Fitzpatrick, Kathleen. *Planned Obsolescence: Publishing, Technology, and the Future of the Academy*. New York: New York University Press, 2011.

Open peer review version:
http://mediacommons.futureofthebook.org/mcpress/plannedobsolescence/

Peer review (Chapter 1): Current peer review is flawed- too often it is a backchannel communication between editor and reviewer that excludes the author from its benefits and impedes the circulation of ideas. Reviewers often know who submitters are. It is also an outdated measure of authority that risks irrelevance in the online environment. Open peer review (OPR) allows for more voices, identifies more issues, and becomes a conversation. OPR also deters submission of low quality manuscripts to journals. However, for OPR to work will require more credit for serving as a peer reviewer. Clay Shirky has said "filter-then-publish, whatever its advantages, rested on a scarcity of media that is a thing of the past. The expansion of social media means that the only working system is publish-then-filter." A change to post-publication review should also switch our thinking from products to the processes of scholarly work.

Authorship (Chapter 2): The digital environment allows writing to be more about process than product-- to be "done" with a project is counter to network's open-endedness, but not to be "done" needs new way of receiving academic credit. The interaction, participation, and conversation that occur during scholarly creation helps the academy communicate with the broader public. "We need to think less about completed products and more about texts-in-process; less about individual authorship and more about collaboration; less about originality and more about remix; less about ownership and more about sharing." (p. 83) Authors part of this gift economy should use CC licenses for their work.

Texts (Chapter 3): Modes of online reading are inadequate. Scrolling does not work with the way the mind maps concepts; PDFs are often not interactive; too much online publishing is modeled on print or the codex. There is still little reader-text interaction, and new digital tools have not been adopted.   Readers should be able to talk to each other and to the author within the text itself. The open source software CommentPress promotes interaction around long-form texts by placing text and commentary side by side. Successful e-publishing requires an understanding of how texts circulate within and give rise to communities. Libraries can be a part of a communications circuit, with lecture series and other ways to spur personal interaction.

Preservation (Chapter 4): The conventional wisdom is that as transmissibility increases, durability decreases; but books more fragile than we assume, and bits more durable. Preservation has technological problems but social solutions; authors who are part of a collaboration or have institutional support are more likely to have their work preserved.

Open standards and XML will be important to avoid trapped data. Metadata, especially for citations, will be increasingly important for search engine indexing. Tagging will be needed as a supplement. Technologies like CommentPress will require much post-publication maintenance by libraries.

The University (Chapter 5): The economic model for academic publishing must change, and open access is the way forward. The average university press subsidy is 8%, and will have to increase. Universities have an obligation to support the publishing efforts of their faculty, and should subsidize publishing in the same way it supports libraries; cost recovery is an untenable burden. This will also help correct the commercial drift of presses and bring them into line with the institutional mission. Publishing subventions should be given to humanities faculty members in the same way the lab space and supplies are given to science faculty. The humanities and the academy in general face less a material obsolescence than an institutional one; we're entrenched in systems that no longer serve our needs.

Conclusion: Rather than synthesize previous chapters, here Fitzpatrick summarizes the experience of open peer review for this book. There were 44 commenters and 295 comments. Early chapters received more comment, and she thinks that serial issuance may solve this problem. Traditional peer review tends to be more holistic, while this experiment had more "locally oriented" responses. As more texts have open peer review, commenting will be diluted, requiring reward for reviewing. The average scholarly monograph sells 400 copies, so in comparison this experiment was a success in that its ideas were disseminated far more widely.

Resources mentioned in the book:

MediaCommons	http://mediacommons.futureofthebook.org/
CommentPress	http://www.futureofthebook.org/commentpress/
Digital Research Tools	http://dirt.projectbamboo.org/
Transliteracies Project	http://transliteracies.english.ucsb.edu
Giant Chair	http://www.giantchair.com
Public Knowledge Project	http://pkp.sfu.ca
Open Monograph Press	http://pkp.sfu.ca/omp
Open Journal Systems	http://pkp.sfu.ca/ojs
Philica	http://www.philica.com

- summary by Philip Young