

OPR – OPEN PEER REVIEW

- Processo de Revisão por pares transparente

Aspects of OPR

- Open up identities Authors and reviewers are aware of each other's identity.
- Make review reports open and accessible
- Review reports are published alongside the relevant article.

- Open up participation
- The wider community is able to contribute to the review process (peer researcher or even general public).

Share pre-review manuscripts

Manuscripts are made immediately available (e.g. via pre-print servers) in advance of any formal peer review procedures.

Allow final-version commenting

Review or commenting on final “version of record” publications.

Encourage interaction

Direct, reciprocal discussion between author(s) and reviewers and/or between reviewers is allowed and encouraged.

Use open platforms

Review is de-coupled from publishing in that it is facilitated by a different organizational entity than the venue of publication.

Why is OPR important?

Transparency

Revealing identities of author and reviewers increases transparency.

Reviewers can be held accountable for their evaluations.

This leads to a higher review (in terms of tone and quality)

with less instances of reviewer bias as conflicts of interest can be identified

by the participating community.

Speed

Traditional peer review takes a long time. In many cases, it can be almost a year between submission and final publication meaning that access to research findings are delayed substantially.

Moving from individual peer reviewers to community review speeds up the process significantly by opening up the pool of reviewers able and willing to take on the review.

Reliability

Including the wider community instead of depending on just 1-2 reviewers provides a better opportunity to identify methodological flaws or other inconsistencies in the research.

Initiatives such as For better science and Pubpeer support open discussion and constructive criticism about scientific papers. The number of papers listed by retractionwatch highlights the fact that the current peer review system is not always a guarantee of quality.

Consistency

Reviewers can have differing opinions about the papers they review.

It can often be unclear as to why a paper is rejected by one reviewer and not by another.

Open peer review supports improved consistency and reduces the chance of bias by ensuring that more reviewers' views for a given paper can be captured and compared.

Context

Making reviewers' questions about a given paper open along with the responses from authors provides valuable context about the methodologies employed and research processes.

This is only possible if review reports are made accessible.

Motivation

Peer review takes time and effort. Current peer review which hides the identity of reviewers does not allow those carrying out reviews to get credit for their work. By publishing their review reports and assigning them a DOI makes them citable research outputs in their own right.

Linking these back to you by including your ORCID ensures that you always have an up to date CV of all areas of your work.

Those authors making use of preprint servers to get early feedback on their work may also benefit from having their work made more visible to potential publishers. In some cases, authors who have shared early results via preprint servers have been approached directly by journals interested in publishing their work.

in:





Organizado por Mariana Selas
2021 – FLUP - Unidade de Publicações