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— I am here for a conference on computational biology, and you?
— Well, I am a neuroscientist, but I am here for a conference on open access repositories.
— Repositories? What is that?
— Oh, well… it’s a long story… but you just gave me an idea on how to start my presentation…

Real dialogue at the lobby of my hotel
Open Peer Review?

• Open access
• Signed
• Nonselective
• Open in time
an aggregation of its reviews, weighted by the reputation of reviewers.
an aggregation of her papers’ reputation, **weighted** by the number of authors

**Reputation: author**
an aggregation of others opinions on our reviewer, weighted by the reputation of the reviewers

http://digital.csic.es/handle/10261/130842

Reputation: reviewer
• Invitation’s module
• Reviews’ module
• Compute reputations
• Item’s view customization
• Author’s view customization
• Standard DSpace configurations
  Defining new collections, workflows,...
  Extending the metadata model

• Apply the code
• Extend the data model (database)
• Views Customization
  Items, authors, item’s relationships, collections...
• Search system, index and filtering adjustment...
• OAI-PMH filtering
Author’s model is needed to...

- disambiguate
- identify
- give credit and recognition, i.e. show author’s reputation
Available at:

Code for DSpace v5 XMLUI (e-IEO)
https://github.com/arvoConsultores/Open-Peer-Review-Module--

Code for DSpace v4 JSPUI (digital.CSIC)
https://github.com/arvoConsultores/dspace_cris--

Wiki
https://github.com/arvoConsultores/Open-Peer-Review-Module/wiki
Pilot implementation in 2 institutional repositories
Open peer reviews and comments have their own collections

https://digital.csic.es/handle/10261/131210

https://digital.csic.es/handle/10261/131213
Waiting for open discussion...

https://digital.csic.es/handle/10261/132304
The reviewer must indicate her affiliation.

By default, all reviews and comments have a CC-BY license.

New resource types

Qualitative and quantitative peer review

Please provide below your detailed review about the work, including all necessary information to help its authors improve their contribution. Try to be constructive in your criticism.

Review text *
Open reviews records contain:
• Name of the reviewer and affiliation
• Links to the reviewed work
• Links to items with related open comments
• Individual quality rating of the reviewed work
• Weighed review reputation metrics

https://digital.csic.es/handle/10261/131502
### Review sheet (clipping)

**Title:** Thunnus thynnus eggs obtained from captive

**Authors:**
- Jerez, S. (Salvador) IEO
- Instituto Español de Oceanografía

**Date:** 2016-04-06

**Type:** review

**Overall quality:** 80

**Review reputation:** 86

**Related works:**
- [http://hdl.handle.net/10508/2494](http://hdl.handle.net/10508/2494)

**Related comments:**
- View comment by Rodrigues-dos-Santos-Domingues, P.M. (T)
- View comment by de-la-Gándara, F. (Fernando)

### Comment sheet (clipping)

**Title:** Assemblages on the soft bottoms off the Catalan-Levante

**Authors:**
- García-Rodríguez, M. (Mariano) IEO
- Subdirección General de Investigación

**Date:** 2016-04-19

**Type:** comment

**Overall quality:** 70

**Related reviews:**
- View review by Sampedro-Pastor, P. (Paz)

**Reputation:**

**Abstract:**
Answer to the referee report of Paz Sampedro Den... time and sampling season has little or no effect in the... rigorously, only this season is ment... argument opposed to the differentiation of the two groups... Firstly, groups were established based on the results... being subsequently grouped by a cluster. The MDS... depth, performing one ANOSIM, with the sub-routine of... Thus five groups were identified, clearly separated by...
Cold-water corals in the Cap de Creus canyon, northwestern Mediterranean: spatial distribution, density and anthropogenic impact

Authors
Orejas, C. (Covadonga); Gori, A. (Andrea); Lo-iacono, C. (Claudio); Puig, P. (Pere); Gili, J.M. (Josep Maria); Dale, M.R.T. (Mark R.T.)

Editor’s version
http://www.int-res.com/abstracts/meps/v397/p37-51/

Date
2009

Type
article

Publication reputation
85

Related reviews
90
View review by Cristobo, J. (Javier)
80
View review by Serrano, A. (Alberto)

Keywords
Cold water corals
Submarine canyons
Author/reviewer reputation metrics show in their personal page (1/2)

http://digital.csic.es/cris/rp/rp01941
Continued..(2/2)

**Orejas, C. (Covadonga)**

**Biography**
Covadonga Orejas is a graduate in Natural Sciences from the University of Seville, currently at COBIS and other benthic organisms since 1989. She has been involved in sustainable management of the Cabo de Gata-Nijar Natural Park and has contributed to the CoE projects conducted in 12 different countries, with 44 SCI, and 7 book chapters. She has published in several scientific journals, and several future publications are anticipated.

**Contact Information**
- Download in PDF
- Download in CVN fragment

**Fields of Specialization**
- Biology and ecology of cold-water corals (CWC) and other benthic organisms

**Degrees**
- Graduate in Biology from the Universidad Complutense de Madrid (Spain)
- PhD in Marine Biology from the University of La Laguna (Spain)

**Departments**
- C.O. CANARIAS
- Last updated marzo 15, 2016

**Author’s reputation**
- 79

---

**Jerez, S. (Salvador)**

**Biography**
Salvador Jerez, born in La Gomera (Spain) in 1957, received his PhD in Marine Biology from the University of La Laguna (Spain). He has been a researcher at the IEO Island Oceanographic Centre since 1989. He has over 20 years of experience working with blue mussel and has participated in 19 Spanish and international projects. He has been included in JCR/SCI, and has authored and co-authored 40 National and International papers. His research focuses on the sustainable management of marine resources, with particular emphasis on greater amberjack in the European Project.

**Contact Information**
- Download in PDF
- Download in CVN fragment

**Fields of Specialization**
- Expert on Greater amberjack (Seriola dumerili) aquaculture specializing in reproduction

**Degrees**
- Graduate and PhD in Biology from the University of La Laguna (Spain)

**Departments**
- C.O. CANARIAS
- Last updated marzo 15, 2016

**Reputation as a reviewer**
- 86
Feedback from CSIC researchers and external reviewers invited to the OPRM pilot phase

- A long awaited service in the repository.
- It is a great idea that merits success as currently peer review is not credited in researchers CVs at all due to its anonymity. But researchers will not have time to review and comment on other peers works as long as this activity remains outside of CVs recognition and lacks strong support from the research institutions.
- The functionality may be also used to evaluate, accept and comment contributions before the conference?
- I have contacted 3 reviewers: one has no time available, another is against any type of peer review as reviewing is a subjective activity in such a reduced scholarly discipline and the third one has accepted to do it.
- The service should promote spontaneous discussion by anybody willing to send comments.
- Inviting peers to an open evaluation may place people in an uncomfortable situation, the module should work 100% open.
- The service is great for preprints and other unpublished works but has limited applicability for works that have been already evaluated and published.
- How does open peer review operate in relation to “finished” pieces of work (i.e, a book)?
- How will the service compete with Academia.edu open review/comments?
- May I use the review functionality to invite peers to review my paper on SSRN?
- On one side, I like the initiative by the CSIC, because it may foster debates among scholars on hot topics. On the other side, it requires time and effort from open reviewers, which they are probably willing to devote only if highly motivated. It must be hard for most scholars to be able to allocate their very scarce time to comment on published articles, unless they really want to say something about them.
- Why do I need to upload my review as an attachment? It is an extra work load
Feedback from e-IEO researchers and reviewers invited to the OPRM pilot phase

- Leads to open collaboration
- Ensures expert reviews
- Avoids subjectivity
- Full support would soon lead to full open science
- Implementation requires time
- Negative review… awkward situation among colleagues?
Prospects for the future

Talking about functionality..
what to evolve in the short-term?

• Reviewers identification/authentication
• Visual approach to object’s relationships, reputations, timeline....

And some “blue-sky” ideas
standardize reputations concepts, profiles? Algorithms?...
 federation of repositories interchanging reputations...
Prospects for the future

• **Institutional awareness raising campaigns**
• It remains a challenge to enthuse authors to use the module for their preprints as fears of journal rejection later on still prevail.
• **More work needed against** the following barriers: reticence to participate as to lack of linkage with institutional assessment exercises and rewards system, limitations associated with an invitation-based module and misunderstandings about the OPRM reputation metrics>>>> FAQs coming soon!
• **A cross-platform evaluation system is pending.** Widely disseminated and comparable platform-independent metrics
Next Generation Repositories

https://www.coar-repositories.org/activities/advocacy-leadership/working-group-next-generation-repositories/

Panel 6: Repositories of the Future
Time: Thursday, 16/Jul/2016: 11:00am - 12:30pm
Session Chair: Richard Rogers
Location: Joly Theatre
Hamilton Building
Contact

Pandelis Perakakis: peraka@ugr.es

Emilio Lorenzo: elorenzo@arvo.es

Isabel Bernal: isabel.bernal@bib.csic.es

Thank you for your Attention!