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A note on transparency

While similar, there are important differences between “Open” and “Transparent” review.

Open
- Content = visible
- Reviewer Identity = visible

Transparent
- Content = visible
- Reviewer Identity = may be anonymous

Transparency empowers journals to embrace open practices
Interest in Open Peer Review is growing
Why ‘Transparent’ Peer Review?

Publons Global State of Peer Review report:
- Extensive data from Publons, ScholarOne, and Web of Science;
- Survey responses from ~12,000 researchers around the globe;
- Statistics and insights on the future direction of peer review.

publons.com/community/gspr

Source: Publons’ Global State of Peer Review report, September 2018
Older, established researchers are more hesitant regarding open review practices:

- Fewer than a quarter of surveyed researchers aged 56-65 were likely or very likely to review for journals with open policies.
- Single and double-blind were still the most preferred review policies amongst all surveyed researchers.
What problem are we trying to solve?

Increasing interest in forms of Open Peer Review amongst publishers, funders, researchers and academic institutions.

Part of the growing Open Research movement, but has also gained traction as a means of:

• improving research integrity and reproducibility;
• decreasing fraudulent peer review; and
• discouraging manipulation of the peer review process.

Adoption of open review policies has been restricted by a lack of viable integrated workflow options, resulting in manual solutions where implemented. These:

• soak up editorial time and resource;
• inhibit rollout due to capacity; and
• often entail complex, legacy workflows.
Traditional peer review has been subject to criticism for lack of accountability, biases, lack of incentives, wastefulness. In response, a wide variety of changes to peer review have been suggested … many are ways in which peer review can be “opened up” Tony Ross-Hellauer

- Our challenge becomes to open-up peer review in a sensitive, flexible, friction-free way.
What do we mean by Transparent Peer Review?

We give authors the option to choose “open reports.” We let peer reviewers know, and can give them the choice to sign their report.

Journals that adopt our Transparent Peer Review approach:

- show the value they add during peer review by publishing reviewer reports, author responses, and editor decision letters as open reports;
- make a permanent citable record of these contributions;
- show they are accountable; and
- embrace open research, and enable researchers to do the same

Significance: A “world first”

The journal *Clinical Genetics* piloted the world’s first scalable, automated way to publish an article’s complete peer review process.

Each element is assigned its own digital object identifier (DOI).

This pilot is a partnership between Wiley, Publons, and Clarivate started in July, announced in September 2018.

Publons Transparent Peer Review addresses these problems

1. Robust and scalable model, working within established systems
2. Minimal effort and input from the publisher & researchers
3. Flexible and adaptable to specific editorial policies
4. Provides reviewers, authors and editors with a 360° view of their contribution
Simplified Workflow for TPR

1. ScholarOne collects author and reviewer options, and peer review content.
2. Publisher sends feed of accepted articles to Publons; Publons collects relevant author, reviewer and peer review data from ScholarOne.
3. Publons creates article peer review pages and registers peer review content DOIs.
4. Article publication triggers peer review content publication on Publons.
Demo

- **Publisher article page:** onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/cge.13450

  “**Peer Review:** The peer review history for this article is available at publons.com/publon/10.1111/cge.13450/”

- **Publons article page:** publons.com/publon/10.1111/cge.13450/

  Navigation pane to quickly assess key peer review content.
Our Transparent Peer Review model is embedded into the editorial workflow tools editors are already using.

Workflow enabled in ScholarOne as per our pilot with Wiley.

Workflow will be further streamlined through the ScholarOne API.
More Journals Join Our Transparent Peer Review Pilot:
hub.wiley.com/community/exchanges/discover/blog/2019/01/22/progressing-towards-transparency-more-journals-join-our-transparent-peer-review-pilot

See asapbio.org/letter for the growing list of 350+ journals adding transparency to peer review.

Impact: Success at 1 journal, so we extended to 11

Transparent Peer Review

“The 83% opt-in rate to publishing the contents of peer reviews is phenomenal and reflects a real demand for more transparency in the publishing process. I hope this success encourages many additional journals to offer the option to their own authors.”

Jessica Polka, Director, ASAPbio

83% of authors opted in

Clinical Genetics

Yes, 278

No, 58
Transparent Peer Review

Next steps: Learn and grow

In May 2019, we’ll analyse data from 11 journals.

There’s demand at Wiley already: Our “waitlist” for Wiley journals has 35 of 50 places taken.

If results are good in May, we’ll begin to extend and will add more Wiley journals in clusters through 2019 and 2020.

3 key observations: Opt-out vs. opt-in… build evidence… aim for scale
What are we doing next?

- Building on the success of the initial pilot with Wiley
- Expanding this pilot to include further Wiley journals and additional ScholarOne partners (limited number)