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REWARDS
Do reviewers want rewards?

YES !!

• Wiley 2015 research found 4 of 5 researchers agree there is not enough recognition

Responses

• “Reviewing should be acknowledged as a measurable research output by research assessment bodies/my institution”

• “I would spend more time reviewing if it was recognised as a measurable research activity by research assessment bodies/my institution”

• “Reviewing is not sufficiently acknowledged as a valuable research activity by research assessment bodies/my institution”
What is valuable to reviewers

- Recognition is more valued than rewards
- Feedback
  - On the quality of their review, seeing other comments, informed of the decision
- Acknowledgement
  - In the journal, and personally from the editor

What do publishers do?

- Money
- Veruscript (UK commercial publisher)
  - Pay reviewers c.£100 (cash, credit, fund)
- Collabra (University of California Press)
  - Reviewers awarded points
    - points = share of the “Research Community Fund”
What do publishers do?

• Recognition tools
  • Elsevier: Reviewer recognition platform

What do publishers do?

• Partner with recognition tools
  • ORCID – linking review activity to individuals
What do publishers do?

- Partner with recognition tools
- Publons - "get credit for peer review"
Unfair burdens

Top 10 countries by no. of corresponding authors:

- Italy
- Spain
- Japan
- France
- Australia
- Canada
- Germany
- United Kingdom
- China
- United States

% of total reviewers, 2014
% of total corresponding authors, 2014
PRE- OR POST-PUBLICATION REVIEW

Pre-publication … “normal?”
Post-publication
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Post-publication
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Post-publication : Pubpeer
Post-publication: ResearchGate

Introducing Open Review
A new way to evaluate research.

Transparency
Relationship between vaginal microbial dysbiosis, inflammation, and pregnancy outcomes in cervical cerclage
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EXTERNAL REVIEW
Pre-submission peer review?

- Peerage of Science
  - Peer review prior to submission
  - Links to publisher submission systems, editor trawling

Commercial peer review?

- Rubiq
  - Paid-for peer review (@$500)
  - Publisher partnerships?
WHAT DO WE WANT?

it is slow, expensive, largely a lottery, poor at detecting errors and fraud, anti-innovatory, biased, and prone to abuse

Richard Smith, BMJ Blogs, March 22, 2010
Why review?

• To check for soundness
• To assess originality, significance and interest
• To assess fit between the paper and journal
• Help authors improve the quality