

1

1

Global North-South science inequalities due to language and funding barriers

2

3 Rachel Turba^{1*}, Eli S.J. Thoré^{2,3,4}, Michael G. Bertram^{3,5,6}, Hannia Bridg⁷, Saeed Shafiei Sabet⁸, Maribet
4 Gamboa^{9,10}, Juan Camilo Ríos-Orjuela^{11,12}, Elina Takola¹³, Jose Capa Salinas¹⁴, Ana Clara Sampaio
5 Franco¹⁵, César Marín^{16,17**}

6

7 ¹Laboratory of Genomics and Molecular Biology Ecology and Evolutionary Biology Pontifical Catholic
8 University of Rio Grande do Sul – PUCRS, Brazil. ²Laboratory of Adaptive Biodynamics, Research Unit
9 in Environmental and Evolutionary Biology, Institute of Life, Earth, and Environment, University of
10 Namur, Rue de Bruxelles 61, Namur 5000, Belgium. ³Department of Wildlife, Fish, and Environmental
11 Studies, Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences, Umeå, Sweden. ⁴TRANSfarm - Science,
12 Engineering, & Technology Group, KU Leuven, Lovenjoel, Belgium. ⁵Department of Zoology,
13 Stockholm University, Stockholm, Sweden. ⁶School of Biological Sciences, Monash University,
14 Melbourne, Australia. ⁷Life Sciences & Bioeconomy Business Strategic Consultant, Bridg-Networking
15 Consultancy, Berlin Brain City Ambassador, Berlin, Germany. ⁸Fisheries Department, Faculty of
16 Natural Resources, University of Guilan, Sowmeh Sara, Iran. ⁹Department of Ecology, Faculty of
17 Sciences, Universidad Católica de la Santísima Concepción, 409054 Concepción, Chile. ¹⁰Centro de
18 Investigación en Biodiversidad y Ambientes Sustentables (CIBAS), Universidad Católica de la
19 Santísima Concepción, Concepción, Chile. ¹¹Laboratorio de Biología Evolutiva de Vertebrados,
20 Departamento de Ciencias Biológicas, Universidad de los Andes, Bogotá, 111711, Colombia. ¹²Grupo
21 de Morfología y Ecología Evolutiva, Instituto de Ciencias Naturales, Universidad Nacional de
22 Colombia, Sede Bogotá, 7495, Colombia. ¹³Department of Computational Landscape Ecology, UFZ—
23 Helmholtz Centre for Environmental Research, Permoserstrasse 15, Leipzig, 04318, Germany.
24 ¹⁴Department of Civil Engineering, University of St. Thomas, St. Paul, Minnesota, United States of
25 America. ¹⁵GRECO, Institute of Aquatic Ecology, University of Girona, Catalonia, Spain. ¹⁶Centro de
26 Investigación e Innovación para el Cambio Climático (CiiCC), Universidad Santo Tomás, Av Ramón
27 Picarte 1130, 5090000 Valdivia, Chile. ¹⁷Amsterdam Institute for Life and Environment, Section
28 Ecology & Evolution, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, de Boelelaan 1085, Amsterdam 1081 HV, the
29 Netherlands.

30

31 *Corresponding author: rturba@outlook.com

32 **Corresponding author: cmarind@santotomas.cl

33

34 **ORCID:** RT: 0000-0003-3388-4503, ESJT: 0000-0002-0029-8404, MGB: 0000-0001-5320-8444, HB:
35 0009-0009-8018-4041, SSS: 0000-0001-5919-2527, MG: 0000-0003-3744-1339, JCR: 0000-0001-6976-
36 9131, ET: 0000-0003-1268-5513, JCS: 0000-0002-0929-7192, ACSF: 0000-0002-1572-3645, CM: 0000-
37 0002-2529-8929.

38

Abstract

39 Delving into the persistent impacts of colonialism within the sphere of modern science, here we explore
40 some of the deep-seated disparities between the Global North and South with regards to the scientific
41 enterprise. Central to this inequality are the hurdles of language and financial support. As such, this work
42 discusses the often-overlooked obstacles that Global South scientists face, including the additional efforts
43 non-native English speakers must invest in reading and publishing, their higher rejection rates, and the
44 widespread neglect of publications in languages other than English. These challenges not only hinder the
45 advancement of science but also deepen existing divides. Furthermore, we examine the double-edged sword
46 of open-access requirements. While these policies democratize access to scientific knowledge, they can
47 inadvertently exacerbate the North-South inequalities due to, for example, the prohibitive costs associated
48 with open-access publishing—a financial burden that is often unmanageable for researchers with limited
49 funding. This funding gap severely restricts the Global South’s scientific capabilities and impact, affecting
50 everything from conducting comprehensive research to attending scientific meetings. The culmination of
51 these disparities not only diminishes the impact of Global South researchers in their fields but also traps
52 them in a cycle of reduced funding and limited global networking opportunities. In addressing these
53 complex issues, the contributions in this work highlight some of the most common and pronounced issues
54 related to scientific inequalities, as well as suggesting possible ways of bridging this gap in order to reach a
55 more equitable distribution of resources and recognition in the global scientific community.

56 **Keywords:** Open access; Non-English science; Decolonization; Financial inequality; Second language.

57

58 **Multilingual translations of this Abstract are available at Page 26 in Spanish, Portuguese, Greek,**
59 **German, and Persian.**

1. Context of the current work

The terminology ‘Global North’ and ‘Global South’ have been increasingly used in academia and by scholars (Toshkov, 2018), although we want to acknowledge that it comes with its own limitations and pitfalls. The history of using this terminology goes back to the commission chaired by former West German Chancellor Willy Brandt, whom prepared a report (Brandt et al., 1980) presenting the concept of a base line dividing “developed” Global North and “developing” Global South. This situation is the same with other terminologies coined in the past and still used today, such as “First-Third Worlds”, and “Developed” and “Developing Countries”. While currently in the literature the “Third World” term is no longer used, international organizations and statistical rankings remain highly stratified among countries in different continents globally, with the obvious similarities that can be observed in the position of many countries outside of the Northern core within the international system, despite substantial local variations (Lees, 2011). All of these terms tend to overly reduce and erase diverse experiences (Beattie, 2023), and the term “Global North-South” focuses on a geographical relation that does not directly translate culturally, historically, or economically (Toshkov, 2018). With that in mind, and with the intention to be more specific, whenever we refer to the “Global South” in this work, we are referring to low middle-income, formerly and currently colonized countries.

As a paper written by many people from different regions of the world, we must acknowledge how our experiences have shaped this piece and have guided much of our discussions and views on this topic (see **Table A1**; Appendix). Our background and experiences relate to the challenges that we have faced when participating in science, influence our perspectives and views (hooks, 1994; Longino, 1995) and determine the focus and story-line of this manuscript. Therefore, we focus on two main barriers that are not only shared among us, but also envelop many other related issues, namely the challenges of language and funding gaps.

2. Context of mainstream modern science

2.1. *Perspective of the Eurocentric dominance in science*

The term “scientific revolution” has been characterized in at least three different ways since it was coined and popularized (Cunningham & Williams, 1993). First, in a philosophical way, it is defined as a particular method of inquiry that produces knowledge in the form of causal, mathematical laws, or which can be reduced to such laws. Second, as a moral enterprise, to amplify freedom, rationality, truth, and as the motor of social progress. And third, as the embodiment of the innate, universally curious human nature.

The history of science, as taught to most students, has long been understood in this way, despite drastic changes and very contrasting views on this topic in the wider scientific community. The deductive, scientific method that most of us understand as the “scientific method” has long been questioned, with some philosophers of science like Okasha (2016) arguing that rather than one scientific method, there are several scientific methods specific for each scientific discipline (Marín, 2018). Hansson (2006) analyzed 70 highly-cited *Nature* articles and found that just two met Karl Popper's deductive, falsification criteria. Of course, Popper's ideas come directly from a characterization of science based on the reduction of phenomena to universal laws only (Okasha, 2016). That is why Popper had issues with demarcating some parts of the life sciences (like evolutionary biology) as science (Stamos, 1996). It would be very difficult to argue that whole disciplines like paleontology, mathematical modeling, naturalist exploration, and many others that do not directly test hypotheses in a deductive manner, do not constitute science. It should also be clear, at this point,

that science can operate rather in an inductive manner, as very well argued by Okasha (2016), and also in an abductive manner, as argued by Charles Pierce (Santaella Braga, 2019). The first uses specific observations to make broader generalizations (i.e., the trisomy in the 21st chromosome of some patients was observed to conclude this is the cause of Down syndrome), while the second case is a form of logical inference of simplest explanation which also incorporates probability, uncertainty, and doubt (Fitzhugh, 2006).

The moral characterization of the scientific revolution has also long been questioned (Merton, 1938). Such characterization assumes that science is free of any religious, social, economic, and political influence. In reality, however, the scientific revolutions were clearly affected by religious (e.g., Puritanism) and economic values (e.g., modern capitalism) (Cunningham & Williams, 1993). It is difficult not to connect the development of many scientific ideas and theories with the specific social contexts and political powers into which they were born. Moreover, the European countries that hosted these scientific revolutions since the 17th century were, mostly, also the countries benefiting from the first forms of global trade and capitalism, colonization, and slave trade. Scientists in the 17th century were directly and indirectly affected, influenced, and funded by such colonization ideas and practices.

Although rationalization has been a valued trait in science since the time of Aristotle, research shows that factors like first impressions and negative experiences deeply affect reasoning, and scientists are not immune to this (Kuhn, 1962; Haidt, 2012; Kahan, 2012). Thus, scientists are equally and strongly influenced by emotions and intuitions. Rather than abandon reason and scientific inquiry in its entirety—as some academics have proposed (Sokal & Bricmont, 1999)—it is more beneficial to be conscious about the historical and psychological factors that affect the way that scientific revolutions started, and the way that individual scientists and the scientific community operate (Haidt, 2012).

Several criticisms have been issued on the ‘universality’ of scientific inquiry over the last decades, coming from many academic areas and thought systems (Cunningham & Williams, 1993). The mainstream understanding of science originates from primary assumptions about the characteristics of science itself, which are based on idealizations of the world and what the scientific activity is (Liboiron, 2021). This has led to long-held views about the scientific method itself, which are still applied at different levels of scientific evaluation, affecting what gets funding, and what gets to be published and taught (Paasi, 2005; Salager-Meyer, 2008).

2.2. *The publishing landscape and move to FAIR (Findability, Accessibility, Interoperability, and Reusability) Science*

For most of the history of the European scientific enterprise, scholarly communication was accomplished through non-commercial means, such as letters, monographs, pamphlets, and essays (Zuckerman & Merton, 1971; Larivière et al., 2015). Publishing costs were mostly in the hands of individuals, or through the support of publishing organizations, such as university presses and donors. The scientific enterprise was concentrated in the hands of wealthy, white, independent, male scholars, and prestige was not yet tied to publication, but rather to social standing (Fyfe et al., 2017).

With the creation of the first learned societies, the first scientific journals appeared, although still far from the structure we understand now, operating more like magazines, with no systematic “peer review”, and primarily fulfilled the vision of the editor (Fyfe et al., 2017). Publishing also became a way to secure

139 intellectual property rights, which motivated researchers to move from a culture of secrecy to open
 140 communication (Zuckerman & Merton, 1971). This transformed the ethos of the European scientific
 141 community, to one of free circulation and sharing of knowledge and ideas.

142 Even though these first journals had the intention of generating revenue, they rarely did (Fyfe et al., 2015).
 143 However, things began to change in the 18th century with the print culture reducing the costs of publication
 144 and increasing accessibility to a wider readership. This, coupled with an increase of academic jobs and the
 145 professionalization of the academic community meant that authorship became a tool for universities to
 146 evaluate their employees (Paasi, 2005). As universities increasingly became the hub of researchers,
 147 publications became a primary way to demonstrate the institution and one's intellectual merits, slowly
 148 changing the culture of prestige (Zuckerman & Merton, 1971; Fyfe et al., 2017). Yet, "reputable"
 149 publications at that time still did not undergo full peer review as it exists today, and a rudimentary system of
 150 refereeing existed mainly in learned societies as a means to safeguard their reputation and representation
 151 (Zuckerman & Merton, 1971).

152 After World War II, there was a major expansion of governmental funding for research, especially in the
 153 United States (Baldwin, 2020). This created fertile ground for a new for-profit system of publishing, for
 154 several reasons, as discussed in Fyfe et al. (2017). First, the volume of research output began to outpace the
 155 capacity of scientific journals to handle them. Suddenly, finding articles to publish and keeping the
 156 periodicity was not an issue anymore which necessitated efficient mechanisms for sharing this wealth of
 157 information. This expansion was also due to the emergence of new scientific disciplines and fields of study.
 158 The diversification of research areas created a demand for platforms to disseminate new knowledge and
 159 findings. The post-war period also saw an increase in the internationalization of research, with conferences,
 160 collaborations, and societies growing in scope and reach. Scientific communities, and readership became
 161 substantially larger, and the new publishers had a much larger customer base to explore. As the US was the
 162 main driving force in research funding and output, English was increasingly used as the international
 163 language of science (*lingua franca*), and was therefore the language chosen by these new publishers.

164 However, this deluge of funding for research in the US also brought increased tension between
 165 accountability to the public and the government, and research autonomy, leading to a transformation of the
 166 refereeing system by the mid 1970s (Baldwin, 2020). This is when the term "peer review" started being
 167 used, with its definition implying that only a small group of people, the expert peers, should be responsible
 168 for evaluating an article or proposal's worthiness. First employed mainly by US funding agencies, this
 169 process was later co-opted by publishers worldwide (Baldwin, 2020) since the judgment of peer reviewers
 170 work as a token of value and legitimization—one that is given for free and anonymously by a community
 171 that still serves the ethos of improving science and sharing knowledge.

172 While generous funding lasted, publishers focused on selling journal access to institutions, since they could
 173 charge more per subscription than to individuals. Due to its particular nature and through various strategies
 174 to reduce costs, publishing became a highly profitable business, one where neither the primary good nor its
 175 quality control is paid for (Larivière et al., 2015). By the 1980s, the stream of funding drastically decreased
 176 and universities and libraries struggled to keep up with the costs of acquiring titles (Fyfe et al., 2017). Unlike
 177 most commercial goods, there is no cheap alternative to scientific discoveries and ideas, and this limitation
 178 has exacerbated the inequality of access between institutions and academics, and their potential for
 179 innovation and participation in cutting-edge research.

More recent advances in technology, such as digital media and the internet, have brought the promise to facilitate publication and circulation of academic research, democratizing its access. However, these technological advances have also brought new commercial opportunities by reducing production costs, and with new digital rights practices, publishers have taken control of intellectual property and thus prevented its free dissemination (Larivière et al., 2015; Fyfe et al., 2017). The academic culture of prestige that emphasizes a particular form of refereeing and journals has stymied alternative, non-profit models of academic publishing that lie outside of traditional systems of reward and recognition (Fyfe et al., 2017).

Over the past decade, the landscape of academic publishing has witnessed a transformative shift in the commitment to Open Science. Current US-European policies and mandates increasingly require publicly funded research to be published in Open Access (OA) formats. While this shift promotes broader dissemination of knowledge, it has also led to a significant financial restructuring, especially for commercial publishers. The transition from institutions shouldering the costs to authors navigating the terrain through Article Processing Charges (APCs) has effectively transferred the financial burden onto research grants and projects' funding (Pulverer, 2018). Consequently, government investment in Open Access inadvertently sustains and benefits for-profit publishing companies by ensuring a continuous stream of revenue through mandatory APCs. This financial re-calibration not only reinforces commercial publishers' profitability but also reflects a broader reconfiguration in the traditional power structures of scholarly communication (Dudley, 2021).

The adoption of Open Science practices has not been without its share of challenges—after all, it is still built on the same foundations and therefore inherits many of the same systematic barriers as traditional science (Bahlai et al., 2019; Gownaris et al., 2022). Non-profit-driven models, designed to foster openness and collaboration face resistance due to the deeply ingrained academic prestige culture (Bosman et al., 2021). The allure of 'prestigious' journals and the associated impact factor often act as barriers to embracing alternative, non-profit-driven models (Lawson, 2015), and leads to many journals, including the open diamond ones, to be not indexed and left out of major citation databases, especially journals from the Global South (Bosman et al., 2021; Bol et al., 2023). This inertia within the system underscores the formidable challenge of reshaping entrenched norms and practices within the scholarly community.

Language diversity emerges as a persistent hurdle in the journey towards Open Science. The dominance of English in scholarly communication marginalizes non-native English speakers, limiting their ability to effectively disseminate their research findings (Amano, Ramírez-Castañeda et al., 2023). Breaking down this language barrier is imperative for realizing the true inclusivity and global reach envisioned by the Open Science movement (Curry & Lillis, 2015) and scientific communication (Rasekoala, 2023). More about this topic is discussed below in **section 4**.

Another significant impediment that hinders widespread participation in Open Science initiatives is the issue of funding. For example, the imposition of APCs, shifting financial responsibilities on authors, creates a new set of challenges, particularly for researchers in resource-limited settings. The inability to cover APCs due to funding constraints inhibits the active engagement of researchers from diverse backgrounds (Nabyonga-Orem et al., 2020). More about this topic is discussed below in **section 5**.

3. Methods

Here, we performed an integrative review, consisting of a conceptual synthesis of a wide range of published studies (Torraco, 2005; Souza et al., 2010; Snyder, 2019). The goal of this work is to assess and critique the current state of Global South researchers' experience and participation in science, within the context of scientific conduct and community of the Global South (see definition in **section 1**). The motivation to write this has come from a combination of personal experiences and everyday challenges that stem from systemic barriers (see **Table A1**; Appendix) and reflections on work from authors from diverse fields, which has been woven in a conceptual framework to offer new perspectives on scientific practices. We synthesize conceptual papers, position papers, literature from different scientific disciplines, as well as statements and quotes from individual scientists. This is the result of a collaborative effort of the co-authors, which was coordinated through online communication and internal peer-reviewing processes. Our work contributes to the community's knowledge on how science is practiced currently, and offers guidelines for the future, especially in the context of Open Science. These guidelines appeal not only to individual scientists, but also institutions.

4. Language barriers

In science, the conditions for participation are not equal across the planet. If we take a historical perspective based on studies such as those by Aagaard et al. (2020) and Graves et al. (2022), a consistent pattern emerges. Most breakthrough discoveries and research advances tend to come from wealthier regions and countries with robust, high-income economies and advanced infrastructure. This pattern is commonly referred to as "scientific inequality" and is manifested in three key aspects: funding, recognition, and resources.

It is important to note that inequalities in science are not driven exclusively by economic factors and the distribution of resources. These disparities manifest at the individual level as well (Xie, 2016), particularly concerning communication skills, where language assumes a central role. As Drubin & Kellogg (2012) highlight, the use of English as a *lingua franca* in scientific communication has implications for global collaboration (Amano, Ramírez-Castañeda et al., 2023). This linguistic dominance, while seemingly unifying, often sidelines non-native English speakers, hindering their ability to access research, publish their work, and engage in scientific discourse (Soares et al., 2023). This situation not only disadvantages individual researchers from non-English speaking backgrounds, who find it challenging to compete in the scientific field, but it also impacts the global scientific community at large (Petersen, 2021). Breaking down language barriers invites a wealth of diverse perspectives, enriching global scientific understanding. Towards this end, practical steps can be implemented. Supporting researchers in language learning, translating crucial scientific texts, indexing non-English journals, and encouraging multilingualism in scientific forums are essential first steps. Such initiatives not only make science more accessible but also nurture a more diverse and vibrant scientific discourse, paving the way for comprehensive and globally inclusive scientific progress.

4.1. Prevalence of English in Scientific Communication

According to the Ethnologue website (<https://www.ethnologue.com/>), there are around 7,168 living languages on the Earth (Retrieved February 27, 2024). Drubin & Kellogg (2012) estimated that less than 15% of the world's population speaks English, with just 5% being native speakers. Nevertheless, English

258 ranks as the most widely spoken language and is the main language used in science. This extraordinary
 259 imbalance emphasizes the importance of recognizing and alleviating the difficulties faced by non-native
 260 speakers of English if we are to have a truly global community of scientists.

261 According to Lynch et al. (2021), the majority of journals listed in academic indexes, especially those with
 262 high impact factor (publications which typically have a disproportionately high impact on career
 263 advancement), publish their content in English. Publishing in English is also a common practice for career
 264 advancement in science, as it often leads to higher citation rates, contributes to job performance, and opens
 265 up better opportunities for career mobility. The majority of scientists around the world use English as their
 266 second language (Elnathan, 2021), making it the international language of science, for better or for worse.
 267 The prevalence of English as a common language in the scientific community has some advantages,
 268 including facilitating communication between researchers from different countries and cultures. Without
 269 this common language, international collaboration in science would be significantly more difficult (Drubin
 270 & Kellogg, 2012; Woolston & Osório, 2019). In line with this, Steigerwald et al. (2022) highlights the
 271 importance of having a central scientific language to facilitate the global dissemination of science and
 272 advancement. However, this great benefit has excluded scientific knowledge generated in other languages.

273 Stockemer & Wigginton (2019) found in their Scientometrics study that about 60% of research papers
 274 submitted by non-native English-speaking scientists are written in English. This trend is especially strong
 275 among younger researchers, Europeans, and those in the natural sciences (Stockemer & Wigginton, 2019).
 276 The idea that writing in English can enhance the global recognition of their work is endorsed by many
 277 renowned science publishers, and is a reflection of the capital dominance of English-speaking countries in
 278 science—as previously discussed.

279 In the context of conservation research, studies published in non-English languages significantly influence
 280 local decision-making (Amano, Berdejo-Espinola et al., 2023; Choi et al., 2024). Unfortunately, these are
 281 frequently ignored in global assessments. Research across 37 countries/territories found that non-English-
 282 language literature forms a major part of local information sources, accounting for 65% of references in
 283 biodiversity assessment reports (Amano, Berdejo-Espinola et al., 2023). This indicates that, by excluding
 284 non-English-language science, international evaluations may miss crucial information about local and
 285 regional biodiversity (Amano, Berdejo-Espinola et al., 2023; Choi et al., 2024).

286 The scenario described here highlights a major obstacle within the scientific community. Collaborating with
 287 scientists from different cultural and educational backgrounds adds energy and creativity to the field.
 288 However, as noted by Meneghini & Packer (2007), many scientists in regions like Africa, Asia, Latin
 289 America, and Europe often publish their research in their native languages within local journals. While this
 290 is valuable for their local scientific communities, it can lead to important insights and discoveries being
 291 overlooked on the global stage because they aren't easily accessible to English-speaking scientists. This
 292 language barrier hampers the worldwide sharing of knowledge and opportunities for cross-border
 293 collaboration.

294 Overlooking scientific research published in languages other than English can have significant
 295 consequences. Research highlights the increasing risk of missing out on a wealth of valuable evidence in the
 296 field of conservation (Amano, Berdejo-Espinola et al., 2023). It is worth noting that globally 75% of authors
 297 recognize the value of non-English language papers as important sources of information (Amano, Berdejo-
 298 Espinola et al., 2023).

4.2. Challenges for Non-English Speakers

One important question, previously raised by Suzina (2021), is whether the English language serves as the *lingua franca* of science, or rather as a mechanism that sterilizes scientific work. For scientists who are non-native English speakers, to reach a high proficiency level in a second language is an additional hurdle. Scientists are aware that the better they speak English, the easier it is to integrate into the global scientific community and the job market. However, fluency in another language is fundamentally different from being a native speaker. People often think in their mother tongue and translate their thoughts into another language when communicating, a highly demanding cognitive process (McFarlane et al., 2020) that is subjected to scrutiny from native speakers.

Beyond the inherent linguistic challenges, many academic journals explicitly require non-native English speakers to have their manuscripts revised by a native speaker prior to submission. This additional step not only increases the time and financial burden on non-native researchers—who must hire professional editors or seek informal assistance—but also creates a market for English speakers in academic editing. In some cases, this requirement leads to *quid pro quo* exchanges, where native speakers who merely revise a paper are granted co-authorship despite contributing no intellectual merit to the research. While linguistic clarity is essential for effective communication, such practices raise concerns about fairness and distribution of academic credit. Some have argued that Artificial Intelligence (AI) developments constitute an important tool to overcome such challenges—at least in writing (Golan et al., 2023).

According to Amano, Ramírez-Castañeda et al. (2023), the impact of the language barrier is significant. Ninety-one percent of non-native English speakers need more time to read papers and 51% spend more time writing them. Their papers are 2.6 times more likely to be rejected due to language issues, and they are 12.5 times more likely to need minor or major revisions. They spend 94% more time preparing and practicing presentations. In addition, 30% often decide not to go to conferences and half decide not to give oral presentations because of these language problems (see Figure 1 in Amano, Ramírez-Castañeda et al., 2023).

It is evident for scientists who do not have a strong command of a foreign language that keeping up to date in their field can be a daunting task—only 25% of authors find non-English papers easy to understand (Amano, Berdejo-Espinola et al., 2023). They face several challenges, such as struggling to communicate effectively, both orally and in writing (Flowerdew, 2019), keeping abreast of the latest advances in their field of research, getting their work published in prestigious scientific journals, and participating in specialized local research teams. These difficulties can have far-reaching consequences, including limiting the visibility and dissemination of their research and limiting their ability to build collaborative partnerships with other scientists. Ultimately, these challenges can hinder their recognition within the scientific community and potentially slow down their career progression.

4.3. Open Science Efforts to Overcome Language Barriers

The UNESCO's "Recommendation on Open Science" (UNESCO, 2021) is designed to strengthen the impact of scientific results and ensure equality of opportunities. It underscores values such as respect, responsibility, collaboration, flexibility, and sustainability. This recommendation urges international scientific institutions, academies, universities, associations, libraries, funders, and other stakeholders to actively promote global, multilingual, and cross-disciplinary research programs. By sharing information

and fostering global interconnection, these efforts aim to contribute to addressing the challenges of our time and advancing the achievement of sustainable development goals for a better world.

To enhance global scientific communication, research needs to be more internationally oriented. Acknowledging and supporting the efforts to overcome language barriers will pave the way for a more inclusive and diverse scientific community (Amano, Ramírez-Castañeda et al., 2023). This includes facilitating international collaborations and accepting scientific literature in multiple languages to improve visibility and inclusivity (Soares et al., 2023). Language training programs in academic settings are gaining importance (e.g., AuthorAid), equipping researchers to participate more effectively in a field where English predominates. However, the success of these initiatives can be mixed, and still operates in maintaining the dominance of one language over others (Salager-Meyer, 2008; Márquez & Porras, 2020). A key factor in this endeavor is fostering an inclusive attitude towards non-native speakers, emphasizing that language proficiency does not equate to scientific merit. Efforts should be made to balance language use in scientific activities, supporting non-native speakers, and effectively utilizing resources to improve communication opportunities.

Translating and creating scientific terms in one's own native language is vital for better sharing ideas to a wider audience, which in turn increases participation and comprehension of science across cultures (Márquez & Porras, 2020; Wild, 2021; Rasekoala, 2023). Translation services, both at conferences and for publishing, assist researchers in sharing their work globally irrespective of their native language. Some journals offer abstracts in multiple languages (e.g., journals published in the Scientific Electronic Library Online (SciELO) database), while others are open to multiple languages within the same journal (e.g., Revista de Saude Publica) or preprint service (e.g., EcoEvoRxiv). These efforts already help bridge some gap in access, but multilingual translation of full articles is still an almost non-existent effort. Some exceptions are PLoS journals and Emerging Themes in Epidemiology, which publish translation of articles, although still at the cost of authors and relegated to the supplemental material section (Fung, 2008).

Artificial intelligence (AI) and Machine Translation technology are gaining popularity due to their potential to overcome the language barriers that can still be an obstacle to accessing information (Rivera-Trigueros, 2022); they could serve as tools for various language editing services. Presently, platforms such as Grammarly, DeepL, and Google Translate offer machine translation services with free online options. Nevertheless, such technologies are still a work in progress, necessitating further enhancements in the accuracy and consistency, especially regarding scientific terminology translation. It's important to acknowledge that many languages are still inadequately represented in these machine translation systems (Steigerwald et al., 2022) and that language models, such as ChatGPT, are not scientists or researchers. Indeed, human verification remains indispensable (Teubner et al., 2023), which has led authors like Khelifa et al. (2022) to propose the use of an integrated peer language proofing and translation systems in preprint platforms as a solution to overcome language barriers.

5. Funding barriers

5.1. Current funding barriers

Funding barriers pose substantial restrictions on researchers all around the globe, with researchers from the Global South—where the budgets allocated to scientific research may be more limited—often experiencing

these restrictions more acutely (Moreira de Oliveira & Vinicus de Jesus, 2023). These restrictions can impact scientific endeavors in various ways. First, minimal financial backing constrains the ability of researchers to conduct state-of-the-art research. Not only is research done in the Global South countries mostly provided by public/university funds, the proportion of funding related to Gross Domestic Product (GDP) is orders of magnitude lower than in Global North countries (Salager-Meyer, 2008). Researchers from the Global South often cannot access private foundations funding (as in the US) or multilateral funding that allows research/sampling in multiple countries (as in the EU). Inadequate or outdated infrastructure (Skupien & Rüffin, 2019), limited access to necessary consumables, and challenges in meeting running costs, constrain the quality and scope of research projects. This can significantly hamper competitiveness, particularly relative to researchers with more resources and access to advanced facilities and personnel (e.g., animal caretakers, research technicians, administrators). Moreover, it is not uncommon for researchers from the Global South to pay costs associated with research (i.e., sampling costs, products) from personal funds, and/or taking on additional jobs to cope with financial constraints, which diverts time and energy away from academic pursuits and perpetuates further disparities in academic competitiveness.

Publishing in academic journals is crucial for researchers and scientific progress, but the associated costs can be prohibitive, especially for prestigious journals. For example, publishing immediate open access in *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* costs USD\$4,995–5,495, depending on the license, while publishing Gold Open Access in *Nature* amounts to USD\$11,690. Some journals also charge submission fees, pushing researchers from the Global South to publish in less reputable journals or avoid traditional outlets altogether. The Gold Open Access fee in *Nature*, for example, corresponds to 35.19% of the annual budget of a starting grant in Chile (Fondecyt Iniciación), 64.95% of an equivalent Peruvian starting grant (“Semilla”, Proyectos de Investigación Básica - Prociencia), 585% of an equivalent to the Iranian starting grant (Pajohaneh – Ostadyari), and corresponds to 3.56% of the annual budget of a European Research Council Starting grant.

Furthermore, scientific knowledge is frequently not freely available, as a significant amount remains locked behind a paywall. High subscription costs to access such publications can particularly hinder institutes or individual researchers from the Global South without the means to afford access agreements, thereby hampering their ability to stay abreast of the latest advancements. Additionally, political issues and sanctions may impede researchers from publishing their works and participating in events, like summer school programs and conferences. This further compounds the already-challenging working conditions of researchers in these restricted countries, predominantly from the Global South (Ro, 2020).

In addition to science dissemination through academic journals, researchers typically showcase their research and foster collaborations through conference participation. However, membership fees, event enrollment costs, and the expenses associated with travel and accommodation (including costly and time-consuming procedures to obtain an entry visa) can be prohibitive. This disproportionately affects researchers from the Global South, not in the least because these events are often organized in touristic and expensive locations, which limits their participation in knowledge exchange and scientific collaboration. Beyond the negative effects this brings for the competitiveness of individual researchers, limited participation from people with diverse backgrounds, including researchers from the Global South, jeopardize scientific progress as a whole. Furthermore, financial constraints may prevent researchers from the Global South from engaging in learned societies, workshops, or research visits abroad, hindering their development of essential skills and expansion of their professional network. Ensuring inclusive

opportunities for all groups in academia not only prevents the loss of valuable contributions that may unveil connections between overlooked ideas and concepts but also fosters a more equitable academic landscape, ultimately promoting a higher rate of scientific advancement (de Vaan et al., 2015; Hofstra et al., 2020).

5.2. *Open Science as a solution*

Several Open Science initiatives offer potential solutions that can alleviate the impact of limited research funding. First, in an effort to promote reproducibility, the Open Science movement encourages resource sharing, with researchers being increasingly willing to share materials such as specific reagents, equipment, or other physical resources such as animals and tissues. This can reduce the financial burden on individual researchers and make state-of-the-art research more affordable. For example, researchers may describe the availability of resources in publications or use open-source software and databases (e.g., Anishare, AniMatch, Addgene) to offer (or seek) materials (Bertram et al., 2023). Furthermore, the development of open-source software and tools facilitates state-of-the-art research for researchers without the necessary means to acquire such resources commercially. Likewise, by making educational resources openly available, researchers who may not have the means to attend workshops can still benefit from research training.

The growing emphasis on open access publishing, a fundamental principle of Open Science, contributes to democratizing access to scientific knowledge. There are many OA diamond journals that do not charge for publishing or access (Bosman et al., 2021). Researchers are also increasingly publishing on preprint servers (e.g., arXiv, bioRxiv, ChemRxiv, EcoEvoRxiv, medRxiv), which makes their work quickly available to peers without traditional publication costs. Similarly, making data openly available and reusable can help researchers from the Global South who may lack the necessary financial means to collect original data to, nevertheless, meaningfully contribute to the scientific endeavor (Gomes et al., 2022).

Many Open Science communities actively target historically underrepresented groups, including researchers from the Global South, promoting equity, diversity, and inclusion, and fostering collaborations among researchers across the globe. In this respect, online conferences can facilitate such collaboration and networking, as costs for travel and accommodation are avoided. In addition, registration costs are often lower, making it easier for researchers from all across the world to participate.

5.3. *Open Science challenges and considerations*

Despite the promising potential of Open Science initiatives to help overcome financial barriers, especially those experienced by researchers from the Global South, many roadblocks remain that are not yet addressed or that may even inadvertently be exacerbated by current Open Science initiatives (Astell et al., 2018; Bahlai et al., 2019; Gomes et al., 2022; Gownaris et al., 2022). For example, while online conferences can enhance accessibility and facilitate participation of researchers from the Global South, they still require a stable internet connection, and can involve registration fees that may potentially exclude researchers with limited resources. In this respect, it is important to recognize that organizers may partially or completely waive participation fees, or provide the opportunity to apply for grants that facilitate participation to online or in-person events. Similarly, some learned societies may offer reduced membership fees for researchers from the Global South.

Further, the emphasis on Open Access publishing, while democratizing access, may inadvertently make the research of Global South researchers less visible if they cannot afford open access publication fees (Pulverer, 2018). In this respect, many academic journals already grant waivers for authors from low-income countries who lack the necessary funding to cover article processing charges. Nevertheless, many Open Science ambassadors are increasingly exploring publication models, governed by the scientific community, which can replace traditional journals by decentralized, evolvable networks adhering to open standards and open-source norms (Brembs et al., 2023). This, in combination with revised incentives for career advancement and new ways of assessing merit, may help overcome some of these financial barriers.

6. Recommendations

Overcoming the multifaceted challenges of language barriers and non-equitable funding in science requires a nuanced and collaborative approach. Redefining academic publishing norms demands a concerted effort to dismantle the traditional prestige-centric culture and promote the core values of open, accessible research. Addressing language barriers necessitates initiatives to diversify scholarly communication, recognizing and validating research contributions in multiple languages. Furthermore, establishing sustainable funding structures is critical for ensuring equitable access to Open Science practices. Developing funding mechanisms that cater to the financial constraints of researchers worldwide will be instrumental in fostering a more inclusive and collaborative research ecosystem. Below, we synthesize some recommendations concerning these barriers as they have been discussed in the text:

1. Language Diversity Initiatives:

- a. Foster a culture that values linguistic diversity, and distinguish language skills from scientific quality.
- b. Support journals that publish in languages other than English.
- c. Practice ‘citation consciousness’ by increasing the visibility of Global South and non-English-language science.
- d. Provide language editing and translation services in events and publishing.
- e. Offer training in multiple languages.

2. Equitable Funding Models:

- a. Advocate for a fair distribution of financial resources within the Open Science framework.
- b. Invest in programs, repositories, and publishers that are open diamond.
- c. Establish funds to cover (totally or partially) Article Processing Charges (APCs) for authors from low, lower middle, and upper middle income regions.
- d. Strategically organize meetings that encourage participation of researchers from all over the globe.
 - i. Include in-person events in diverse and accessible locations.
 - ii. Offer travel grant programs.
 - iii. Offer virtual attendance options to ease geographical and financial barriers.
 - iv. Create mentorship programs.
- e. Create online platforms that support and facilitate international collaborations.
- f. Re-evaluate assessment metrics to be aligned with Open Science best-practices.

In Table 1, we list some resources that we hope will be of value to the scientific community in relation to publication tools that can help minimize the burden of publication fees and language barriers. This table is not meant to be exhaustive, and focuses on resources related to publishing, but the article by Bertram et al. (2023) provides other Open Science resources as well.

502

503 **Table 1.** List of Open Science publication resources. Adapted from Bertram et al. (2023).

Stage	Open Science Practice	Tools	Description
Publication	Use FAIR principle	GoFAIR	Initiative to implement the FAIR data principles
	Use persistent identifiers	ORCID ID	Provides a persistent digital identifier to distinguish among researchers (Open Researcher and Contributor ID)
		Research Resource Identifiers	Portal to promote research resource identification, discovery, and reuse
	Publish pre-prints	arXiv	Preprint server for studies in various disciplines
		bioRxiv	Preprint server for studies in biology
		ChemRxiv	Preprint server for studies in biology
		EcoEvoRxiv	Preprint server for studies in ecology, evolution and conservation
		medRxiv	Preprint server for studies in medicine
	Publish open access	DOAJ	Platform to identify the open access policies of scientific journals (Directory of Open Access Journals)
		Sherpa Romeo platform	Platform to identify the open access policies of scientific journals
		OA Diamond Journals Inventory	Inventory of OA Diamond Journals collected by Bosman et al., 2021 (https://zenodo.org/records/4562828)
	Open peer review	Peer Community In	Open research peer-reviewing and publishing platform.
		F1000	Open research peer-reviewing and publishing platform.
		LifeCycle Journal	Open research peer-reviewing and publishing platform.
	Language and writing	AuthorAid	Canadian program providing editing assistance to inexperienced and non native English speakers researchers
		DeepL	AI translation tool
		Google Translate	AI translation tool. As an example, this tool uses Google Translate to translate documents in any format and free: www.onlinedoctranslator.com
		Social media (e.g. Mastodon)	Social networking service
		ResearchGate	Social media and social networking service for researchers
		Academia	For-profit open repository of academic articles, free to read by visitors. Uploading and downloading is restricted to registered users. Additional features are accessible only as a

Stage	Open Science Practice	Tools	Description
			paid subscription. Social media and social networking service for researchers.
		Mutual Aid	Platform for upload, download and comment on scientific papers and articles from various topics and sources
		LinkedIn	Business and employment-focused social media and networking service

504

505 **7. Conclusion**

506 Understanding the modern context of science and the impact big for-profit publishers have in science should
507 make it clear that the importance we give to the impact-factor of journals are tied to arbitrary values of
508 "prestige". It shows its weight relies much more on a social construct than on tangible contributions. With
509 developments in technology, we now have the ability to make the ethos of free (or at least almost free)
510 sharing of knowledge as close to a reality as possible. We already see it happening through the efforts of
511 many individuals that still hold to this idea, through the creation of archives and free peer-reviewing
512 networks. This world is more possible than ever once we understand we can make the shift of priority from
513 "prestige" to open access of knowledge and ideas.

514 Mastroianni (2022) advocates for the idea of abolishing the system of peer review as we have it now, in this
515 formalized structure that often tends to work more as a gatekeeper than an actual evaluation system. If a true
516 open system is one accessible to all, all research should be available for scrutiny and feedback from the
517 community and hopefully beyond. Some archives already work as a forum for discussions on manuscripts
518 and most of the issues that arise with publications do not come from peer-review itself, but emerge from
519 systematic reviews and meta-research (van Noorden, 2023; Brainard, 2024). Most mainstream ideas get
520 established through years of dialogue and community discussion, and we miss out by gate-keeping and
521 selecting which ideas are accessible and widespread and which ones are not.

522 Of course, this does not mean that journals do not have a place in the future of publication, and there are
523 many services that journals could offer. In the context mentioned above, journals could help manage these
524 forums and discussion boards, rewarding contributors, potentially hiring data scientists for meta-research,
525 and helping highlight those studies that have been thoroughly investigated and tested out, in a "distribute
526 then print" fashion (Paasi, 2005). Another main service discussed here is translation. This would be a major
527 point of interest and investment with potential to grow, especially now with many technological
528 advancements in linguistic software available. This, in turn, would help reach a much larger audience for
529 publications.

530 The reality of open diamond access, where authors do not have to pay to publish or read is not that
531 uncommon in many places (Costa & Leite, 2016; Bosman et al., 2021). Authors should not have to make the
532 choice of either doing their research (which most of the time comes from public funds) or paying for-profit
533 publishers. There are also other strategies that include a decentralized, open access, and open peer review
534 model of publication, such as F1000 (<https://f1000research.com/about>), LifeCycle Journal
535 (<https://lifecyclejournal.org>), and Peer Community In (<https://peercommunityin.org/>). At a minimum,
536 authors have argued for "citation consciousness" (Paasi, 2005; Bol et al., 2023), a practice that should help
537 increase visibility of Global South journals. One way journals can aid in this process is by requiring and

534 referring authors to relevant publications outside of the Global North center, requiring a justification why
535 otherwise.

536 If it is hard to get rid of the “prestige” culture, then prestige should at least be tied to real concrete values of
537 transparency, inclusion, and diversity of ideas and experiences for the betterment of science and its
538 contribution to the world (Longino, 1995). Not due to the “mindless” inheritance of social capital. Working
539 on the re-evaluation of assessment metrics to be more aligned with Open Science best-practices will be key
540 to facilitating this change.

541

542 **CREDIT statement:**

543 CM: Conceptualization; Writing–Original Draft (Abstract, Context of Current Work, Context of Modern Science,
544 Funding barriers); Writing–Review & Editing; Supervision. RT: Conceptualization; Writing–Original Draft (Abstract,
545 Context of Current Work, Context of Modern Science, Recommendations and Suggestions); Writing–Review &
546 Editing; Supervision; Project Administration. ESJT: Writing - Original Draft (Funding Barriers; Recommendations
547 and Suggestions), Writing - Review & Editing. MG, MGB: Writing - Original Draft, Writing - Review & Editing. SSS:
548 Writing–Original Draft (Funding Barriers, Recommendations and Suggestions); Writing–Review & Editing. ET,
549 JCRO, JCS, ACSF: Writing - Review & Editing. HB: Writing–Original Draft (Language Barriers); Writing–Review &
550 Editing.

551 **Acknowledgments**

552 We would like to thank Luisa Diele-Viegas for first proposing the idea of a collection of writings to discuss the
553 challenges of doing research in the Global South, and gathering a great team of researchers for this effort. Without this
554 first seed, this project would have not happened. We are also thankful for the Society of Open, Reliable and
555 Transparent Ecology and Evolutionary Biology (SORTEE), for providing the space for a more enriched conversation
556 about this topic in an unconference session in the 2023 SORTEE Conference that resulted in more insights and
557 partnerships for this manuscript. CM thanks the ANID + Convocatoria Nacional Subvención a Instalación en la
558 Academia, Convocatoria Año 2021 + Folio No. SA77210019, and the Fondecyt Regular Project No. 1240186 (ANID,
559 Convocatoria 2024). RT would like to thank the Coordenação de Aperfeiçoamento de Pessoal de Nível Superior –
560 Brasil (CAPES), and Conselho Nacional de Desenvolvimento Científico e Tecnológico (CNPq) research agencies for
561 the funding of my post doctorate during which this manuscript was developed. MG thanks to the ANID Fondecyt
562 Regular Project No. 1240712.

563 **References**

- 564 Aagaard, K., Kladakis, A., & Nielsen, M. W. (2020). Concentration or dispersal of research funding?
 565 *Quantitative Science Studies*, 1(1), 117-149. https://doi.org/10.1162/qss_a_00002
- 566 Amano, T., Berdejo-Espinola, V., Akasaka, M., De Andrade Junior, M. A. U., Blaise, N., Checco, J.,
 567 Çilingir, F. G., Citegetse, G., Corella Tor, M., Drobniak, S. M., Giakoumi, S., Golivets, M., Ion,
 568 M. C., Jara-Díaz, J. P., Katayose, R., Lasmana, F. P. S., Lin, H.-Y., Lopez, E., Mikula, P., ...
 569 Zamora-Gutierrez, V. (2023). The role of non-English-language science in informing national
 570 biodiversity assessments. *Nature Sustainability*, 6(7), 845–854. [https://doi.org/10.1038/s41893-](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41893-023-01087-8)
 571 [023-01087-8](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41893-023-01087-8)
- 572 Amano, T., Ramírez-Castañeda, V., Berdejo-Espinola, V., Borokini, I., Chowdhury, S., Golivets, M.,
 573 González-Trujillo, J. D., Montaña-Centellas, F., Paudel, K., White, R. L., & Veríssimo, D.
 574 (2023). The manifold costs of being a non-native English speaker in science. *PLOS Biology*,
 575 *21*(7), e3002184. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pbio.3002184>
- 576 Astell, M., Hrynaskiewicz, I., Allin, K., Penny, D., Mithu Lucraft, Baynes, G., & Springer Nature
 577 Admin. (2018). *Practical challenges for researchers in data sharing* [Dataset].
 578 <https://doi.org/10.6084/M9.FIGSHARE.5971387>
- 579 Bahlai, C., Bartlett, L., Burgio, K., Fournier, A., Keiser, C., Poisot, T., & Whitney, K. (2019). Open
 580 Science Isn't Always Open to All Scientists. *American Scientist*, 107, 78.
 581 <https://doi.org/10.1511/2019.107.2.78>
- 582 Baldwin, M. (2020). Peer Review. *Encyclopedia of the History of Science*. [https://doi.org/10.34758/srde-](https://doi.org/10.34758/srde-jw27)
 583 [jw27](https://doi.org/10.34758/srde-jw27)
- 584 Beattie, A. (2023). *The 'Global South' is a pernicious term that needs to be retired*.
 585 <https://www.ft.com/content/7f2e0026-56be-4f3d-857c-2ae3a297daab> (Accessed on September
 586 14, 2023).
- 587 Bertram, M. G., Sundin, J., Roche, D. G., Sánchez-Tójar, A., Thoré, E. S. J., & Brodin, T. (2023). Open
 588 science. *Current Biology*, 33(15), R792–R797. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cub.2023.05.036>

- 589 Bol, J. A., Sheffel, A., Zia, N., & Meghani, A. (2023). How to address the geographical bias in academic
590 publishing. *BMJ Global Health*, 8(12), e013111. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjgh-2023-013111>
- 591 Bosman, J., Frantsvåg, J. E., Kramer, B., Langlais, P.-C., & Proudman, V. (2021). *OA Diamond Journals*
592 *Study. Part 1: Findings*. Zenodo. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.4558704>
- 593 Brainard, J. (2024). Retractions lag for wave of suspect papers. *Science* 383(6681): 356.
594 <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.ado2400>
- 595 Brandt, W. (1980). *North South: a programme for survival; report of the independent commission on*
596 *international development issues*. MIT, Cambridge, MA, US.
- 597 Brembs, B., Huneman, P., Schönbrodt, F., Nilsson, G., Susi, T., Siems, R., Perakakis, P., Trachana, V.,
598 Ma, L., & Rodriguez-Cuadrado, S. (2023). Replacing academic journals. *Royal Society Open*
599 *Science*, 10(7), 230206. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rsos.230206>
- 600 Choi, J. J., Gaskins, L. C., Morton, J. P., Bingham, J. A., Blawas, A. M., Hayes, C., Hoyt, C., Halpin, P.
601 N., & Silliman, B. (2024). Role of low-impact-factor journals in conservation implementation.
602 *Conservation Biology*, e14391. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cobi.14391>
- 603 Costa, M. P. D., & Leite, F. C. L. (2016). Open access in the world and Latin America: A review since
604 the Budapest Open Access Initiative. *Transinformação*, 28(1), 33–46.
605 <https://doi.org/10.1590/2318-08892016002800003>
- 606 Cunningham, A., & Williams, P. (1993). De-centring the ‘big picture’: The Origins of Modern Science
607 and the modern origins of science. *The British Journal for the History of Science*, 26(4), 407–432.
608 <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0007087400031447>
- 609 Curry, M. J., & Lillis, T. (2015). The Dominance of English in Global Scholarly Publishing.
610 *International Higher Education*, 46. <https://doi.org/10.6017/ihe.2007.46.7948>
- 611 De Vaan, M., Vedres, B., & Stark, D. (2015). Game Changer: The Topology of Creativity. *American*
612 *Journal of Sociology*, 120(4), 1144–1194. <https://doi.org/10.1086/681213>
- 613 Drubin, D. G., & Kellogg, D. R. (2012). English as the universal language of science: Opportunities and
614 challenges. *Molecular Biology of the Cell*, 23(8), 1399–1399. <https://doi.org/10.1091/mbc.e12->

615 02-0108

616 Dudley, R. G. (2021). The Changing Landscape of Open Access Publishing: Can Open Access Publishing

617 Make the Scholarly World More Equitable and Productive? *Journal of Librarianship and*

618 *Scholarly Communication*, 9(1). <https://doi.org/10.7710/2162-3309.2345>

619 Elnathan, R. (2021). English is the language of science—But precision is tough as a non-native speaker.

620 *Nature*. <https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-021-00899-y>

621 Fitzhugh, K. (2006). The abduction of phylogenetic hypotheses. *Zootaxa*, 1145(1), 1.

622 <https://doi.org/10.11646/zootaxa.1145.1.1>

623 Flowerdew, J. (2019). The linguistic disadvantage of scholars who write in English as an additional

624 language: Myth or reality. *Language Teaching*, 52(2), 249–260.

625 <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444819000041>

626 Fung, I. C. (2008). Open access for the non-English-speaking world: Overcoming the language barrier.

627 *Emerging Themes in Epidemiology*, 5(1), 1. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1742-7622-5-1>

628 Fyfe, A., Coate, K., Curry, S., Lawson, S., Moxham, N., & Røstvik, C. M. (2017). *Untangling Academic*

629 *Publishing*. University of St Andrews. <http://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.546100>

630 Fyfe, A., McDougall-Waters, J., & Moxham, N. (2015). 350 years of scientific periodicals. *Notes and*

631 *Records*, 69, 227–239. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rsnr.2015.0036>

632 Golan, R., Reddy, R., Muthigi, A., & Ramasamy, R. (2023). Artificial intelligence in academic writing: A

633 paradigm-shifting technological advance. *Nature Reviews Urology*, 20(6), 327–328.

634 <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41585-023-00746-x>

635 Gomes, D. G. E., Pottier, P., Crystal-Ornelas, R., Hudgins, E. J., Foroughirad, V., Sánchez-Reyes, L. L.,

636 Turba, R., Martinez, P. A., Moreau, D., Bertram, M. G., Smout, C. A., & Gaynor, K. M. (2022).

637 Why don't we share data and code? Perceived barriers and benefits to public archiving practices.

638 *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 289(1987), 20221113.

639 <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2022.1113>

640 Gownaris, N. J., Vermeir, K., Bittner, M.-I., Gunawardena, L., Kaur-Ghumaan, S., Lepenies, R.,

- 641 Ntsefong, G. N., & Zakari, I. S. (2022). Barriers to Full Participation in the Open Science Life
 642 Cycle among Early Career Researchers. *Data Science Journal*, 21, 2.
 643 <https://doi.org/10.5334/dsj-2022-002>
- 644 Graves, J. L., Kearney, M., Barabino, G., & Malcom, S. (2022). Inequality in science and the case for a
 645 new agenda. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 119(10), e2117831119.
 646 <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2117831119>
- 647 Haidt, J. (2012). *The righteous mind: Why good people are divided by politics and religion*. New York:
 648 Pantheon Books.
- 649 Hansson, S. O. (2006). Falsificationism Falsified. *Foundations of Science*, 11(3), 275–286.
 650 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10699-004-5922-1>
- 651 Hofstra, B., Kulkarni, V. V., Munoz-Najar Galvez, S., He, B., Jurafsky, D., & McFarland, D. A. (2020).
 652 The Diversity–Innovation Paradox in Science. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*,
 653 117(17), 9284–9291. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1915378117>
- 654 hooks, B. (1994). *Teaching to transgress: Education as the practice of freedom*. Routledge.
- 655 Kahan, D. M. (2012). Cultural Cognition as a Conception of the Cultural Theory of Risk. In: S. Roeser,
 656 R. Hillerbrand, P. Sandin, & M. Peterson (Eds.), *Handbook of Risk Theory* (pp. 725–759).
 657 Springer Netherlands. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-1433-5_28
- 658 Khelifa, R., Amano, T., & Nuñez, M. A. (2022). A solution for breaking the language barrier. *Trends in*
 659 *Ecology & Evolution*, 37(2), 109–112. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2021.11.003>
- 660 Kuhn, T. S. (1962). *The structure of scientific revolutions*. The University of Chicago Press.
- 661 Larivière, V., Haustein, S., & Mongeon, P. (2015). The Oligopoly of Academic Publishers in the Digital
 662 Era. *PLOS ONE*, 10(6), e0127502. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0127502>
- 663 Lawson, S. (2015). Fee Waivers for Open Access Journals. *Publications*, 3(3), 155–167.
 664 <https://doi.org/10.3390/publications3030155>
- 665 Lees, N. (2011). The dimensions of the divide: Theorising inequality and the Brandt line in international
 666 relations. In: Paper presented as part of the Panel ‘South-South Cooperation: History, Concepts,

- 667 Trends' at the IPSA-ECPR Joint Conference 'Whatever Happened to North-South?', São Paulo,
668 Brazil.
- 669 Liboiron, M. (2021). *Pollution is colonialism*. Duke University Press.
- 670 Longino, H. E. (1995). Gender, politics, and the theoretical virtues. *Synthese*, 104(3), 383–397.
671 <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01064506>
- 672 Lynch, A. J., Fernández-Llamazares, Á., Palomo, I., Jaureguiberry, P., Amano, T., Basher, Z., Lim, M.,
673 Mwampamba, T. H., Samakov, A., & Selomane, O. (2021). Culturally diverse expert teams have
674 yet to bring comprehensive linguistic diversity to intergovernmental ecosystem assessments. *One*
675 *Earth*, 4(2), 269–278. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.oneear.2021.01.002>
- 676 Marín, C. (2018). Delirios y estereotipos racionalistas en ciencia: Cómo combatirlos desde la consiliencia.
677 *Konvergencias, Filosofía Y Culturas En Diálogo*, 27, 59–75.
678 [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/327731822_Delirios_y_estereotipos_racionalistas_en_c](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/327731822_Delirios_y_estereotipos_racionalistas_en_ciencia_como_combatirlos_desde_la_consiliencia)
679 [iencia_como_combatirlos_desde_la_consiliencia](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/327731822_Delirios_y_estereotipos_racionalistas_en_ciencia_como_combatirlos_desde_la_consiliencia)
- 680 Márquez, M. C., & Porras, A. M. (2020). Science Communication in Multiple Languages Is Critical to Its
681 Effectiveness. *Frontiers in Communication*, 5, 31. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fcomm.2020.00031>
- 682 Mastroianni, A. (2022, February 23). *The rise and fall of peer review*. [https://www.experimental-](https://www.experimental-history.com/p/the-rise-and-fall-of-peer-review)
683 [history.com/p/the-rise-and-fall-of-peer-review](https://www.experimental-history.com/p/the-rise-and-fall-of-peer-review)
- 684 McFarlane, S., Cipolletti Perez, H., & Weissglass, C. (2020). Thinking in a Non-native Language: A New
685 Nudge? *Frontiers in Psychology*, 11, 549083. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.549083>
- 686 Meneghini, R., & Packer, A. L. (2007). Is there science beyond English? Initiatives to increase the quality
687 and visibility of non-English publications might help to break down language barriers in scientific
688 communication. *EMBO Reports*, 8(2), 112–116. <https://doi.org/10.1038/sj.embor.7400906>
- 689 Merton, R. K. (1938). Science, Technology and Society in Seventeenth Century England. *Osiris*, 4, 360–
690 632. <https://doi.org/10.1086/368484>
- 691 Moreira de Oliveira, T., & Bomfim, M. V. de J. (2023). Funding of research agendas about the global
692 south in Latin America and the Caribbean: lexicometric and content analysis in Latin American

- scientific production. *Tapuya: Latin American Science, Technology and Society*, 6(1).
<https://doi.org/10.1080/25729861.2023.2218260>
- Nabyonga-Orem, J., Asamani, J. A., Nyirenda, T., & Abimbola, S. (2020). Article processing charges are stalling the progress of African researchers: A call for urgent reforms. *BMJ Global Health*, 5(9), e003650. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjgh-2020-003650>
- Okasha, S. (2016). *Philosophy of Science: A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford University Press.
- Paasi, A. (2005). Globalisation, Academic Capitalism, and the Uneven Geographies of International Journal Publishing Spaces. *Environment and Planning A: Economy and Space*, 37(5), 769–789.
<https://doi.org/10.1068/a3769>
- Petersen, O. H. (2021). Inequality of Research Funding between Different Countries and Regions is a Serious Problem for Global Science. *Function*, 2(6), zqab060.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/function/zqab060>
- Pulverer, B. (2018). Open Access—Or Open Science? *The EMBO Journal*, 37(24), e101215.
<https://doi.org/10.15252/emboj.2018101215>
- Rasekoala, E. (Ed.). (2023). *Race and Sociocultural Inclusion in Science Communication: Innovation, Decolonisation, and Transformation* (1st ed.). Bristol University Press.
<https://doi.org/10.2307/jj.5274089>
- Rivera-Trigueros, I. (2022). Machine translation systems and quality assessment: A systematic review. *Language Resources and Evaluation*, 56(2), 593–619. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10579-021-09537-5>
- Ro, C. (2020). How researchers overturned US sanctions on a virtual summer school. *Nature*.
<https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-020-02347-9>
- Salager-Meyer, F. (2008). Scientific publishing in developing countries: Challenges for the future. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 7(2), 121–132.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2008.03.009>
- Santaella Braga, L. (2019). C. S. Peirce’s Abduction, Induction, and Deduction. In: M. A. Peters (Ed.),

- 719 *Encyclopedia of Educational Philosophy and Theory* (pp. 1–6). Springer.
 720 https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-287-532-7_575-1
- 721 Skupien, S., & Rüffin, N. (2020). The Geography of Research Funding: Semantics and Beyond. *Journal*
 722 *of Studies in International Education*, 24(1), 24–38. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1028315319889896>
- 723 Snyder, H. (2019). Literature review as a research methodology: An overview and guidelines. *Journal of*
 724 *Business Research*, 104, 333–339. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2019.07.039>
- 725 Soares, B. E., Franco, A. C. S., Leal, J. S., Lima, R. G. de S. F., Baker, K., & Griffiths, M. (2023).
 726 Decolonising ecological research: A generative discussion between Global North geographers
 727 and Global South field ecologists. *Area*, 55(4), 550–557. <https://doi.org/10.1111/area.12901>
- 728 Sokal, A., & Bricmont, J. (1999). *Imposturas intelectuales*. Paidós.
- 729 Souza, M. T. D., Silva, M. D. D., & Carvalho, R. D. (2010). Integrative review: What is it? How to do it?
 730 *Einstein (São Paulo)*, 8(1), 102–106. <https://doi.org/10.1590/s1679-45082010rw1134>
- 731 Stamos, D. N. (1996). Popper, falsifiability, and evolutionary biology. *Biology & Philosophy*, 11(2), 161–
 732 191. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00128918>
- 733 Steigerwald, E., Ramírez-Castañeda, V., Brandt, D. Y. C., Báldi, A., Shapiro, J. T., Bowker, L., & Tarvin,
 734 R. D. (2022). Overcoming Language Barriers in Academia: Machine Translation Tools and a
 735 Vision for a Multilingual Future. *BioScience*, 72(10), 988–998.
 736 <https://doi.org/10.1093/biosci/biac062>
- 737 Stockemer, D., & Wigginton, M. J. (2019). Publishing in English or another language: An inclusive study
 738 of scholar’s language publication preferences in the natural, social and interdisciplinary sciences.
 739 *Scientometrics*, 118(2), 645–652. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-018-2987-0>
- 740 Suzina, A. C. (2021). English as lingua franca. Or the sterilisation of scientific work. *Media, Culture &*
 741 *Society*, 43(1), 171–179. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0163443720957906>
- 742 Teubner, T., Flath, C. M., Weinhardt, C., Van Der Aalst, W., & Hinz, O. (2023). Welcome to the Era of
 743 ChatGPT et al.: The Prospects of Large Language Models. *Business & Information Systems*
 744 *Engineering*, 65(2), 95–101. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12599-023-00795-x>

- 745 Torraco, R. J. (2005). Writing Integrative Literature Reviews: Guidelines and Examples. *Human*
 746 *Resource Development Review*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1534484305278283>
- 747 Toshkov, D. (2018). The ‘Global South’ is a terrible term. Don’t use it! *RE-DESIGN*. [http://re-](http://re-design.dimiter.eu/?p=969)
 748 [design.dimiter.eu/?p=969](http://re-design.dimiter.eu/?p=969) (Accessed on November 8, 2018)
- 749 UNESCO. (2021). *Recommendation on Open Science*.
 750 <https://www.unesco.org/en/legal-affairs/recommendation-open-science>
- 751 Van Noorden, R. (2023). More than 10,000 research papers were retracted in 2023—A new record.
 752 *Nature*, 624(7992), 479–481. <https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-023-03974-8>
- 753 Wild, S. (2021). African languages to get more bespoke scientific terms. *Nature*, 596(7873), 469–470.
 754 <https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-021-02218-x>
- 755 Woolston, C., & Osório, J. (2019). When English is not your mother tongue. *Nature*, 570(7760), 265–
 756 267. <https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-019-01797-0>
- 757 Xie, Y. (2016). Understanding inequality in China. *Chinese Journal of Sociology*, 2(3), 327–347.
 758 <https://doi.org/10.1177/2057150X16654059>
- 759 Zuckerman, H., & Merton, R. K. (1971). Patterns of Evaluation in Science: Institutionalisation, Structure
 760 and Functions of the Referee System. *Minerva*, 9(1), 66–100.
 761 <https://www.jstor.org/stable/41827004>

Appendix

Table A1. Personal testimonies that show how the experiences of the authors have shaped this work.

Author	Country	Experience with funding and/or language barriers
RT	Brazil	As an ESL (English as second language) early career researcher, I have been trained to seek high impact journals for publication, since the Impact Factor has a significant weight in competition for public funding and positions in Brazil. This meant submitting manuscripts to international journals in English, even when research was done in Brazil with Brazilian samples, or when stakeholders most interested in my research could not easily access my publication due to paywalls.
ESJT	Belgium	Drawing from my own experience as a first-generation academic and having experienced the challenges of growing up in an economically disadvantaged background, I have come to intimately understand the obstacles many people face in academia. I have experienced firsthand how insufficient proficiency in English and limited experience in academic speech can significantly hinder the full engagement and success of talented researchers. Additionally, having worked and collaborated across national borders, institutes, and sectors, I have witnessed how limited funding opportunities disproportionately affect promising researchers in areas with limited financial support.
HB	Colombia / Germany	Throughout my international career, I have noticed a troubling tendency to equate foreign language proficiency with professional competence. This misconception often distorts the evaluation of an individual's abilities and, in many cases, overlooks the valuable scientific contributions that non-native speakers bring to the field. I believe this highlights the urgent need for greater inclusion and equity within the scientific community, recognizing that non-native speakers navigate significant language barriers every day. Pronunciation and native intonation, in particular, are difficult to master in a short time, and I find it essential to emphasize that communication challenges do not reflect intellectual capacity. These difficulties should never diminish the impact or recognition of one's scientific work.
CM, MG	Chile	I have had several national level projects, but I do not have the budget to pay APCs for Open Access articles. This hinders both the impact and reach of my publications but also getting more funding. Early career scientists face significant challenges due to the lack of funding for open science initiatives, hindering their ability to conduct transparent and collaborative research.
MGB	Australia / Sweden	I am passionate about Open Science because I believe in making scientific knowledge accessible to all. I see it as a way to democratise research, foster collaboration, and accelerate innovation. My enthusiasm for Open Science also stems from the belief that science should be accessible to everyone, transcending barriers of geography, wealth, and privilege. However, Open Science also has major issues, such as the ongoing shift towards high APCs in many journals. This creates a barrier to entry for some researchers and exacerbates inequalities in accessing scientific knowledge.
SSS	Iran	I received my PhD in the Netherlands and currently do research in Iran; so have experience doing research in two different continents. As an independent researcher, I think providing financial applications/facilities for early career researchers based in developing countries can help to develop science and share thoughts more internationally. And I do not have the financial support/funding/budget to pay APCs for Open Access articles therefore I am passionate about Open Science.
ACSF	Brazil/ Spain	My personal experience as a scientist from a Global South country involves dealing with the language barrier starting in my undergraduate years, where texts were in English. Coming from a poor family, I had to learn the language later in life. During my career, I had the opportunity to come to Spain as a PhD and postdoc. English helped, but in everyday life and in integrating with colleagues, speaking the local language became essential. Language thus remains a constant barrier, extending beyond English. Moreover, funding opportunities are very limited for early-career scientists in non-permanent positions, especially in Global South countries. To this day, the grants I have received have been in the name of PIs, even though I have been the main person responsible for the projects. This limits the consolidation of my profile and my competitiveness for certain positions, compared to a scientist who has spent their career in Global North countries.

Multilingual translations of the Abstract

Spanish translation of the Abstract

Profundizando en los impactos persistentes del colonialismo en el ámbito de la ciencia moderna, aquí exploramos algunas de las desigualdades profundamente arraigadas entre el Norte y el Sur Global con respecto a la empresa científica. Un aspecto central en esta desigualdad son los obstáculos del idioma y el apoyo financiero. Así, este trabajo discute los desafíos frecuentemente ignorados que enfrentan los científicos del Sur Global, incluyendo los esfuerzos adicionales que los hablantes no nativos de inglés deben invertir para leer y publicar, sus mayores tasas de rechazo, y el abandono generalizado de publicaciones en idiomas distintos al inglés. Estos desafíos no solo obstaculizan el avance científico, sino que también profundizan las divisiones existentes. Además, examinamos la espada de doble filo de los requisitos de acceso abierto. Si bien estas políticas democratizan el acceso al conocimiento científico, pueden inadvertidamente exacerbar las desigualdades Norte-Sur debido a, por ejemplo, los costos prohibitivos asociados con la publicación de acceso abierto, una carga financiera que suele ser inmanejable para investigadores con fondos limitados. Esta brecha de financiación restringe severamente las capacidades e impacto científicos del Sur Global, afectando todo desde la realización de investigaciones de largo alcance hasta la posibilidad de asistir a reuniones científicas. El conjunto de estas disparidades no sólo reduce el impacto de los investigadores del Sur Global en sus campos de estudio, sino que los atrapa en un ciclo de financiación reducida y oportunidades limitadas de conexión global. Al abordar estos complejos problemas, los aportes en este trabajo destacan algunos de los problemas más comunes y pronunciados relacionados con las desigualdades científicas, además de sugerir posibles formas de cerrar esta brecha para alcanzar una distribución más equitativa de recursos y reconocimiento en la comunidad científica global.

Portuguese translation of the abstract

Aprofundando-se nos impactos persistentes do colonialismo na ciência moderna, nosso trabalho explora algumas das profundas disparidades entre o Norte e o Sul Global em relação à atividade científica. No centro dessa desigualdade estão os desafios relacionados à língua e ao financiamento. Assim, este estudo discute os obstáculos frequentemente ignorados que os cientistas do Sul Global enfrentam, incluindo o esforço adicional que falantes não nativos de inglês devem investir na leitura e publicação de artigos, suas taxas de rejeição mais altas e o amplo descaso com publicações em idiomas diferentes do inglês. Esses desafios não apenas dificultam o avanço da ciência, mas também aprofundam as divisões existentes. Além disso, examinamos a dualidade dos requisitos de acesso aberto. Embora essas políticas democratizem o acesso ao conhecimento científico, elas podem, inadvertidamente, agravar as desigualdades entre o Norte e o Sul, devido, por exemplo, aos altos custos associados à publicação em acesso aberto — um fardo financeiro frequentemente insustentável para pesquisadores com financiamento limitado. Essa lacuna orçamentária restringe severamente as capacidades científicas do Sul Global, afetando desde a realização de pesquisas abrangentes até as possibilidades de participação em conferências científicas. A consequência dessas disparidades não apenas reduz o impacto dos pesquisadores do Sul Global em suas áreas de estudo, mas também os prende em um ciclo de financiamento insuficiente e oportunidades limitadas de networking global. Ao abordar essas questões complexas, este estudo destaca alguns dos problemas mais comuns e marcantes relacionados às desigualdades científicas, além de sugerir possíveis caminhos para reduzir essa lacuna, a fim de alcançar uma distribuição mais equitativa de recursos e reconhecimento na comunidade científica global.

812 Greek translation of the abstract

813 Εξετάζοντας τις διαχρονικές επιπτώσεις της αποικιοκρατίας στη σύγχρονη επιστήμη, διερευνούμε εδώ
 814 ορισμένες από τις βαθιά ριζωμένες ανισότητες μεταξύ του Παγκόσμιου Βορρά και του Παγκόσμιου Νότου
 815 όσον αφορά την επιστημονική δραστηριότητα. Κεντρικά σε αυτή τη σχέση είναι τα ζητήματα της γλώσσας
 816 και της οικονομικής στήριξης. Ως εκ τούτου, η παρούσα μελέτη διερευνά τα συχνά παραβλεπόμενα
 817 εμπόδια που αντιμετωπίζουν οι επιστήμονες του Παγκόσμιου Νότου, συμπεριλαμβανομένων των
 818 πρόσθετων προσπαθειών που πρέπει να καταβάλλουν οι μη φυσικοί ομιλητές Αγγλικών για την ανάγνωση
 819 και τη δημοσίευση μελετών στα Αγγλικά, των υψηλότερων ποσοστών απόρριψης και της ευρείας
 820 παραμέλησης των δημοσιεύσεων σε γλώσσες άλλες από την αγγλική. Αυτές οι συνθήκες όχι μόνο
 821 εμποδίζουν την πρόοδο της επιστήμης αλλά και εντείνουν τις υπάρχουσες ανισότητες. Επιπλέον,
 822 εξετάζουμε το δίκοπο μαχαίρι των απαιτήσεων για ελεύθερη πρόσβαση. Ενώ αυτές οι πολιτικές
 823 δημοκρατικοποιούν την πρόσβαση στη γνώση, μπορούν ακούσια να επιδεινώσουν την άιση σχέση Βορρά-
 824 Νότου. Ενδεικτικά, αναφέρουμε το απαγορευτικό κόστος που συνδέεται με τη δημοσίευση μελετών με
 825 ανοικτή πρόσβαση —ένα οικονομικό βάρος που συχνά είναι αδύνατο να διαχειριστούν ερευνητές με
 826 περιορισμένη χρηματοδότηση. Αυτό το χρηματοδοτικό χάσμα περιορίζει σοβαρά τις επιστημονικές
 827 δυνατότητες και την επιρροή του Παγκόσμιου Νότου, επηρεάζοντας τα πάντα, από τη διεξαγωγή μιας
 828 ολοκληρωμένης έρευνας μέχρι τη συμμετοχή σε επιστημονικά συνέδρια. Η συσσώρευση αυτών των
 829 ανισοτήτων όχι μόνο μειώνει την επίδραση των ερευνητών του Παγκόσμιου Νότου στους τομείς τους αλλά
 830 συνάμα τους παγιδεύει σε έναν κύκλο μειωμένης χρηματοδότησης και περιορισμένων ευκαιριών
 831 παγκόσμιας δικτύωσης. Αντιμετωπίζοντας αυτά τα σύνθετα ζητήματα, το παρόν έργο αναδεικνύει
 832 ορισμένα από τα πιο κοινά και έντονα προβλήματα που σχετίζονται με τις επιστημονικές ανισότητες, και
 833 παραθέτει πιθανούς τρόπους γεφύρωσης αυτού του χάσματος για την επίτευξη μιας πιο δίκαιης κατανομής
 834 πόρων και αναγνώρισης στην παγκόσμια επιστημονική κοινότητα.

835

836 German translation of the abstract

837 Indem wir die anhaltenden Auswirkungen des Kolonialismus im Bereich der modernen Wissenschaft
 838 untersuchen, beleuchten wir einige der tief verwurzelten Ungleichheiten zwischen dem Globalen Norden
 839 und dem Globalen Süden im wissenschaftlichen Betrieb. Im Zentrum dieser Ungleichheiten stehen
 840 Sprachbarrieren und finanzielle Hürden. Diese Arbeit erörtert die oft übersehenen Herausforderungen, mit
 841 denen Wissenschaftlerinnen und Wissenschaftler aus dem Globalen Süden konfrontiert sind – darunter die
 842 zusätzlichen Anstrengungen, die nicht-englische Muttersprachler beim Lesen und Veröffentlichen
 843 aufbringen müssen, ihre höheren Ablehnungsquoten sowie die weit verbreitete Vernachlässigung von
 844 Veröffentlichungen in anderen Sprachen als Englisch. Diese Herausforderungen behindern nicht nur den
 845 wissenschaftlichen Fortschritt, sondern vertiefen auch bestehende Ungleichheiten. Darüber hinaus
 846 untersuchen wir das zweischneidige Schwert der Open-Access-Anforderungen. Während diese
 847 Maßnahmen den Zugang zu wissenschaftlichem Wissen demokratisieren, können sie unbeabsichtigt die
 848 Nord-Süd-Ungleichheiten verstärken – etwa durch die hohen Kosten, die mit Open-Access-Publikationen
 849 verbunden sind. Diese finanzielle Belastung ist für Forschende mit begrenzten Mitteln oft nicht tragbar. Die
 850 daraus resultierende Finanzierungslücke schränkt die wissenschaftlichen Kapazitäten und die Wirkung des
 851 Globalen Südens erheblich ein – von der Durchführung umfassender Forschung bis hin zur Teilnahme an
 852 wissenschaftlichen Konferenzen. Die Summe dieser Ungleichheiten verringert nicht nur die Sichtbarkeit
 853 von Forschenden aus dem Globalen Süden in ihren jeweiligen Fachgebieten, sondern hält sie auch in einem
 854 Kreislauf aus begrenzter Finanzierung und eingeschränkten internationalen Vernetzungsmöglichkeiten
 855 gefangen. Die Beiträge in dieser Arbeit thematisieren einige der häufigsten und ausgeprägtesten Formen
 856 wissenschaftlicher Ungleichheit und schlagen zugleich mögliche Wege zur Überwindung dieser Kluft vor,

um eine gerechtere Verteilung von Ressourcen und Anerkennung in der globalen wissenschaftlichen Gemeinschaft zu erreichen.

Übersetzung aus dem Englischen ins Deutsche angefertigt von Hannia Bridg, Berlin 09.02.2025.

860

Persian/farsi translation of the abstract

سعید شفیعی ثابت*

عضو هیئت علمی گروه شیلات، دانشکده منابع طبیعی، دانشگاه گیلان، صومعه سرا، ایران

آدرسی ایمیل نویسنده مسئول: s.shafiei.sabet@guilan.ac.ir

چکیده

در این مقاله، به تأثیرات پایدار استعمار در حوزه علم مدرن می‌پردازیم و برخی از نابرابری‌های عمیق بین کشورهای مناطق توسعه‌یافته ثروتمند و توسعه‌نیافته فقیر را در زمینه فعالیت علمی بررسی می‌کنیم که در این مقاله به عنوان کشورهای مناطق شمال و جنوب جهانی تعریف می‌کنیم. موانع زبان و حمایت مالی نقش مهمی در این نابرابری قرار دارند. بنابراین، این پژوهش به موانع اغلب نادیده گرفته شده‌ای که محققان در کشورهای مناطق جنوب جهانی با آن روبرو هستند اشاره دارد، از جمله می‌توان تلاش‌های بیشتری که این محققین غیربومی انگلیسی باید برای خواندن و انتشار مقالات خود انجام دهند، نرخ رد شدن بالاتر مقالات آن‌ها، و غفلت گسترده از انتشارات علمی آن‌ها به زبان‌هایی غیر از انگلیسی را ذکر نمود. این چالش‌ها نه تنها پیشرفت علم را محدود می‌کند بلکه شکاف‌های موجود در بین کشورهای مناطق شمال و جنوب جهانی را نیز عمیق‌تر می‌کند. علاوه بر این، ما به سیاست‌های دسترسی باز منابع و انتشارات علمی به عنوان شمشیر دو لبه نگاه می‌کنیم. اگرچه این سیاست‌ها دسترسی به دانش علمی را به نظر گسترده‌تر و عمومی‌تر می‌کنند اما ممکن است به طور غیرعمدی و غیرمستقیم باعث تشدید نابرابری بین محققین کشورهای مناطق شمال و جنوب شوند؛ مثلاً هزینه‌های تحمیلی مرتبط با نشر دسترسی باز - بار مالی که اغلب برای محققانی با بودجه محدود قابل مدیریت نیست را می‌توان نام برد. به طور یقین شکاف بودجه‌ای شدید توانمندی علمی محققین کشورهای منطقه جنوب جهانی را محدود کرده و بر همه چیز از انجام تحقیقات جامع تا شرکت در اجلاس‌های علمی تأثیر می‌گذارد. نتیجه و جمع‌بندی این اختلالات و نابرابری‌ها نه تنها تأثیر محققان جنوب جهانی در رشته خود را کاهش می‌دهد بلکه آن‌ها را در چرخه‌ای از کمبود بودجه و فرصت‌های شبکه‌سازی علمی محدود قرار می‌دهد. در بررسی و حل این مسائل پیچیده، مشارکت‌های این پژوهش برخی از رایج‌ترین و برجسته‌ترین مسائل مربوط به نابرابری‌های علمی را روشن می‌کند و راه‌های ممکن برای پر کردن این خلأ ارتباطی را پیشنهاد می‌دهد تا توزیع منصفانه‌تری از منابع و شناخت در بین جامعه علمی جهان حاصل شود.

کلمات کلیدی: دسترسی باز؛ علم غیر انگلیسی؛ استعمارزدایی؛ نابرابری مالی؛ زبان دوم