



EDITORIAL

Niche Journals as Pivotal Incubators of Maverick Ideas



James Houran

Journal of Scientific Exploration
editor@scientificexploration.org
orcid.org/0000-0003-1725-582X



Darby Orcutt

Open Knowledge Center, Libraries,
North Carolina State University, USA
dcorcutt@ncsu.edu
orcid.org/0000-0002-4202-6431

<https://doi.org/10.31275/20264047>

GOLD OPEN ACCESS



Creative Commons License 4.0.
CC-BY-NC. Attribution required.
No commercial use.

Economic analyses, historical studies, and sociological reviews paint on a consistent picture: the recent surge in academic journals is propelled by the rapid expansion of international scientific players—most notably China—alongside increasing disciplinary specialization, commercial incentives such as open-access models, and the low barriers to launching new titles (Goel & Faria, 2007; Jacobs, 2014; National Science Board, National Science Foundation, 2024). That expansion has widened outlets for interdisciplinary and niche work but has also fragmented literatures, increased the effort required to locate relevant research, strained peer-review capacity, and intensified incentives—such as “publish or perish” pressures—that can individually or collectively erode editorial standards and research quality (see e.g., Goel & Faria, 2007; Hanson et al., 2024; Horton, 2015; Ioannidis, 2005; Jacobs, 2014; Smith, 2003). Meta-analytic surveys of scientific misconduct and questionable research practices further show how perverse incentives can distort the integrity of scholarly outputs (Fanelli, 2009).

In the face of these challenges, the entire academic publishing landscape is and will undergo massive change. For example, even the centuries-old Cambridge University Press, one of the larger publishers of peer-reviewed scientific and scholarly articles, recently proposed an agenda for “radical change,” endorsing the reformation of academic incentives, the reduction of pre-publication peer review, and the prioritization of quality over quantity in publication (i.e., fewer articles and journals). The growing adoption of artificial intelligence (AI) agents in scientific research will reduce the direct human readership of peer-reviewed articles, further reducing the need for the genre of “research article” to persist at current levels. Already, AI-generated submissions are straining peer-review systems (Kusumegi et al., 2025), and the recent publication in *Nature* of the first fully AI-generated paper to pass rigorous human peer review marks a concrete inflection point in this transformation (Lu et al., 2026).

Within this reconfigured ecosystem, niche journals devoted to frontier science—work that extends beyond established knowledge into uncertain, exploratory, or not yet well-validated terrain—such as the *Journal of Scientific Exploration (JSE)*, *Explore*, *Medical Hypotheses*, *Limina: Journal of UAP Studies*, *Mind and Matter*, *World Futures*, and *Journal of Anomalistics* play a vital yet often underrecognized role. In particular, they serve as irreplaceable incubators where high-risk, high-reward ideas can be proposed, critiqued, and iteratively improved before they face the stringent demands of mainstream, high-impact venues. Niche journals are not sidelines; they arguably are the experimental engine room that primes bold ideas for broader dissemination, where validation in cross-disciplinary, preeminent journals can catalyze the paradigm shifts in method or theory that reshape whole fields.



History testifies that major scientific advancements have often originated from ideas initially dismissed by the mainstream: familiar examples include Galileo's heliocentric theory, Semmelweis's handwashing hypothesis, and Wegener's continental drift theory Kuhn (1962). These precedents underscore the need for intellectual space where nascent ideas can mature without premature dismissal. Simonton (2004) likewise noted that breakthrough discoveries frequently arise at the intersection of risk-taking and intellectual freedom, and niche journals function as the modern institutional equivalent—akin to Bell Labs or Alphabet's X—where disruptive concepts receive early critique and iterative refinement (Gertner, 2012). These historical and industrial analogies illustrate why a deliberate, staged incubator pathway is necessary to move promising maverick ideas from initial insight to mainstream validation. Such maverick journals also help to counter a major consequence of the scientific literature's meteoric expansion. As Chu and Evans (2021, p.1) observed, "canons crystallize as fields grow large," leaving mainstream science increasingly resistant to novel ideas. Quantitative evidence reinforces this point. Analyzing 45 million papers and 3.9 million patents across six decades, Park et al. (2023) found that scientific and technological work has become progressively less likely to push fields in new directions—a pattern that holds across disciplines.

AN INCUBATOR MODEL: FIVE STAGES TO GUIDE MAVERICK IDEAS TO MAINSTREAM VALIDATION

Discovery often begins with a contrarian observation or a theoretical fracture in accepted assumptions; an individual or small team suggests an unconventional hypothesis or a novel measurement approach intended to reveal phenomena that standard methods might miss (Kuhn, 1962). These early proposals are frequently speculative and modest in evidence, but they are important for expanding the conceptual search space and articulating new research questions.

Before formal submission, scholars can refine nascent proposals through what might be called the "underground"—a loose array of platforms and settings outside the peer-reviewed literature where ideas are informally shared, tested, and debated. Social scientists might characterize such spaces as a form of "third place:" casual environments distinct from home ("first place") and work ("second place") where individuals gather to socialize and cultivate a sense of belonging (Oldenburg, 1989). This notion resonates with the older concept of the "invisible

college"—the informal networks of scholars who, long before the age of journals, exchanged letters, circulated manuscripts, and met in coffeehouses to argue ideas across disciplinary boundaries (Crane, 1972; Price, 1963). Thornton (1995) observed that when a culture lacks public recognition and is embraced only by a small circle, it tends to coalesce into a relatively closed community—an underground culture. Most researchers have inhabited one of these underground places—conference corridors, moderated online groups, workshops, private correspondence, or campus cafés where interdisciplinary dialogue naturally unfolds.

In these third places, the invisible college does its quiet work: rapid feedback, pointed counterarguments, and early iteration transform raw intuition or preliminary findings into a defensible proof of concept, a pilot design, or an early-stage manuscript ready for peer review. Scholarly networking platforms such as ResearchGate and Academia.edu extend this function into the digital realm, offering normalization, moral support, intellectual stimulation, and a sympathetic arena for airing new, speculative, or controversial ideas. Together, these environments help scholars to identify methodological pitfalls, locate relevant literatures, and discover potential collaborators. Yet promising ideas cannot remain buried in the underground indefinitely. The invisible college, for all its generative power, is not an end in itself. Ideas must eventually ascend from informal circulation to transparent, peer-reviewed forums—where iterative critique and structured refinement can prepare them for the scrutiny, and ultimately the validation, of the wider scholarly community.

Mainstream journals typically prioritize rigor, replication, and adherence to established paradigms, which, while critical for maintaining scientific standards, can inadvertently discourage the publication of ideas that challenge orthodoxy. Niche journals, on the other hand, are designed to accommodate unconventional research that may lack immediate empirical support but is grounded in logical reasoning and theoretical plausibility. For instance, *Medical Hypotheses* explicitly invites speculative articles, recognizing that breakthroughs in medicine often begin as untested ideas (Hughes, 2021). Similarly, all niche journals can be repositories for early-stage thinking and research, reducing the risk of intellectual stagnation. This parallels technology firms that have "peripheral zones" for experimenting with unconventional ideas (Chesbrough, 2006) or "blue-sky" projects to foster disruptive thinking without immediate concern for profitability (Chesbrough, 2003). Indeed, Ioannidis (2005) showed how dominant



paradigms in mainstream science can create a file-drawer effect, where novel or controversial ideas struggle to find publication outlets. In contrast, empirical studies show that lower-prestige, niche, and maverick journals publish a higher proportion of null or non-confirmatory results than mainstream venues (Fanelli, 2012; Franco et al., 2014; van Assen et al., 2015).

Authors are strongly encouraged therefore to submit preliminary data, theoretical essays, or methodological notes, and null results to specialized outlets that champion exploratory lines of work. Niche journals provide three vital resources in this context: first, they offer a receptive readership that understands the domain's conceptual stakes, second, their peer reviewers have both domain-appropriate expertise and sympathetic minds, and lastly, they provide a public record that establishes intellectual priority and invites broader scrutiny. By offering early peer scrutiny and intellectual credit, these journals enable ideas to evolve responsibly. In particular, constructive peer critique in the niche venue should prioritize sharpening conceptual claims and rendering methods increasingly testable. Reviewers and editors should push authors to specify boundary conditions, state uncertainty clearly, and propose concrete follow-up studies. Recommended actions often include pilot replications, standardizing measures, or developing cross-laboratory protocols so that exploratory findings can advance toward confirmatory phases.

When methods or hypotheses have been refined in this way, the most promising research lines should naturally progress to confirmatory pipelines—that is, preregistration, adequately powered replication studies, multi-site collaborations, or cross-disciplinary syntheses that allow mainstream journals with broader audiences to evaluate and as warranted, disseminate validated results. Preregistration and open data are central to these confirmatory pipelines, improving transparency and reproducibility (Nosek et al., 2015). The Registered Reports format operationalizes this most fully: by subjecting methods and analysis plans to peer review *before* data collection, it eliminates selective reporting and publication bias while still permitting exploratory analyses to be reported transparently alongside confirmatory findings (Chambers, 2013). Moreover, large-scale replication initiatives document why multi-site confirmation is necessary to separate robust effects from various artifacts (Open Science Collaboration, 2015). Mainstream, high-impact journals are the ideal venues for such work because, when supported by rigorous confirmation, their broad readership and disciplinary reach are where paradigm-shifting ideas gain the critical

scrutiny, integration, and visibility necessary to transform established frameworks (Kuhn, 1962).

Readers should make no mistake, many influential journals have published papers on a wide range of frontier science topics (Houran & Bauer, 2022)—including Scott and Rines' (1975) famous feature article in *Nature* advocating for the existence of the Loch Ness Monster (though not peer-reviewed), Bem and Honorton's (1994) meta-analysis suggestive of putative psi phenomena that appeared in *Psychological Bulletin*, Sykes et al.'s (2014) genetic study of hair samples attributed to unidentified primates like the sasquatch or yeti—published in the prestigious *Proceedings of the Royal Society B*—which found that all samples matched known species, and Szydagis et al.'s (2025) study in *Progress in Aerospace Sciences* detailing the deployment of camera and radiation sensor arrays to investigate unidentified aerial phenomena (UAPs) during a field expedition off Catalina Island.

This proposed five-stage pathway outlines a strategic progression for advancing frontier research from initial spark to mainstream validation: (1) *Formulate and articulate a maverick idea* (cf. Wardle & Rossi, 2016, p. 8)—develop an unconventional hypothesis or innovative method that challenges prevailing assumptions and opens new conceptual terrain; (2) *Circulate the idea for early critique and calibration* (cf. Martin-Gomez & Muñoz de Luna, 2024)—test its resonance in your third places and within the hallways of the invisible college, from workshop conversations to trusted professional networks, to refine the core argument and gather preliminary evidence; (3) *Publish in a niche journal* (cf. Flier, 2019)—submit a preliminary study, methodological note, or conceptual paper to attract domain-specific critique and establish intellectual priority; (4) *Engage in peer critique and iterative refinement* (cf. Alberts et al., 2008)—leverage structured reviews to sharpen claims, clarify boundary conditions, and design concrete follow-up or replication strategies; and (5) *Transition to mainstream confirmation* (cf. van Dalen & Henkens, 2005)—advance the most promising lines of inquiry into preregistered, adequately powered, multi-site or cross-disciplinary studies suitable for high-impact journals. This final stage preserves early creativity while ensuring that claims intended for policy, clinical practice, or public uptake meet rigorous evidentiary standards (Ioannidis, 2005).

BALANCING RISK AND RIGOR

Niche journals wrestle with the key challenge of maintaining a careful equilibrium between openness to



unconventional ideas and adherence to scientific rigor. Frontier scientists routinely advance bold, speculative hypotheses on sparse empirical grounds, and the credibility such claims acquire depends heavily on disciplinary cultures and gatekeepers; peer review therefore functions not only as a methodological filter but as cultural boundary work that helps to decide what counts as legitimate knowledge (Gieryn, 1998; Ioannidis, 2005). Both failure modes are well documented: overly restrictive gatekeeping can dismiss sound but unconventional work as pseudoscience—Wegener’s continental drift being the paradigm case—while overly permissive gatekeeping can delay legitimate consensus by keeping unwarranted alternatives in circulation (Hauswald, 2026). Without rigorous editorial standards, niche outlets risk lapsing into repositories for allegedly unsound or even potentially harmful claims, as the *Medical Hypotheses* controversy demonstrated in the early 2010s, prompting corrective editorial reform (Enserink, 2010). That episode underscores the necessity of peer review that is both exacting and fair, so that published ideas remain speculative yet plausibly grounded. Long-standing critiques of peer review highlight structural flaws that make deliberate editorial redesigns both necessary and practicable (Smith, 2006).

These cultural and structural pressures are amplified by today’s fast-moving communication ecosystem, where preprints, social media, and rapid news cycles can propel tentative findings into public view before replication and critique have had time to operate. When preliminary claims are amplified prematurely, they can misdirect funding, shape policy without corroboration, and erode public trust; consequently, the peer review system becomes implicated in societal risk management as well as epistemic judgment (Ioannidis, 2005). Because reviewers operate within local norms, peer review can either reproduce conservative biases that stifle novel work or tolerate rhetorical boldness that outstrips the evidence; both distortions undermine the long-term epistemic health of a field (Fanelli, 2012; Nosek et al., 2015).

These challenges call for proactive editorial architectures that anticipate error rather than merely react to it—structures that refine speculation into disciplined experimentation. To manage those risks while preserving intellectual freedom, niche journals can adopt risk-management lessons from innovation practice and embed them in editorial workflows. Structured, iterative processes—analogue to corporate frameworks such as Amazon’s “Working Backwards,” which emphasize clarity of objectives, iterative feedback, and staged validation (cf. Hess

& Ludwig, 2017)—can help journals to refine speculative ideas without sacrificing credibility. Practically, this means publishing transparent review criteria, requiring clear statements of uncertainty and planned follow-up from authors, and insisting on plausible mechanism building or boundary conditions even in exploratory reports; such measures enable constructive critique rather than reflexive dismissal.

Finally, a proportionate, tiered review architecture aligns evaluative intensity with potential downstream impact. *Low-impact* exploratory reports can receive light-touch, transparent review with explicit caveats and replication plans. *Moderate-impact* claims that could shape applied research or practice should undergo multidisciplinary scrutiny and meet standard data-sharing requirements. *High-impact* assertions with implications for health, safety, or policy merit coordinated, intensive review, preregistration of confirmatory studies, and conditional publication tied to staged confirmation.

Transparent and innovative peer-review models offer practical tools to align review intensity with manuscript risk and public impact (Ross-Hellauer, 2017). Coupled with post-publication monitoring of replication trajectories, media uptake, and policy citations, these reforms reframe peer review as calibrated epistemic governance—preserving the creative edge of frontier science while limiting the societal harms of premature or overstated claims (Ioannidis, 2005; Open Science Collaboration, 2015). Conceptual balance alone is insufficient; to realize this vision, frontier journals must embed rigor into their workflows in practical, transparent ways. The next step is to consider how editorial design can translate these principles into daily practice.

EVOLVING EDITORIAL PRACTICES TO OPERATIONALIZE AN INCUBATOR MODEL

Translating philosophy into policy demands a reimagining of submission categories, reviewer expectations, and feedback systems—ensuring that exploratory and confirmatory research progress along a unified developmental pathway. To bring this aspirational incubator model to life, journals must adopt concrete editorial practices and governance structures that support its implementation. *First*, journals could adopt and clearly advertise tiered submission tracks—Exploratory, Confirmatory, and Synthesis—with distinct review rubrics so authors and reviewers share expectations. *Second*, reviewer guidance must be structured: for exploratory submissions reviewers should



assess conceptual coherence, feasibility of follow-up validation, transparency about limitations, and whether the manuscript supplies actionable pathways toward confirmation. *Third*, publication formats should be diversified to reflect iterative development: pilot briefs, method notes, registered exploratory reports, and living reviews allow ideas to appear in progressively stronger forms without forcing premature definitive claims.

Fourth, reviewer training and recognition matter. Short primers or workshops on evaluating speculative methods, and formal acknowledgement of exemplary reviewers, raise the quality and reward of the service that peer review constitutes. Peer review is a public good; everyone who benefits from a healthy literature should strive to serve when they can. Recent cross-disciplinary analyses of peer-review innovation provide templates and case studies for implementing reviewer training and tiered tracks (Tennant et al., 2017). *Fifth*, for higher-risk claims, editors might require preregistration of confirmatory protocols, mandatory data sharing, and, where necessary, convened multidisciplinary validation panels before mainstream amplification. *Sixth*, post-publication monitoring—tracking replications, media exposure, and policy uptake—creates feedback loops that allow journals to calibrate editorial standards and learn from outcomes (Ioannidis, 2005). Systematic monitoring and metadata-driven approaches are already being piloted in scholarly communication studies and can inform journal-level feedback loops (Kaltenbrunner et al., 2022).

IN SERVICE OF MAINSTREAM EXPOSURE AND INTEGRATION

The incubator approach implies that niche journals should prioritize publishing early-stage ideas and research, while guiding frontier scientists to submit their most advanced studies to high-impact journals. In fact, the ultimate success of niche journals like *JSE* arguably lies in their ability to transition promising hypotheses into mainstream venues. Journals should therefore proactively foster interdisciplinary dialogue—through special issues and collaborative networks—that can attract attention from broader audiences. They could also incentivize empirical follow-up by prioritizing submissions that present feasible validation plans and by facilitating cross-lab collaborations that supply the statistical power and methodological breadth mainstream journals require.

Historical examples show this pathway in action: topics initially aired in specialized outlets, such as placebo research, later matured into robust mainstream literatures

because exploratory work was followed by rigorous replication and synthesis (Benedetti, 2014). Systematic reviews of translational pathways emphasize that staged validation, inclusive networks, and synthesis are common features of topics that move from niche to mainstream (West et al., 2014).

Niche journals—and particularly those devoted to maverick concepts—are not marginal curiosities but essential engines of scientific renewal. Like corporate “innovation labs,” they provide structured, lower-risk spaces where boundary-pushing ideas can be proposed, tested, and improved. By embracing a tiered incubator model—socializing fresh perspectives, offering early peer scrutiny, enforcing fair but rigorous standards, and actively shepherding validated findings toward mainstream venues—these journals can preserve the adventurous spirit of frontier science while safeguarding credibility and societal trust. Peer review is a crucial scholarly service in this enterprise; those who rely on the scientific record should also accept the responsibility to sustain it.

Anomalistics-oriented journals will ideally function as deliberate bridges, creating clear, resourced pathways that move validated, high-quality frontier work into mainstream, high-impact venues for broad scrutiny and transformative uptake. The aim of this is not to force paradigm shifts per se, but to recognize which paradigms are ripe for revision or reinvention—guiding where rigorous confirmation and cross-disciplinary attention will yield the greatest scientific and social payoff. Although *JSE* and similar periodicals have not yet adopted the full incubator system outlined here, we urged frontier scientists to treat niche journals as disciplined waystations rather than final havens. This shift in mindset and action can collectively chart a more transparent, testable, and ultimately transformative course in the advancement of non-obedient science.

REFERENCES

- Alberts, B., Hanson, B., & Kelner, K. L. (2008). Reviewing peer review. *Science*, 321(5885), 15. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1162115>
- Bem, D. J., & Honorton, C. (1994). Does psi exist? Replicable evidence for an anomalous process of information transfer. *Psychological Bulletin*, 115, 4–18. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.115.1.4>
- Benedetti, F. (2014). *Placebo effects: Understanding the mechanisms in health and disease* (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780198705086.001.0001>



- Chambers, C. D. (2013). *Registered Reports: A new publishing initiative at Cortex*. *Cortex*, 49(3), 609–610. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cortex.2012.12.016>
- Chesbrough, H. W. (2003). *Open innovation: The new imperative for creating and profiting from technology*. Harvard Business School Press.
- Chesbrough, H. W. (2006). *Open business models: How to thrive in the new innovation landscape*. Harvard Business School Press.
- Chu, J. S. G., & Evans, J. A. (2021). Slowed canonical progress in large fields of science. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 118(41), e2021636118. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2021636118>
- Crane, D. (1972). *Invisible colleges: Diffusion of knowledge in scientific communities*. University of Chicago Press.
- Enserink, M. (2010). Elsevier to editor: Change controversial journal or resign. *Science*, 327(5971), 1316. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.327.5971.1316>
- Fanelli, D. (2009). How many scientists fabricate and falsify research? A systematic review and meta-analysis of survey data. *PLoS One*, 4(5), e5738. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0005738>
- Fanelli, D. (2012). Negative results are disappearing from most disciplines and countries. *Scientometrics*, 90, 891–904. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-011-0494-7>
- Flier, J. S. (2019). Credit and priority in scientific discovery: A scientist's perspective. *Perspectives in Biology and Medicine*, 62(2), 189–215. <https://doi.org/10.1353/pbm.2019.0010>
- Franco, A., Malhotra, N., & Simonovits, G. (2014). Publication bias in the social sciences: Unlocking the file drawer. *Science*, 345(6203), 1502–1505. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1255484>
- Gertner, J. (2012). *The idea factory: Bell Labs and the great age of American innovation*. Penguin.
- Gieryn, T. F. (1998). *Cultural boundaries of science: Credibility on the line*. University of Chicago Press. <https://doi.org/10.7208/chicago/9780226824420.001.0001>
- Goel, R. K., & Faria, J. R. (2007). Proliferation of academic journals: Effects on research quantity and quality. *Metroeconomica*, 58(4), 536–549. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-999X.2007.00285.x>
- Hanson, M. A., Gómez Barreiro, P., Crosetto, P., & Brockington, D. (2024). The strain on scientific publishing. *Quantitative Science Studies*, 5(4), 823–843. https://doi.org/10.1162/qss_a_00327
- Hauswald, R. (2026). Gatekeeping failures, degenerative consensus dynamics, and undue deference to science. *Synthese*, 207, 35. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11229-025-05423-7>
- Hess, E. D., & Ludwig, K. (2017). *Humility is the new smart: Rethinking human excellence in the smart machine age*. Berrett-Koehler Publishers.
- Horton, R. (2015). Offline: What is medicine's 5 sigma? *The Lancet*, 385(9976), 1380. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(15\)60696-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(15)60696-1)
- Houran, J., & Bauer, H. (2022). "Fringe science"—A tautology, not pariah. *Journal of Scientific Exploration*, 36(2), 207–217. <https://doi.org/10.31275/20222527>
- Hughes, J. M. B. (2021). Medical breakthroughs: Chance and opportunity. *QJM*, 114(4), 229–231. <https://doi.org/10.1093/qjmed/hcaa257>
- Ioannidis, J. P. A. (2005). Why most published research findings are false. *PLoS Medicine*, 2(8), e124. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.0020124>
- Jacobs, J. A. (2014). *Defense of disciplines: Interdisciplinarity and specialization in the research university* (online edn). University of Chicago Press. <https://doi.org/10.7208/chicago/9780226069463.003.0004>
- Kaltenbrunner, W., Pinfield, S., Waltman, L., Buckley Woods, H., & Brumberg, J. (2022). Innovating peer review, reconfiguring scholarly communication: An analytical overview of ongoing peer review innovation activities. *Journal of Documentation*, 78(7), 429–449. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JD-01-2022-0022>
- Kuhn, T. S. (1962). *The structure of scientific revolutions*. University of Chicago Press.
- Kusumegi, K., Yang, X., Ginsparg, P., de Vaan, M., Stuart, T., & Yin, Y. (2025). Scientific production in the era of large language models. *Science*, 390(6779), 1240–1243. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.adw3000>
- Lu, C., Lu, C., Lange, R. T., Yamada, Y., Hu, S., Foerster, J., Ha, D., & Clune, J. (2026). Towards end-to-end automation of AI research. *Nature*, 651, 914–919. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-026-10265-5>
- Martin-Gomez, S., & Muñoz de Luna, A. B. (2024). The role of social networks in communication in the scientific research community. *Journal of Technology and Science Education*, 14(2), 291–305. <https://doi.org/10.3926/jotse.2361>
- National Science Board, National Science Foundation. (2024). *Science and engineering indicators 2024*. National Center for Science and Engineering Statistics. <https://nces.nsf.gov/pubs/nsb20257>
- Nosek, B. A., Alter, G., Banks, G. C., Borsboom, D., Bowman, S. D., Breckler, S. J., Buck, S., Chambers, C. D., Chin, G., Christensen, G., Contestabile, M., Dafoe, A., Eich, E., Freese, J., Glennerster, R., Goroff, D., Green, D. P., Hesse, B., Humphreys, M., ... Yarkoni, T. (2015). Promoting an open research culture. *Science*, 348(6242), 1422–1425. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aab2374>
- Oldenburg, R. (1989). *The great good place: Cafés, coffee shops, bookstores, bars, hair salons, and other hangouts at the heart of a community*. Paragon House.



- Open Science Collaboration. (2015). Estimating the reproducibility of psychological science. *Science*, 349(6251), aac4716. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aac4716>
- Park, M., Leahey, E., & Funk, R. J. (2023). Papers and patents are becoming less disruptive over time. *Nature*, 613, 138–144. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-022-05543-x>
- Price, D. (1963). *Little science, big science*. Columbia University Press. <https://doi.org/10.7312/pric91844>
- Ross-Hellauer, T. (2017). What is open peer review? A systematic review [version 1; peer review: 1 approved, 3 approved with reservations]. *F1000Research*, 6, 588. <https://doi.org/10.12688/f1000research.11369.1>
- Scott, P., & Rines, R. (1975). Naming the Loch Ness monster. *Nature*, 258, 466–468. <https://doi.org/10.1038/258466a0>
- Simonton, D. K. (2004). *Creativity in science: Chance, logic, genius, and zeitgeist*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139165358>
- Smith, R. (2003). Medical journals are an extension of the marketing arm of pharmaceutical companies. *PLoS Medicine*, 2(5), 138. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.0020138>
- Smith, R. (2006). Peer review: A flawed process at the heart of science and journals. *Journal of the Royal Society of Medicine*, 99(4), 178–182. <https://doi.org/10.1258/jrsm.99.4.178>
- Sykes, B. C., Mullis, R. A., Hagenmuller, C., Melton, T. W., & Sartori, M. (2014). Genetic analysis of hair samples attributed to yeti, bigfoot and other anomalous primates. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 281(1789), 20140161. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2014.0161>
- Szydagis, M., Knuth, K. H., Kugielsky, B., & Levy, C. (2025). Initial results from the first field expedition of UAPx to study unidentified anomalous phenomena. *Progress in Aerospace Sciences*, 156, 101099. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paerosci.2025.101099>
- Tennant, J. P., Dugan, J. M., Graziotin, D., Jacques, D. C., Waldner, F., Mietchen, D., Elkhatib, Y., Collister, L. B., Pikas, C. K., Crick, T., Masuzzo, P., Caravaggi, A., Berg, D. R., Niemeyer, K. E., Ross-Hellauer, T., Mannheimer, S., Rigling, L., Katz, D. S., Greshake Tzovaras, B., ... Colomb, J. (2017). A multi-disciplinary perspective on emergent and future innovations in peer review [version 3; peer review: 2 approved]. *F1000Research*, 6, 1151. <https://doi.org/10.12688/f1000research.12037.3>
- Thornton, S. (1995). *Club cultures: Music, media and sub-cultural capital*. Polity Press.
- van Assen, M. A. L. M., van Aert, R. C. M., & Wicherts, J. M. (2015). Meta-analysis using effect size distributions of only statistically significant studies. *Psychological Methods*, 20(3), 293–309. <https://doi.org/10.1037/met0000025>
- van Dalen, H. P., & Henkens, K. (2005). Signals in science: On the importance of signaling in gaining attention in science. *Scientometrics*, 64, 209–233. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-005-0248-5>
- Wardle, J., & Rossi, V. (2016). Medical hypotheses: A clinician's guide to publication. *Advances in Integrative Medicine*, 3(1), 37–40. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aimed.2016.07.006>
- West, J., Salter, A., Vanhaverbeke, W., & Chesbrough, H. W. (2014). Open innovation: The next decade. *Research Policy*, 43(5), 805–811. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2014.03.001>

