



ARTICLE

THE TYRANNY OF THE PUBLISHABLE

www.rgnmed.com | circles@rgnmed.com

THE PREMISE

Science was once governed by disciplined inquiry and collective verification. Its slow, cumulative rhythm ensured that discoveries matured through scrutiny. In the modern research economy, that rhythm has been replaced by velocity. Today, scientific progress is defined by publication count rather than intellectual contribution. *Publishability* – the capacity to generate a result fast enough, fashionable enough, and fundable enough – has become the operative currency of success.

THE DISTORTION

Under this regime, novelty eclipses reliability. A finding that is intriguing but unstable will outcompete a replication that is dull but true. Incentives reward the easily cited over the carefully tested. Peer review, once a mechanism for quality control, functions largely as a formality – a procedural endorsement of productivity. Journals compete not for accuracy but for attention, chasing “impact factors” that often correlate with controversy, not validity. The entire system has inverted: signaling replaces substance.

THE CONSEQUENCE

The resulting distortion corrodes the epistemic fabric of science. Research becomes a form of theater – designed for visibility rather than veracity. Young scientists internalize a survival logic: select questions that yield publishable noise, not durable knowledge. Institutions respond with metrics and dashboards that quantify reputation without measuring truth. The consequence is a vast accumulation of papers that cannot replicate, policies that mislead, and technologies that rest on statistical mirages.

THE WAY FORWARD

Repair begins with incentive inversion. Journals must reward correction over discovery, transparency over novelty. Funders should prioritize reproducibility studies and open

datasets as legitimate endpoints. Institutions must recalibrate tenure metrics to reflect *truth maintenance* rather than *paper velocity*. Above all, science must remember its moral identity: a covenant with uncertainty, not a contest of output. The tyranny of the publishable ends only when humility is restored as the highest form of rigor.

REFERENCES

1. RegenMed (2025). *Genuine Medical Research Has Lost Its Way*. White Paper, November 2025.
2. Ioannidis, J. P. A. (2005). *Why Most Published Research Findings Are False*. PLoS Medicine, 2(8).
3. Brembs, B. (2018). *Prestige Journals and the Reproducibility Crisis*. Frontiers in Human Neuroscience, 12, 37.
4. Smaldino, P. E., & McElreath, R. (2016). *The Natural Selection of Bad Science*. Royal Society Open Science, 3(9).
5. Sarewitz, D. (2016). *The Pressure to Publish Pushes Down Quality*. Nature, 533(7602), 147.
6. Horton, R. (2015). *Offline: What Is Medicine's 5 Sigma?* The Lancet, 385(9976), 1380.

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](https://www.rgnmed.com)

 circles@rgnmed.com



SCAN ME

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