

EDITORIAL

Translated version

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/S0034-759020200401>

MARIA JOSÉ TONELLI
Editora-chefe

THE FUTURE OF SCIENTIFIC JOURNALS

SciELO Brasil has published an updating of its document “**Crítérios, política e procedimentos para a admissão e a permanência de periódicos na Coleção SciELO Brasil**” [Criteria, Policies and Procedures for the Admission and Permanence of Journals in the *Coleção SciELO Brasil*], which is valid as of May 2020. The criteria presented in the document are underpinned by the Open Science concept, which includes: i) open access; ii) open data; and iii) open reviewing. Although the first of those items is not universally accepted, since business interests are involved in this industry, it is already practiced by journals in Brazil. Discussion is in order as to the other topics, which entail some controversy.

I recently attended a meeting of scientific editors that was organized by Professor Fabio Frezatti, the editor-in-chief at *Revista Contabilidade & Finanças*, and by Professor Abel L. Packer, Director of the SciELO/FAPESP Program. I take this opportunity to publically thank for the meeting. The debate was clarifying about deep changes that scientific journals will have to implement in the next few years. While risking to advance misconceptions, I present below a personal summary of that conversation in order to continue reflections about these new policies on knowledge communication, with researchers, scientific editors and referees in the Administration academic community.

These transformations may have, in a few years’ time, an impact on the organization and communication of scientific research, as well as on journal management itself. With the advancement of new technologies, journals’ traditional management – which includes publication frequency, volumes and the whole journal production process, which is organized to meet that model – may be totally revised, with contents being continuously published in platforms that may be endlessly renewed in (almost) real time. Journals disappear, but the communication of scientific production grows more agile. In addition to data, other steps in the scientific communication production process may be open in the future: reviews may be published and scientific editors and authors may talk directly to each other.

Who are the ones responsible for this transformation? Periodicals are protagonists in this process, but the adherence and participation of researchers, editors and referees are necessary. The change does not have to be radical. In this new trajectory, positioning may be flexible, and the steps forward may be modular, along with the research community.

RAE follows SciELO's guidelines and seeks paths to keep up with these changes in scientific communication. Below we selected a few links to further insight on this debate.

About Open Science:

Open Science and the new Modus Operandi of Communicating Research – Part I

<https://blog.scielo.org/blog/2019/08/01/ciencia-aberta-e-o-novo-modus-operandi-de-comunicar-pesquisa-parte-i/#.XuO2iVRKi5s>

Open Science and the new Modus Operandi of Communicating Research – Part II

<https://blog.scielo.org/blog/2019/08/01/ciencia-aberta-e-o-novo-modus-operandi-de-comunicar-pesquisa-parte-ii/>

About Open Evaluation

<https://blog.scielo.org/blog/2018/02/28/sobre-as-vinte-e-duas-definicoes-de-revisao-por-pares-aberta-e-mais/#.XuOoz1RKi5s>

<https://blog.scielo.org/blog/2019/04/30/potenciais-vantagens-e-desvantagens-na-publicacao-de-pareceres/#.XuO2pFRKi5sE>

<https://blog.scielo.org/blog/2019/03/27/avaliacao-por-pares-aberta-a-publicacao-dos-pareceres-influencia-o-comportamento-dos-pareceristas/#.XuO2qFRKi5s>

Enjoy the reading!

Maria José Tonelli¹ | ORCID: 0000-0002-6585-1493

¹ Fundação Getulio Vargas, Escola de Administração de Empresas de São Paulo, São Paulo, SP, Brazil