

Review of a Review

When reading the July-August issue of *Science Editor*, I was disappointed by the book review of *The Access Principle*. The piece reads much more like an opinion on the merits of open access than a book review.

I take issue in particular with Yamey's unfair use of an example from the book to make a general statement that publishers charge "exorbitant" fees to scientists in the developing world. The situation involves a researcher in Uganda who cannot gain access to scientific literature. My employer, the American Society of Plant Biologists, partners with AGORA, HINARI, and OARE to make journal content available for *free* to public institutions in dozens of developing countries, as do many other scholarly publishers. A publisher that belongs to even one of the three organizations mentioned above would have its content available for free in Uganda. The reviewer uses this example as evidence that open access is a necessity, when encouraging publishers to join AGORA, HINARI, and OARE could solve this particular problem just as effectively.

Open access is obviously an important topic in our industry and it would be appropriate for *Science Editor* to publish thoughtful opinions for or against it; however, I believe that in this case you have published an opinion piece in the guise of a book review. I understand that you probably rely on volunteers to provide content for your publication, but in this case the book reviewer clearly seemed to have an agenda to promote.

Thank you for the work you do to bring us *Science Editor*.

John Long

Managing Editor

The Plant Cell and *Plant Physiology*

jlong@aspb.org