



## **Publication philosophy of Frontiers in Earth Science**

Nick van de Giesen

Water Resources Section, Faculty of Civil Engineering and Geosciences, Delft University of Technology, Delft, Netherlands

Every academic involved in scientific publishing probably often has the feeling that the system is a bit under the wool, if not perhaps even with a life threatening pneumonia. The pressure to publish is enormous and the number of scientists participating is increasing rapidly. As a rule of thumb, one should review three papers for every paper submitted but it is exceedingly difficult to find reviewers. The quality of reviews is very mixed and, especially, young scientists are often frustrated by the random, irrelevant, or simply mean comments one receives. Editors tend to quickly choose the side of the reviewers because they are the ones to be pleased rather than the infinite mass of aspiring authors. However, we are all in it together! A second problem, perhaps not yet felt as acutely in Earth Science as in Medicine, is the lack of repeat studies. A recent discussion on the validity of numerical hydrological studies hints at the problem of repeatability but a complete discussion of this hallmark of science still has to start within our field. Frontiers in Earth Science tries to address some of these problems simply by being inclusive. Instead of judging a paper by its innovation, it judges by its scientific correctness. Instead of rejecting papers, coaching is provided to ensure the paper is indeed scientifically accurate. Clearly, this model does not solve all problems and may even be extra difficult given the deluge of papers, but it does address the problems of early career scientists and inclusion of repeat studies.