08-14

