



FEMS yeast research: the yeast community journal

Downloaded from: <https://research.chalmers.se>, 2025-12-05 04:39 UTC

Citation for the original published paper (version of record):

Nielsen, J. (2015). FEMS yeast research: the yeast community journal. FEMS Yeast Research, 15(2).
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/femsyr/fou007>

N.B. When citing this work, cite the original published paper.

FEMS yeast research: the yeast community journal

With the appearance of many new journals, in particular open-access journals, the landscape of scientific publishing is changing rapidly and this has imposed pressure on the whole industry. Basically, scientific publishing can be divided into two: society-associated journals and commercial journals. Society-associated journals are normally peer-edited and peer-reviewed, meaning that it is your scientific peers that handles and reviews the paper. Thus, not only in the review stage do peers handle the paper, but also in making decisions it is a peer scientist that makes the editorial decision. Even more important, the profit generated by society-associated journals is given back to the scientific community, e.g. in the form of scholarships to young researchers, support for specific publications and support for conferences that benefits the scientific community. Good examples of society journals are the *Journal of Biological Chemistry* (JBC) that has been published since 1905 and has been published by the American Society for Biochemistry and Molecular Biology since 1925, and the family of scientific journals published by the Federation of European Microbiology Societies (FEMS), such as *FEMS Yeast Research*. Commercial journals cover a much broader spectrum of journals. Some are journals with a long history and therefore sometimes also with a strong connection to the scientific community, whereas others have little association with the scientific community. However, even journals with close ties to the scientific community are for-profit journals with no commitment to support the scientific community.

Traditionally, libraries at universities and other scientific institutions subscribe to scientific journals and the costs of running a journal, and generating profit, were hereby covered by subscriptions from libraries and other institutions. Several years back, many of the traditional journals became electronic meaning that researchers could easily access papers directly, if their institution had a subscription to the journal publishing the paper. This reduced the need for printed copies of the journals and today many journals are available only electronically. Open access publishing was introduced based on the idea of having the authors pay for the costs of handling their paper and then let the paper be freely accessible for anyone who wanted to download their paper. These open access journals saved costs for printing and only provided their papers through the World Wide Web. Public Library of Science (PLOS), who now runs a series of high-profile journals, was a pioneer of open access publishing, but others followed rapidly, e.g. BioMedical Central that now runs a very wide range of journals. PLOS started as a non-for-profit organization based on donations, but following launching of PLOS ONE, that publishes >30 000 papers per year, it is now generating profits and is using this to launch new initiatives in sci-

entific publishing. Due to the ease of establishing open access publishing, this has resulted in a very rapid expansion in this field, and has resulted in appearance of what Jeffrey Beall refers to as predatory publishes (Beall 2012). I discussed this issue more extensively in my editorial two years ago (Nielsen 2013). Initially, the large traditional publishers were not operating in the open access space as it basically clashes with the business model of journal subscription, but in recent years they have engaged more actively in this space, and this has resulted in Springer acquiring the BMC journals and Nature Publishing Group acquiring the Frontiers journals. Also, many of the traditional journals also offer open access upon author payment, just like the open access only journals. Clearly scientific publishing is in a state of flux.

So where should one publish in this complex landscape? I guess we all as researcher strive for sending our papers to high-impact prestigious journals, often journals that have a high-impact factor. This is much due to the fact that evaluation of our research performance, both internally and in connection with review of our grant proposals, much depends on our ability to publish leading journals of the field. Furthermore, the careers of our students and post docs much depend on them publishing in high-impact journals. However, even though impact factor is an important factor in deciding on target journal for our papers, it is equally important to consider how the journals are generally accepted in the field. Thus, even though JBC has had a decreasing impact factor in the last couple of years and is now at an all-time low of 4.6, this has not resulted in a lower quality of papers published in this journal as well as lower status of this journal in the field. Using other metrics for evaluation of journals, e.g. the Eigenfactor Metrics, JBC also comes in as one of the leading journals in the field.

Similarly holds for *FEMS Yeast Research*. We are a society-associated journal with a very high quality. All our handling editors are top-level scientists in their specialized field of yeast research and our very strong editorial board includes most of the leading yeast researchers. Our strong position is clearly manifested by the high quality of the papers published in our journal, and I am always happy when I see the very thorough and fair review process each paper, which is considered for publication in our journal, undergoes. Furthermore, we have a very fast processing time of manuscripts meaning that your results are rapidly communicated to your peers. The fact that *FEMS Yeast Research* is a high-quality journal is also reflected by an increasing trend of submissions as well as of accepted papers, and we have an increasing number of downloads of our published papers (up to 25% last year). Despite our link with a European society, we are still a global journal with about one-third of our papers coming

from Europe, about one-third coming from Asia, about one-sixth from the North America and about one-sixth from the rest of the World.

To further position FEMS Yeast Research as a **The Yeast Community Journal** (Nielsen 2014), we have initiated a number of new initiatives. We will now regularly have thematic issues on key topics. In 2012, we had a thematic issue on systems biology of *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*, in 2014 we had a thematic issue on yeast stress and cell death and in 2015 we will have several thematic issues. The first will be on synthetic biology and later in the year we will have a thematic issue in honor of the many scientific contributions of Professor Jure Piskur. In 2015, we will also have a thematic issue on *Candida glabrata* and we are also planning a thematic issue on *C. albicans* in 2016. In 2015, we will also start with a series of short commentaries from leaders in the yeast community. These will discuss how yeasts are used as cell factories and as model organisms for studying molecular mechanisms related to different human diseases.

So in conclusion, why should you publish in FEMS Yeast Research? You should do this because it is a society-associated

journal and because it is a journal that will work on supporting and maintaining a strong yeast community. FEMS is currently undergoing a re-organization and the society will strengthen its support for conferences and young researchers. We are confident that hereby the journal and the society will assist in strengthening yeast research onwards.

REFERENCES

- Beall J. Predatory publishers are corrupting open access. *Nature* 2012;**489**:179.
- Nielsen J. Editorial. *FEMS Yeast Res* 2013;**13**:1.
- Nielsen J. Maintaining a strong yeast research community. *FEMS Yeast Res* 2014;**14**:527–8.

Jens Nielsen, Department of Biology and Biological Engineering, Chalmers University of Technology, Kemivägen 10, SE 41296 Gothenburg, Sweden