RegenMed

ARTICLE

PUBLISH OR PERISH ECONOMICS

Why the productivity metrics of science reward velocity over veracity.

www.rgnmed.com | circles@rgnmed.com

THE TYRANNY OF THROUGHPUT

Science was once measured by insight. Now it is measured by output. In the academic marketplace, publication count has become the primary currency of advancement. Tenure, grants, and reputation all hinge on one variable: volume. The result is a distorted incentive structure in which quantity substitutes for meaning — and velocity becomes a form of virtue.

The irony is that the system succeeds brilliantly at what it was designed to do: generate more papers. But papers are not knowledge. They are byproducts of a manufacturing process that now optimizes for throughput rather than truth.

FROM CURIOSITY TO CONTENT

Modern research teams operate like media organizations, managing "content calendars" of studies timed for grant renewals and performance reviews. The unit of survival is not the validated finding but the accepted manuscript. Each paper functions as both progress marker and marketing asset.

Peer reviewers, overwhelmed by volume, have little time to replicate logic or scrutinize raw data. As journals chase citation velocity, even editorial standards begin to favor the provocative over the precise. The ecosystem's collective attention span contracts. The result is predictable: the half-life of credibility shortens as the pace of publication accelerates.

The damage is cumulative — a growing archive of uncertain claims that future scientists must first unlearn before they can discover anything new.

THE ECONOMICS OF OVERSUPPLY

The publish-or-perish model obeys the same economic logic as any overproduced commodity. When supply explodes, value per unit collapses.

The academic job market mirrors this imbalance: thousands of publications chase too few genuine breakthroughs, and citation counts become speculative currency.

Institutions compete in this inflationary economy by marketing output volume to attract funding. Researchers respond rationally by fragmenting work into the smallest publishable pieces — the "least publishable unit." The system thus rewards what one meta-analyst called *paper slicing*: splitting one dataset into multiple shallow reports.

It is the scientific analog of high-frequency trading: a blur of transactions, minimal new information, and massive resource burn.

THE OPPORTUNITY COST OF SPEED

Every hour spent polishing a redundant paper is an hour not spent refining a meaningful one. The publish-or-perish treadmill diverts attention from longitudinal, integrative work — the kind that requires patience, iteration, and humility.

The most reliable knowledge in medicine emerges from studies that resist this tempo: long-term follow-ups, multi-site replications, and negative results published with equal pride. Yet these are precisely the forms least rewarded by current metrics. The signal of genuine learning is drowned out by the noise of performative productivity.

REFORMING THE INCENTIVE STRUCTURE

Fixing this requires retooling the scorecard:

- **Quality-Weighted Output**. Universities can normalize faculty evaluation by weighting publications by methodological rigor, transparency, and replication.

- **Replication Credits**. Funders can reward independent verification of existing results — the scientific equivalent of quality assurance.

- **Longitudinal Grant Structures**. Replace annual progress reports with milestone-based verification, emphasizing depth of understanding over paper count.

- **Editorial Transparency**. Journals can publish acceptance statistics by study type (confirmatory vs. exploratory) to rebalance expectations.

Such reforms would slow the pace of superficial publishing and redirect energy toward cumulative reliability.

MORAL VELOCITY

The deepest question is not how fast science can move, but in what direction. Every acceleration has a moral vector. Publishing faster is not progress if it drives confusion faster too.

The opposite of stagnation is not motion; it is meaning. The purpose of medical research is not to fill journals but to relieve suffering. When we remember that, the calculus of productivity changes — from "how much did you publish?" to "how much did you clarify?"

That single shift would end the tyranny of throughput and restore the dignity of discovery.

SELECTED REFERENCES

- RegenMed *(2025). Genuine Medical Research Has Lost Its Way*. White Paper.

- Ioannidis, J. P. A. (2005). *Why Most Published Research Findings Are False. PLoS Medicine*.

- Sarewitz, D. (2016). *The Pressure to Publish Pushes Down Quality. Nature*.

- Merton, R. K. (1973). *The Sociology of Science*. University of Chicago Press.

- OECD (2023). *Science Metrics and Research Assessment Reform*.

GET INVOLVED OR LEARN MORE — CONTACT US TODAY!

If you are interested in contributing to this important initiative or learning more about how you can be involved, please contact us*:

RegenMed | www.rgnmed.com

circles@rgnmed.com

*If the links do not work for you, please download the PDF.