Will scholarly journals perish?

Will scholarly journals perish? This is a question that has puzzled me for years.

The introduction of online journals results in the inevitable recession of print journals. The uprise of the open access journals has been changing the structure of scholarly journals ceaselessly. What keeps me thinking is the open access of clinical trials data. What would be the bigger picture if open access to clinical trials data becomes the mainstream?

It is interesting that with the primary bottleneck lying in the availability of open data, the Big-data Clinical Trial (BCT) seems to stay where it was in spite of the increasingly popularity of “Big Data” among scientists. It has to be the fact that without open data, a statistical analysis is restricted to a particular area (or several areas). Even with big enough data, the study can only be termed as “research with big data sets” rather than “big data research”, which are totally different concepts. Big Data is constituted by a plurality of dimensions. On one hand, for an individual (e.g., a patient), the relevant data covering his/her disease course is big enough; on the other hand, for the entire population, as more as individuals (e.g., patients) are expected to be included, to contains all the elements just like the “universe set” in set theory; by doing so, scientists expect to carry out the so-called clinical studies in real-world settings.

Why do the real-world-based clinical trials so appealing? It is understandable that the results and conclusions are likely to be altered in studies targeting the same issue using the same research method with sample size changed. In addition, the probability of such a “likely” is quite high. In many top journals, it is a common phenomenon that some authors tend to validate the results of one study in another population using the same research method. However, if the results are “validated” in one population, it only means that they are “repeatable”. Will the results also be repeatable in the second, third, and more populations? If the attempts are not continuing, which should be, the “validation” is equivalent to “self-deception” in a sense.

When clinical research data is open accessed, we can easily integrate data from multiple centers for statistical analysis and meanwhile “validate” the results in multiple populations. If this is the case, then another question arise: can everyone easily publish his/her results/papers in high-profile journals such as the New England Journal of Medicine? My answer is NO.

When the open access to clinical research data becomes mainstream, we can easily find the constant update of database on the Internet. Simply by clicking on a button, we obtain the statistical results of the most current data. A further button click would display the validation results based on a specific population. The database would be updated at a certain period of time (e.g., 1 month or 1 day), and the statistical results would “likely” also be changed accordingly. At that time, the questions may change to “would any researchers publish their findings in a journal?” Well, even if someone is still keen to write such articles, journals may be reluctant to publish them because of the indefiniteness of the findings with the risk of being overturned at anytime.

Eventually here it comes the serious question: will scholarly journals perish? My answer is still NO. Then in what way the scholarly journals would probably lead to?

During my Business Administration course, my teacher distributed to us an article from the Case Study column of the Harvard Business Review. In this highly respected journal, articles in this column often present one case first, followed by the comments from two experts. These comments could either support or oppose each other. My teacher asked us to study the case, read through the comments and then form our own point of views on the case. He encouraged us to interpret the case from different perspectives independently in what form that I found pretty practical.

The course brought a possible answer to me. When the open access to clinical research data becomes mainstream, the entire publishing industry, especially the publication of “scholarly journals”, would eventually experience revolutionary change. It may no longer focus on the rigid and cold outcomes but it would definitely cares more about the reflection on the problems, update of insights, and integration of science and arts.

AME Medical Review Series is a production of the above thinking. As an attempt, we decided to invite experts internationally to provide their views on a specific topic to share their insights with more clinicians and thus benefit more patients. The first chosen topic for the series is the currently controversial one: conventional surgery versus stereotactic body radiotherapy for
the early stage lung cancer. As the first book to the series, we hope it would give you a glance at the coming changes.

The book series will be written by a group of individual experts who are willing to contribute medical reviews and comments to individuals who are interested in clinical research and medical reviews specifically. The book in your hand may possibly be on a heavy subject but we do hope it is presented in an easier way. It will be more than great if it brings you some thoughts and inspire you in some way.
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