

During April 2025, GreyNet International carried out a brief survey via its Distribution List and social media. Its goal was to assess some current views held on grey literature. The results are shown below and are followed by three questions.

Survey Results:

Which of the terms juxtaposed to one another are nearer to your views on grey literature?

Indicate as follows:	x	or	x
Literature Studies	19%	Information Studies	81%
Humanities	13%	Social Science	87%
(grey) literature	6%	grey literature	94%
Free of Charge	19%	Open Access	81%
Replicable data	13%	Reuseable data	87%

The above results show a significant majority of shared views among the respondents, which are in line with GreyNet's position.

Which of the terms juxtaposed to one another are nearer to your views on grey literature?

Indicate as follows:	x	or	x
Published	38%	Unpublished	62%
Reviewed	33%	Non-peer reviewed	67%
Conventional	31%	Non-conventional	69%

The above results show a majority of shared views among the respondents. However, they are not in line with GreyNet's position.

Three questions resulting from the survey:

Published / Unpublished

Is a document in digital or non-digital format that carries an ISBN, ISSN, DOI, ORCiD, ROR ID, and/or Funder-ID accompanied by metadata housed in an open access repository, data archive, or portal not to be considered published?

Reviewed / Non-peer reviewed

Given that the review process undergone by commercial publishers is not one that fits all. Given that one of the identifying characteristics of grey literature is that an organization carrying a ROR-ID is identified with the author(s) and that these author(s) have an ORCiD, is then their work not to be considered reviewed?

Conventional / Non-conventional

If by conventional, one implies prevailing, prevalent, current, ubiquitous, and widespread – then is grey literature not more deserving the term conventional? It is multiple times more abundant than commercial publications, timelier in production, and openly accessible.