

Open Peer Review & Collaboration

- *by Heather Morrison*

<http://poeticeconomics.blogspot.com>

THE IMAGINARY JOURNAL OF POETIC ECONOMICS

IMAGINE A WORLD WHERE ANYONE CAN INSTANTLY ACCESS ALL OF THE WORLD'S SCHOLARLY KNOWLEDGE - AS PROFOUND A CHANGE AS THE INVENTION OF THE PRINTING PRESS. TECHNICALLY, THIS IS WITHIN REACH. ALL THAT IS NEEDED IS A LITTLE IMAGINATION, TO RECONSIDER THE ECONOMICS OF SCHOLARLY COMMUNICATIONS FROM A POETIC VIEWPOINT.

Peer Review

- An assumption based on tradition that needs to be tested?
- Research questions:
 - How useful is peer review?
 - Are there better ways to do peer review?
 - Are there different ways to do peer review?

How useful is peer review?

- Some assurance of quality, particularly for the non-expert
- 4 of 5 potential reviewers say no (one publisher)
- Range of quality from very poor (nonsense syllables) to very thorough

Is peer review always necessary?

- Pharmacology / toxicology
- What do bears eat?
- Literary opinion
- For the researcher's career (why not review work as a whole instead?)
- Research reports vs. review articles

Are there better ways?

- Open peer review model - a model & an invitation

Elements:

- Signed peer reviews
- Open access peer reviews
- Automated processes - e.g. reviewer profiles, calendars, selection of reviewers, tracking
- Credit for reviewers

Open Peer Review - a Model

- Goals:
- research to improve peer review
- science literacy
- cost efficient
- facilitate new / global collaboration

Peer Review & Collaboration

- Why wait?
- Research funders: review before the grant!
- Talk to your peers before you start the research!
- Share your data

Final thought...

We advance knowledge by working together, by giving and accepting critical analysis and helpful suggestions. Those who do the work need to be appropriately acknowledged and rewarded.

There are different, and better, ways to do all these things, than relying on a tradition based on factors that have changed.