My thanks to Reviewer 1 for their discussion points. I would like to offer the following rebuttals and responses.

**Reviewer 1 writes:**

“First, the main argument and the suggested solution - the transformation of journals into digital libraries - is anything but new or original. This suggestion has been made since the launch of the web, thirty years ago. How many times have I read comments, papers, viewpoints, analyses, predictions like: journals risk dying; journals may die; they will die; journals should die... Especially in the context of open science and the development of open repositories and preprint servers, this was and still is a kind of mantra, and this was and is also the reason and rationale for many initiatives of publishing results. My concern is that the author proposes a more or less ahistorical viewpoint without a real understanding of the development of academic journals before and after the launch of the web. This may be the reason why new models of academic publishing like open repositories, overlay journals or preprint servers are nearly completely missing. Also, I think that the author underestimates the actual transformation of journal platforms from Elsevier, Springer Nature and others into something very different from digital libraries (see for instance the progressive vertical integration of the Elsevier products or of Digital Science). Reading the viewpoint, I sometimes had the feeling that the author was kicking at an open door and preaching the converted; or worse, that he was trying to open the wrong door.”

**Author response:**

Maybe the suggestion has been made since the launch of the web that journals should be transformed into digital libraries, but journals continue to apply a print-based workflow. The reviewer doesn’t reject this claim, and therefore, 30 years after the launch of the web, it continues to be a legitimate claim.

**Reviewer 1 writes:**

“Second, the paper lacks a kind of strategic analysis of the situation of the academic journals. If it is true that journals are dysfunctional and obsolete ("detrimental"), so why are they still in the field? Why is their number continuously increasing? The only real argument for their obsolescence I can find is that a paper (the Pubmed and Medline example) may be available on one server or platform years before it is also available on others. So what? Is this really a great problem? (Also, the author mentions "some of the big problems of science" - which problems???). My impression (based on recent studies) is that journals may have many flaws and problems (and of course, they have) but that they still fulfill some significant functions in the system of scientific communication - beyond the traditional "Oldenburg functions", they produce for instance money, data and metrics, they (still) structure communities etc. So, I would suggest that the author includes some more references on journal publishing and tries to understand why the journals are still there. This would provide depth to his viewpoint that journals should be transformed.”

**Author response:**

The reviewer assumes perfect rationality among the publishing industry. However, something can be dysfunctional and obsolete but continue to be used in lieu of better systems. For example, in the United States, Southwest Airlines recently cancelled “more than 15,000 of its flights … on Dec. 22 [2022]” and then an additional 2,300 after a major storm hit much of the United States. The blame is due to outdated and obsolete scheduling systems. From the New York Times article on this: “This problem — relying on older or deficient software that needs updating — is known as incurring technical debt, meaning there is a gap between what the software needs to be and what it is.” Thus, just because a process or industry continues to function under a certain model doesn’t mean, as the reviewer argues, that the model is efficient or serves the best interests of its users or ‘clients’. <https://www.nytimes.com/2022/12/31/opinion/southwest-airlines-computers.html>

**Reviewer 1 writes:**

“Third, and related to my second point, I would also suggest a kind of SWOT analysis which would be helpful for the description and understanding of dynamics and barriers in the field of journal publishing. In fact, my impression is that the main problem may not be the bundling (issues) but the (lack of) integration into a system of papers, data and other materials, research assessment and so on, a problem in terms of standards, formats, interoperability, metadata, identifiers etc.”

**Author response:**

I appreciate the suggestion, but I think this would be a different paper and outside the scope and purpose of this one.

**Reviewer 1 writes:**

“More generally, don't let me be misunderstood: I think that the viewpoint is quite legitimate but I think, too, that the arguments are weak and that the paper does not contribute to the debate on academic publishing with new elements. Another, general issue is that some sentences (especially in the first part) are assumptions without any evidence, and that some terms lacks precision (eg., true digital libraries - what are untrue/false digital libraries???)”

**Author response:**

I agree about the phrase “true digital libraries” and have struck out the word “true”.