

Shaping the Future of Scholarly Communication: The Role of Preprint Peer Review				
Question	Daniela	Stefano	Thomas	Jonny
What are the costs of peer review, since we are providing peer review for free?		The bulk of peer-review labor is clearly the work done by peer reviewers that is almost entirely uncompensated. However, the costs of managing the peer review process are also significant – especially as it becomes harder and harder to convince academics to do peer reviews. It would be possible to estimate the opportunity cost of the uncompensated peer review and perhaps that is what some of the estimates (Jonny – not sure about your estimate) have used.		The data I gave in my slides came from https://researchintegrityjournal.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s41073-023-00128-2
On the data around number of preprints published - do you have any data on how many preprints are coming directly from journals at submission stage to, while the article is already under review from the journal - I had heard about 1/3 of bioRxiv/medRxiv articles now come from a journal - would these preprints not be available to review, as they are already under review with a journal? any thoughts on ways to signal on a preprint, if the author is open to have peer review of the preprint, assuming it's not been submitted to a journal?? do you see this as a major challenge or not			At PCI, we don't accept submissions if the article are currently under Peer-review in journals. This is to avoid duplication of the work. Authors have to certify that the article are not submitted elsewhere	
There are so many predatory journals where no peer review process has been maintained and this creates unnecessary confusions on the entire process. What is your suggestions to eradicate such malpractices			Allow transparency of the evaluations, get support from serious institutions, have no financial interest in the system	
With journals author(s) may only send an article to one journal for review. Only if rejected the author may submit the article to another journal. Is that the same with pre-prints? Or may an author submit an article to more than one preprint server at a time?			A preprint is supposed to be deposited in only one preprint server. However, copies can be deposited in other open archives as soon as the doi of the original preprint is displayed	
what's the business model or funding around COLAB?? how do people get paid, how is the infrastructure supported, or is it all volunteer?				
Is there any concern about all this review labor being co-opted for more profit?		The peer review labor is already "co-opted" for profit. If we make peer review more efficient by making it more transparent and reducing the number of different rounds of peer review by different journals on the same paper then we would reduce the amount of "free" labor that is subsidizing for-profit publishers. However, to the extent that it also can reduce their costs, then it can also increase their profits unless we find a way to have them contribute to funding preprint peer review.		
@Science Colab-How long does it take on average for the review team to arrive at a consensus and formulate a report for a given preprint?				
Do prospective journals look favorably on your manuscript if your preprint has been certified peer reviewed?			It depends on which journals. PCI-friendly journals are of course positive about the preprints evaluated and validated by the PCIs. Rare journals do not like it!	
Can any of the presenters share any criteria or guidelines for peer reviewers that helps them avoid bias (EDI again)		Daniela has done a lot on this and may want to respond. We: use Semantic Scholar to identify conflict of interest from having previously published with the authors; exclude peer-reviewers from the same institution; and only exceptionally invite peer reviewers from the private sector. It would be helpful to have AI tools that would help us identify additional sources of potential bias (e.g. has the reviewer acknowledged funding in the past from companies that are connected to the matter under review).		
Are we thinking of any collaborations with journals where in once the articles are peer reviewed by one of the services they can move ahead without a round of reviews at the journal.			This is the case with PCI friendly journals, cf https://peercommunityin.org/pci-friendly-journals/	
Curious 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 preprint ecosystem, is there a centralized place for people to identify (and understand differences among) the key players? And is that information targeted only at authors or also at e.g. policymakers and others key to building that enabling environment? What does the preprint review community need from other open science actors?		Too bad that there wasn't time to discuss this live. It seems that this could be the topic of an entire session. I'm amazed that universities like mine (UC Berkeley) that claim to be so committed to DEI have preprinting rates of approx. 10%. If you believe that everyone should have access to the products of science and you have a mechanism which does that that costs the authors and the university nothing – how is it ethical to not preprint everything? You ask how we can create an enabling environment and I'd be interested in hearing more ideas. I'd start by changing NIH and NSF (and their corresponding funding bodies in other countries: MRC, EU Commission...) policy to require that the products of all funded research be preprinted unless the authors file a request for an exemption.		
Can reviewers access the same preprint via different preprint review services? If so, how are the reviews reconciled? Are these dynamically updated on the preprint server?			I think it's an additive process	
For the services speaking today which support public reviews of preprint, could you share whether negative reviews ("negative" meaning "this paper needs work, isn't ready for publishing") are shared with the public as well?	Yes! "Negative" reviews are shared as long as the language is constructive and not offensive. We don't moderate publication of the content but we enforce our Code of Conduct https://prereview.org/code-of-conduct . In our guidelines and resources we encourage constructive, clear and actionable feedback, both positive and negative.		Peer-reviews leading to the rejection of article by PCI are not published. We want to avoid any kind of "public punishment". Public punishment with negative peer-reviews can be a reason why authors do not want to deposit articles in preprint server anymore.	
For the services speaking today which support public reviews of preprint, could you share whether negative reviews ("negative" meaning "this paper needs work, isn't ready for publishing") are shared with the public as well?	All the PRereviews are shared without pre-publication moderation. If a review violates our Code of Conduct then they can be retracted https://prereview.org/code-of-conduct . Negative reviews are welcome as long as they are constructive.	For Rapid Reviews' Infectious Diseases we share critical reviews (all reviews) that we judge to be of appropriate quality and that are appropriately constructive.		
Does it cost anything for a library to participate in these initiatives?	We don't collect any money from libraries. The platform is completely free. We charge for ad hoc trainings and collaborations for live-streamed preprint journal clubs, for example.	All of our work is posted on our website https://rrid.mitpress.mit.edu/ and is free of charge to anyone, libraries included. We would love to develop a more sustainable (non-philanthropy-based) financing model which could include support from libraries. We have received support from MIT and US libraries and would welcome additional such collaborations.	We welcome symbolic sponsorship (with no cost) as well as financial support. In general, a yearly financial support from a university or a library to PCI is about the same as a usual APC	
Is there an intention to submit any of the PCI journals for indexing in a database like Web of Science, Scopus, etc?			The PCIs are not journals but communities peer-reviewing articles. Most PCI friendly journals are indexed in Wos. Peer Community Journal has applied for indexation in WoS, and has passed the first steps	
Sorry if I missed it, but will the pre-print peer reviews consider articles that are reporting null/negative results?		Absolutely — but they are less likely to be reviewed by our initiative because they are inherently more believable (it is less likely that the peer review will change views regarding the validity of the results). If a negative result represents a change in conventional wisdom that would change policy/practice if true — then it would be higher priority to review.	Sure! this is so important	
As part of peer-review training and selection, are there processes in place for identifying reviewers with expertise in specific methods and matching them with pre-prints to review? Specifically are there reviewers with expertise in systematic, scoping, rapid reviews etc? There seems to be a lot of these types of reviews coming out that do not follow best practices yet still pass peer review and result in negative public commentary and possibly retractions later on.	We currently don't do that. But we are working to improve the "match-making" workflow as we implement the COAR Notify protocol. What we want to make sure is that we don't accidentally bring barriers to participation by using proxy of expertise that have more to do with prestige and access to resources than to experience in review.	We almost never review systematic reviews and meta-analyses although you make a strong argument for why we might want to in the future. My view is that the review of such manuscripts is best left to experts in those methods and that our approach to identifying nearest-neighbor papers to identifying scientific peers is less suited for such manuscripts.		
BioRxiv appears to always add a disclaimer with all preprints "This article is a preprint and has not been certified by peer review." They lift/remove this notice and give a link to published paper, if it is published in a journal. But will they also remove that notice if it has gone through a preprint review process and has been recommended (in PCI Ecology, say)?		BioRxiv recognizes peer reviews if they have been requested/approved by the author of the peer reviews. In our case, that requires ex post approval from the authors; most other initiatives (e.g. Review Commons) are author-initiated.	If a preprint has been validated by a PCI after Peer-review, bioRxiv indicate that it has "not been certified by a journal but peer reviews are available" with a link to the reviews at PCI	

Shaping the Future of Scholarly Communication: The Role of Preprint Peer Review				
Question	Daniela	Stefano	Thomas	Jonny
Is the ultimate purpose of pre-print peer review to eliminate journals or to improve manuscripts for publication in traditional journals?	Different people have different purposes. Our goal is to lower the barriers to participation to peer review. We also work with like-minded journals to connect the community-led reviews to the journal-organized peer review workflow. Example: https://content.prereview.org/prereview-and-cneuropilot .	Our goals are to provide peer review much more rapidly than tradition publication for the benefit of the authors and all users of the manuscripts — including journals considering the manuscript for publication. In addition, we want to increase the efficiency and 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. This does not mean that we want to eliminate journals. It means that we offer an alternative choice to authors. + We are extremely friendly to Diamond OA journals and to society journals.	
Daniela, would it be possible for undergraduate researchers interested in publishing to sit in on a community review or training to learn? can you share any training materials or guidelines you provide peer reviewers to avoid bias - along the lines of the EDI?	I think Sam, already answered this, but here are some resources we have published: https://content.prereview.org/open-reviewers-toolkit-is-now-openly-available . We also host trainings tailored around the needs of specific communities (https://prereview.org/trainings). Please reach out to community@prereview.org for additional info.			
Sorry if I missed it. Do you check for plagiarism before releasing a preprint?	PREreview does not host preprints. We 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 of plagiarism and novelty more generally.	we check plagiarism before evaluating preprints (with iThenticate) if this has not been already checked by the preprint server.	
A question to the panellists - This currently seems to be separate good-actors - are there any moves towards collective action on this form of preprint review?		We are actively collaborating and exploring 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 agrees, they could feed into Review Commons. We encourage our student reviewers to both co-author reviews 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 + an animal (eg. yellow elephant) so it's unlikely that those are names of people.			
Re the option for a pseudonym for reviewers in PREreview: Given that many 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 I, as a reviewer, pick a pseudonym that is actually the name of someone in my field (unbeknownst to me)? 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) so we hope that there are not many people with those names. :)			
I'm wondering if preprints and peer reviews are indexed 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 after serious peer-reviews would be indexed. The opposite is not understandable	
Are there any forums to discuss the business models/revenue outside philanthropy for these initiatives - I know OASPA has some working group more on APC equity - is there a timeline for Shaping the Future of Scholarly Communication: The Role of Preprint Peer Review ? it seems like a number of these initiatives while still fairly new, also have been around a few years - what or where is the tipping point, or ahhah moment ?		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 publication fees that the funders directly support peer-review of preprints		
How would a reader viewing a preprint discover if review(s) exists and find the review(s) for the preprint? Are reviews assigned DOIs and with a relationship to the preprint's DOI via Crossref? Are preprint servers supporting linking out to reviews? This question might be more relevant to services where reviews are published on a different platform separate from the preprint.	PREreviews are published on Zenodo and receive a DOI via DataCite. Currently PREreviews appear linked on bioRxiv and medRxiv. We are working now to implement COAR Notify which will better connect preprint authors and reviewers https://elifesciences.org/for-the-press/e94cf241/elifesciences-and-prereview-to-enhance-the-publish-review-curate-ecosystem-through-adoption-of-coar-notify?utm_source=twitter&utm_medium=social&utm_campaign=organic . Also, we are working to adopt melada standards that will allow for better discoverability of the reviews.	We have agreed with BioRxiv and MedRxiv that they link back to our reviews and are seeking similar agreements with other preprint servers.	Preprint 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 message alerting the reader that peer-reviews exist and that the article has been validated by PCI. PCI evaluations have doi, eg https://doi.org/10.24072/pci.ecology.100467	
The following questions were live answered on the recording				
Res Square had Rubriq, and there were other efforts some years ago to provide J-agnostic review - all of them folded. Publishers, at that time, didn't want to accept those reviews+author revision. Clearly, now is different, but other than the acceleration and growth of preprints, what else might be driving this.			Other reasons: the difficulty for journals to find reviewers, the need for transparency, the willingness to reappropriate the publication process to the scientists themselves, the need for a less costly system	
Does it cost anything for a library to participate in these initiatives?			not necessarily. We welcome symbolic sponsorship (with no cost) as well as financial support. In general, a yearly financial support from a university or a library to PCI is about the same as a usual APC.	
In the PeerCommunityin platform, are "rejected " preprints allowed to revise their manuscript and resubmit the revised article?			There is an editorial decision that is "Revise". This is the normal way to ask for a revision. In some case, authors may want to send a revision after a "reject" decision. In that case there is an appeal procedure. This is rare but it occurs.	
Do you have any data on who are using the open peer reviews, what's the average usage, profile, and main use case to read the peer review along side the article?			The recommendation texts at PCI are often used by evaluation committees. It's very useful to get a 1 page analysis of an article for a jury or a committee member (no data on this but several testimonies). Editors of journals also use our reviews when the article is submitted to a journal together with the PCI evaluation.	