

Editorial: A new chapter for The All Results Journal

David Alcantara¹, David Díaz Díaz^{2,3}

^a *Sociedad para el Avance Científico (SACIS), Avda Via Apia, 7, 41016, Seville (Spain);*

^b *AFM-NANO, Instituto Universitario de Bio-Organica Antonio González (IUBO-AG), Universidad de La Laguna, Avda. Astrofisico Francisco Sánchez 2, 38206 La Laguna, Spain;*

^c *Departamento de Química Orgánica, Universidad de La Laguna, Avda. Astrofisico Francisco Sánchez 3, 38206 La Laguna, Spain.*

Dear readers, authors, reviewers and members of the scientific community,

Science advances through all reliable evidence, yet much of that evidence never reaches the scientific record. Negative findings, null results and failed replications remain systematically underreported despite their importance for scientific progress. It was this problem that initially motivated the creation of The All Results Journal, and it is this problem that continues to guide its evolution today.

Since its creation, *The All Results Journal* has defended a simple but often neglected idea: negative results are not failed science. Poorly designed experiments, weak methodology or unsupported conclusions are problematic; but rigorously conducted studies that do not confirm a hypothesis, that reveal the limits of a method, that challenge an expected mechanism, or that prevent other researchers from repeating unproductive routes are valuable scientific contributions. They deserve to be reviewed, published, cited, discussed and preserved.

For many years, science has been shaped by a strong preference for positive, confirmatory and apparently breakthrough results. This preference has contributed to a distorted scientific record, where only the visible tip of the iceberg is published, while a substantial amount of useful knowledge remains locked in laboratory notebooks, hard drives, doctoral theses, internal reports or forgotten supplementary files. In many fields, researchers spend months or years exploring hypotheses, experimental conditions, materials, biological models, computational approaches or clinical assumptions that do not lead to the expected result. Too often, these results disappear.

The All Results Journal was created precisely to recover that knowledge.

Our objective has always been to provide scientists with responsible and balanced information in order to advance faster, improve experimental designs, avoid unnecessary duplication, support better scientific decisions and increase society's return on research investment. When negative results are rigorously obtained and transparently communicated, they help other researchers to choose better routes, refine hypotheses, understand the boundaries of current models and avoid wasting time, resources and public funding. In an era of increasing pressure on research budgets, the systematic loss of well-conducted negative evidence is not only a scientific problem but also an economic one. Every unpublished result increases the likelihood that time, funding and human effort will be spent repeating unproductive paths that have already been explored elsewhere.

In that sense, rigorously obtained negative and null findings are not the opposite of scientific progress. They are one of its foundations.

Why this new stage is necessary

The scientific problem that motivated the creation of *The All Results Journal* remains highly relevant today. Multiple meta-research studies have shown that positive findings are substantially more likely to be published than negative or null results, contributing to publication bias across disciplines.¹ Publication bias, selective reporting and the reluctance to submit non-confirmatory results continue to affect the reliability, efficiency and completeness of science. Researchers are still rewarded more often for success than for transparency. Journals still tend to prioritise novelty and positive conclusions. Funding systems, academic careers and evaluation cultures still make it difficult for scientists to publish work that is rigorous but does not fit the dominant narrative of discovery.

At the same time, the scientific community is increasingly aware of the importance of reproducibility, open science, methodological transparency, research integrity and responsible use of resources. These trends confirm that the original mission of *The All Results Journal* was not marginal; it was anticipating a deeper transformation in the way science should be communicated.

For this reason, we believe that now is the right moment to strengthen the journal, simplify its structure and expand its scientific and editorial capacity.

The former field-specific journals of the ARJ family have now been consolidated into a single multidisciplinary journal: *The All Results Journal*. This unified journal preserves the historical scientific areas of ARJ as dedicated editorial categories:

- Chemistry
- Biology and Life Sciences
- Physics
- Nanoscience and Nanotechnology

This new structure allows us to maintain the identity and accumulated history of each area while building a stronger, clearer and more efficient editorial platform. Instead of fragmenting our efforts across separate titles, we will now concentrate our editorial work, visibility, peer-review standards, technical infrastructure and community-building activities under one journal.

The result is a more coherent and ambitious *The All Results Journal*: one journal, one mission, four scientific categories and a renewed commitment to publishing all rigorous scientific evidence, including negative findings and unexpected outcomes.

A strengthened editorial leadership

This new stage will also be marked by strengthened editorial leadership. We are pleased to announce that Prof. David Díaz will serve as Editor-in-Chief of *The All Results Journal*.

The appointment of a dedicated Editor-in-Chief reflects the journal's commitment to strengthening editorial governance, scientific oversight and long-term sustainability. Prof. David Díaz brings extensive editorial and scientific experience that will support these objectives. The journal will now operate under a co-direction model. The founding team will continue to protect the original mission of *The All Results Journal*, its Total Open Access philosophy, its technological infrastructure, its historical continuity and its broader community vision. The Editor-in-Chief will lead the scientific and editorial development of the journal, including the renewal of the editorial team, the improvement of peer-review workflows, the

refinement of editorial criteria and the attraction of high-quality submissions.

This distinction is important. A journal devoted to negative results must be especially rigorous. Publishing negative results does not mean lowering scientific standards. It means applying strong standards to a type of evidence that has traditionally been undervalued. For a negative result to be useful, the research question must be meaningful, the methodology must be sound, the experimental or analytical design must be appropriate, the limitations must be clearly discussed, and the conclusions must be proportional to the evidence.

The role of reviewers and editors is therefore central. Since the early years of *The All Results Journal*, we have repeatedly acknowledged that the final quality of published papers depends to a great extent on the dedication and constructive criticism of expert reviewers. This will remain one of our core principles. In this new stage, we aim to reinforce a fair, rigorous and constructive peer-review process that helps authors improve their manuscripts and helps readers trust the published record.

Negative results with a positive scientific value

One of the main goals of this new stage is to change the perception of negative results without abandoning the term or the mission.

We remain a journal focused on negative results. However, we want to communicate more clearly what that means.

Negative results are not merely results that “did not work”. They can be:

- Results that do not support an initial hypothesis.
- Results that challenge an accepted model, method or assumption.
- Results that show the limitations of a technique, material, biological system, computational model or therapeutic approach.
- Results that reveal lack of reproducibility under defined conditions.
- Results that prevent other researchers from repeating unproductive routes.
- Results that improve future experimental design.

Many so-called negative results are, in reality, unexpected outcomes. And unexpected outcomes are often where discovery begins. When observations diverge from expectations, they may reveal limitations in current models, expose hidden variables or point toward entirely new questions. Scientific progress depends as much on understanding surprises as it does on confirming predictions.

Thus, “negative” results are not the end of research; they are often the beginning of better science.

Seen from this perspective, negative results are positive for science because they complete the scientific record. They reduce unnecessary repetition, improve evidence synthesis and increase the efficiency of scientific research. They also provide a more honest picture of how research actually progresses: through confirmation, contradiction, refinement, error correction, unexpected observations and careful learning from what does not happen as predicted.

Science does not advance only by proving hypotheses. It also advances by eliminating weak explanations, identifying limits, closing unproductive paths and creating better questions.

We see the publication of negative results as a natural component of the broader Open Science movement, alongside transparency, reproducibility, data sharing and methodological openness. That is the intellectual space that *The All Results Journal* wants to continue leading.

Total Open Access and technical renewal

The new *The All Results Journal* remains committed to Total Open Access. Our goal is to ensure that published work is freely and universally accessible online, without unnecessary barriers for readers. This principle is especially important for negative results, because their value often lies in being findable at the right moment by researchers designing a similar experiment, testing a similar hypothesis or evaluating a similar method.

In this new stage, the journal has also moved to a stronger technical infrastructure and all historical articles have been transferred to the unified platform and classified according to the new editorial categories. This technical consolidation is a key part of the journal’s future development.

In addition, the journal will incorporate DOI registration through Crossref as part of its ongoing efforts to improve discoverability, persistence and integration within the scholarly ecosystem. This is an important step toward improving the traceability, persistence and discoverability of published articles. DOI registration will initially support new publications and will also allow us to consider the progressive assignment of DOIs to selected historical content where metadata quality and editorial consistency can be ensured.

This is not only a technical improvement. It is a statement of intent. Negative results must be part of the formal scholarly record. They must be searchable, citable, preserved and connected to the wider research ecosystem.

Building a community around all scientific results

A journal alone is not enough to change a publication culture. For negative results to become more visible and valued, we need a community of researchers, reviewers, editors, institutions, funders and open science advocates who understand their importance.

For this reason, this new stage of *The All Results Journal* will be complemented by the creation of an open support community on Scinder.net. To facilitate dialogue beyond formal publication, the journal will support an online community space where researchers can exchange methodological experiences, discuss reproducibility challenges and identify opportunities for collaboration.

The Scinder community will not replace the journal or the peer-review process. Rather, it will provide an open environment where conversations around negative results, reproducibility, research transparency and publication bias can take place before, during and after formal publication.

We believe this is especially important for early-career researchers, small research groups, interdisciplinary teams and scientists working on difficult, high-risk or underreported problems. Many researchers have valuable negative results but do not know whether they are publishable, how to frame them, or whether other scientists would find them useful. A community can help transform isolated unpublished results into shared scientific value.

Our invitation is therefore not limited to authors. We invite reviewers, editors, methodologists, open science experts, funders, institutional representatives and all researchers interested in improving the completeness of the scientific record to participate in our new ecosystem.

An invitation to submit, review and participate

With this renewed structure, *The All Results Journal* invites submissions from researchers working in Chemistry, Biology and Life Sciences, Physics, Nanoscience and Nanotechnology.

We welcome rigorously conducted studies with negative, null, inconclusive or replication-based findings. We are especially interested in manuscripts that clearly explain the original hypothesis, describe the methodology in sufficient detail, analyse why the expected result may not have been obtained, discuss limitations honestly and explain how the findings may help other researchers.

We also encourage short communications, methodological notes, replication studies, counter-examples to accepted assumptions, carefully documented unsuccessful experimental routes, and studies that clarify the limits of widely used approaches.

However, we want to be clear: not every negative result is automatically suitable for publication. The journal will continue to prioritise methodological soundness, transparency, relevance and usefulness for the scientific community. A negative result has scientific value when it is generated through rigorous work, replicable and communicated in a way that others can understand, evaluate and reuse.

We also invite qualified scientists to join our reviewer and editorial community. The success of a journal devoted to negative results depends on reviewers who understand both the difficulty and the importance of evaluating this type of work fairly. Reviewers should not ask negative results to become positive results. They should ask whether the study was well designed, well conducted, clearly reported and scientifically useful.

Looking forward

When *The All Results Journal* started, the central message was simple: all results are good results.

Today, after years of experience, that message remains valid, but it can be expressed with greater maturity. All results are good results when they are honestly obtained, rigorously reviewed, transparently reported and made available to the scientific community.

The consolidation of the ARJ journals into a unified *The All Results Journal*, the appointment of Prof. David Díaz as Editor-in-Chief, the incorporation of DOI registration, the migration to a stronger platform and the creation of an open community on Scinder.net represent the beginning of a new phase.

Our mission is still the same: to recover and publish valuable scientific knowledge that would otherwise be lost. Our ambition is now stronger: to make negative results visible, respected, useful and fully integrated into the scientific record.

Science advances not only through confirmation, but also through correction, refinement and contradiction. By ensuring that all rigorous evidence can enter the scientific record, we move closer to a more complete, efficient and trustworthy science. This remains the mission of *The All Results Journal*.

We invite you to participate in this new stage of *The All Results Journal*. Submit your rigorous negative results. Review constructively. Join the conversation. Help us make science finally complete.

References

1. Bartoš F, Maier M, Wagenmakers E-J, et al. *Footprint of publication selection bias on meta-analyses in medicine, environmental sciences, psychology, and economics. Res Syn Meth.* 2024; 15(3): 500-511.