



## Editorial: The next generation in (EuPA Open) Proteomics



People make science; or vice versa, science is a product of people. Unfortunately, people have to worry about more than just science. We have to grow personally, we have to find funding channels that want to pay for the research and we want to have an impact on our field. Science itself does not benefit from these personal concerns. Deadlines curtail results. Money can distort science... In fact, science only flourishes in absolute objectivity.

Fortunately, science can fall back on unwavering corroboration to objectify the world. Therefore, the most important validation of our work as a researcher is the manuscript. Rightly so, because sharing knowledge makes it possible to do science *as mankind*, instead of *as (wo)men*. In those manuscripts, we can write the results that we obtained with the methods that were developed and optimized in earlier manuscripts. This way, everyone who takes new methods to heart and makes new discoveries with them can be acknowledged for the contribution.

Right? Unfortunately, the community gives mainly credit to results that are mind-blowing or groundbreaking, preferably both. As such, we reward the results and not the method. So, we can't blame the researchers for investing more time in presenting the results than developing the experimental design. Due to the increasingly complex methods, we also generate increasingly complex data. Therefore, it is easily forgiven that colleague-reviewers cannot validate the results and the quality of the work in detail. Actually, that should not even be a problem. A detailed report on the way in which those results were achieved is a direct indicator of their quality. Quality emerges from reliability.

Here at EuPA Open Proteomics, we want to facilitate the process of scientific objectification. If there is consensus within the community about how objective results can be achieved, then people should be

acknowledged for using these conventions. An experiment is just as much work, whether it has the desired outcome or not. By respecting the rules and deploying an experimental design only to measure the intended targets, at least the community knows that the conclusion is valuable. Moreover, by publishing all findings, we facilitate great discoveries. When we also express gratitude to those who have paved the way for us, no one is left empty-handed. Just to be clear: EuPA Open Proteomics is no place for failed experiments. It is a place for substantiated conclusions that can only be drawn from the results of well-designed and conducted experiments that were analyzed according to the state-of-the-art.

**This Special Issue introduces our transition.** Have a look at the **new Aims & Scope** of the journal and submit your own research if you feel that this journal is the right place for it. Help us make impact on the field. A new generation is coming and it is an ambitious and creative one! To illustrate that, we publish all the manuscripts from the **Young Proteomics Investigators Club Challenges** alongside the **Proceedings of the European Bioinformatics Community (EuBIC) Winter School** in this **Special Issue**. Please browse on and enjoy the creativity of **The Next Generation in Proteomics**.

We are still actively looking for young reviewers as well as young editorial board members! But obviously, the next generation grows at the grace of the mentorship of previous generations. Therefore, everybody is more than welcome at EuPA Open Proteomics!

Maarten Dhaenens  
ProGenTomics, Ghent University, Ottergemsesteenweg 460, 9000 Gent,  
Belgium  
E-mail address: [maarten.dhaenens@ugent.be](mailto:maarten.dhaenens@ugent.be).