What are the costs of peer review, since we are providing peer review for free?

It depends on which journals. PCI-Daniela has done a lot on this and may want to discuss this with you.

If you don’t accept submissions if the article is currently under Peer review in journals. This is to avoid duplication of the work. Authors have to certify that the article is not being submitted elsewhere.

We are no longer collecting the data because we have been realigned and this create unnecessary confusion on the entire process. What is your suggestion on what to do with this data?

What is the business model for funding around OA? How do people get paid, how is it a sustainable approach or not all countries?

If there any concerns about this data not being co-opted for more profit?

Yes! this is so important! We currently do not have a business model. PCI-Paul needs to be in the driver seat to help develop this.

Are any of the presenters share any criteria or guidelines for peer reviewers that help from avoid conflict (OE) again?

Peer review labot is already "co-opted" for profit as we make peer review more efficient by making it more transparent and reducing the number of different rounds of peer review. So instead of reducing the amount of "free" labor that is subsidizing for profit publishers. However, to the extent that it does reduce their rates, then it also can increase their profiles unless we find a way to have them contribute to funding preprint peer review.

What are the costs of peer review, since we are providing peer review for free?

We have to estimate the cost of managing the peer review. However, to the extent that it also can reduce their rates, then it also can increase their profiles unless we find a way to have them contribute to funding preprint peer review.

Are there any monetary benefits for a journal to submit a manuscript to another journal?

Peer review is already "co-opted" for profit as we make peer review more efficient by making it more transparent and reducing the number of different rounds of peer review. So instead of reducing the amount of "free" labor that is subsidizing for profit publishers. However, to the extent that it does reduce their rates, then it also can increase their profiles unless we find a way to have them contribute to funding preprint peer review.

Is the new model that port review process is at open access, in the context of countries implementing the UNESCO Recommendation on Open Science. Given the growth in the open access ecosystem, there is a concerted place for people to identify and understand differences among the main players? And is that information targeted only at authors or also at e.g. publishers and others key to building that enabling environment? What does the preprint review community need now that the open access ecosystems is changing?

Yes! We have to know about the enabling environment for preprint review as part of open science. In the context of countries implementing the UNESCO Recommendation on Open Science. Given the growth in the open access ecosystem, there is a concerted place for people to identify and understand differences among the main players? And is that information targeted only at authors or also at e.g. publishers and others key to building that enabling environment? What does the preprint review community need now that the open access ecosystems is changing?

Is there any concern about the peer review being done for profit?

Yes! this is so important! We currently do not have a business model. PCI-Paul needs to be in the driver seat to help develop this.

Are any of the collaborations with journals where in ones the articles are peer reviewed by one of the services they can move ahead without a round of reviews at the journal?

Are there any monetary benefits for a journal to submit a manuscript to another journal?

Peer review is already "co-opted" for profit as we make peer review more efficient by making it more transparent and reducing the number of different rounds of peer review. So instead of reducing the amount of "free" labor that is subsidizing for profit publishers. However, to the extent that it does reduce their rates, then it also can increase their profiles unless we find a way to have them contribute to funding preprint peer review.

Is there any concern about the peer review being done for profit?

Yes! this is so important! We currently do not have a business model. PCI-Paul needs to be in the driver seat to help develop this.

In the future of scholarly communication - the role of preprint peer review

We currently do not have a business model. PCI-Paul needs to be in the driver seat to help develop this.

Shaping the Future of Scholarly Communication - the role of preprint peer review

We currently do not have a business model. PCI-Paul needs to be in the driver seat to help develop this.
Different people have different preferences. As answered in another question, our prereviews are published on Zenodo.

Jerry: We have already answered this. If there are some resources we have published: https://content.prereview.org/previews-lookbook/now-availability. We also host resources tailored around the needs of specific communities (https://prereview.org/community). Please reach out to community@prereview.org for additional info.

Sorry if I missed it, but I see check for plagiarism before releasing a preprint? Prereviews do not host preprints, only provide a free service for anyone with an ORCID iD to write feedback to preprints and publish that feedback in the form of a preReview. We are not releasing preprints — that is the role of the preprint servers — we are not currently checking for plagiarism as part of our review process. We do check for conflict of interest and would like to add AI-enabled check for plagiarism and novelty more generally.

A question to the panelists: This currently seems to be separate good-actors — are there any moves towards collective action on this form of preprint review?

The activity coordinating and supporting ways to collaborate even more formally. As examples, we are in discussions with Review Commons about how to align our reviews so that, if an author and reviewer agree, they could feed into Review Commons. We encourage our student reviewers to both co-author with our peer-reviewers and to publish them on PREreview.

How does PREreview ensure that pseudonyms aren’t accidentally the same as someone else’s “real” name?

As answered in another question, our pseudonyms are assigned at the time of sign up and are a color + animal (e.g. yellow elephant) so it’s unlikely that those are names of people.

The option for a pseudonym for reviewers in PREreview: How much of the reviews display the actual name of a reviewer, could the presence of pseudonyms in the same space potentially cause confusion? For example, what if, as a reviewer, pick a pseudonym that is actually the name of a person in my field (unintentional coincidence)? How do you manage the complexity of simultaneously known and masked identities?

The pseudonym is given to the user at the time of sign-up and it's unchangeable. It's a color + animal (e.g. yellow elephant). We ensure that there are not many people with those names.

I’m wondering if preprints and peer reviews are instead or will be indexed by citation databases such as Web of Science and Scopus.

PREreviews are published on Zenodo and receive a DOI via DataCite. Ours are indexed by Google Scholar so far — we hope so. It would be a good thing and quite natural that preprints validated by COAR and COAR Notify which have doi, eg https://doi.org/10.0000002

Are there any forums to discuss the business model/revenue outside philanthropy for these initiatives?

We also work with like-minded journals to connect the community-led reviews to our reviews when the article is published in traditional journals. Preparation recommended by PCIs have a specific format with a badge linking to the reviews. If the preprint server is bioRxiv or HAL (in France), then there is specific format with a badge linking to the preprint, via CrossRef. If the preprint server is bioRxiv or HAL (in France), then there is specific format with a badge linking to the preprint, via CrossRef.

How would a reader viewing a preprint discover if review(s) exists and find the review(s) for the preprint?

PREreviews are published on Zenodo and receive a DOI via DataCite. Currently PREreviews appear listed on bioRxiv and medRxiv. We are working to implement COAR Notify which will better connect preprint authors and reviewers. https://github.com/prereview/pre-review-notification through services like Scopus (https://www.scopus.com) and PubMed. Also, we are working to adopt ORCID badges that will allow for better discoverability of the reviews.

I think Sam, already answered this, but that serious peer-reviews would be better incentivised.

This is interesting and important. My sense is that it needs to be built into research funding — e.g. NIH — so that instead of just funding authors to pay for a revision at successive journals, the need for a more transparent, more reproducible and of better quality than the current system.

Future of Scholarly Communication: The Role of Preprint Peer Review

It seems like a number of infrastructures are being built in parallel or in series, all with different goals and purposes. Our goal is to provide peer review much more widely so that tradition publication for the benefit of the authors and all users of the manuscript — including journals considering the manuscript for publication. It also helps strengthen transparency of peer review, eliminating the repeated, inefficient peer review that occurs with closed peer review at successive journals.

Our goal is to offer a publication system that is less expensive, more transparent, more reproducible and of better quality than the current system. It’s not necessarily about substituting journals for preprints but creating a more efficient and transparent peer review system that allows authors to find reviewers, the need for an unchangeable, transparent, more reproducible and of better quality than the current system.

Shaping the Future of Scholarly Communication: The Role of Preprint Peer Review
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