

## A Proposal for iConference 2022

**Title:** Peer review innovations in the era of open science: Transparent and open

**Type:** Interactive Event (Panel)

### Panelists:

Peiling Wang, The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, USA; Moderator, Presenter & Organizer

Dietmar Wolfram, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, USA; Presenter & Organizer

Ludo Waltman, Leiden University, The Netherlands; Presenter

John Budd, University of Missouri, USA; Discussant

### Abstract:

Peer review is the cornerstone of scientific publishing. The blind-review system has been criticized as limited and in need of innovation. Innovations in peer review have been experimented with and adopted since the 1990s (Godlee, 2002). However, the pace has been slow, especially by large publishers. On 24 March 2021, OpenAIRE announced: "*Open Research Europe Officially Launched!*" (<https://libereurope.eu/article/official-launch-of-open-research-europe-ore-publishing-platform/>). This open access platform publishes scientific articles in natural sciences, medical and health sciences, humanities and the arts, and social sciences, etc. Most significantly, it adopts a rapid and transparent publishing model in that manuscripts are published first followed by an open and transparent peer-review process in real-time. What impact will this publishing model make on open science? How will researchers in information science embrace this model as a reader, author, or reviewer? Which aspects of open peer review could benefit scholarly journals in information science?

### Description:

As the first Open Access publisher, Biomed Central (BMC) is also a pioneer in open peer review (OPR). Over the past two decades, BMC OPR journals experimented with *open peer review* (publishing named review reports alongside the article), as well as *transparent peer review* (publishing review reports without identity unless reviewers wish to sign) (<https://www.biomedcentral.com/about/advancing-peer-review#models-of-peer-review>). OPR as an important part of open science is being adopted by different disciplines at various rates. Journals in medical and health

sciences, and natural sciences, have been early adopters (Wolfram, Wang, Hembree & Park, 2020), while fewer researchers in information science have chosen to publish peer review reports of their articles or sign peer review reports, and few journals in information science have adopted forms of OPR to date. How will the growing adoption of OPR impact information science?

The panelists bring extensive experience with journal editing and the topic of OPR:

Peiling Wang is Professor at the iSchool at the University of Tennessee, Knoxville where her research areas include user-centered information retrieval, scientific communication in the era of open science, reporting standards for biomedical publishing, and post-publication expert recommendation systems.

Ludo Waltman is Professor of Quantitative Science Studies at the Centre for Science and Technology Studies (CWTS) at Leiden University, where he conducts research in altmetrics, bibliometrics, and scientometrics. He serves as Editor-in-Chief of the MIT Press open access journal *Quantitative Science Studies*. He is the 2021 recipient of the Derek John de Solla Price Medal. He gave a keynote at the 11th International Workshop on Bibliometric-enhanced Information Retrieval @ERIR2021 on Openness, transparency, and inclusivity in science.

Dietmar Wolfram is Professor and Senior Associate Dean at the iSchool at the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee where he conducts research in scholarly communication, applied informetrics and information retrieval. He serves as Specialty Chief Editor for the Scholarly Communication section of the open-access journal *Frontiers in Research Metrics and Analytics*.

John Budd is Professor Emeritus and Editor of the *Journal of Education for Library and Information Science*. He also served as editor of *Library Resources and Technical Services*, and monograph series for the Association of College and Research Libraries. He engaged in an OPR experiment by *College and Research Libraries* 2018.

### **Purpose and Intended Audience:**

The purpose of this interactive panel is to debate emerging, new open peer review (OPR) in scientific journal publishing. The intended audiences include researchers, authors and reviewers of scholarly and scientific journals, journal editors, and publishers.

### **Proposed Format and Engagement:**

Interactive session with Zoom integrating Mentimeter or another interactive real-time poll/survey tool to engage the audience.

At the beginning of the session, the moderator will poll the audience with the Mentimeter App in Zoom regarding their experience with OPR (or the built-in Zoom polling feature if it cannot be integrated with Zoom). [10 minutes]

Each panelist will comment on an aspect of OPR in which they have been involved [40 minutes]

- Dietmar Wolfram will provide a summary of the state of the art of OPR and current models and his experience as an editor for a journal with a more limited form of OPR.
- Ludo Waltman will discuss his experience as the Editor-in-Chief of Quantitative Science Studies, which is pilot-testing transparent peer review
- Peiling Wang will discuss her observations of experiences and attitudes towards OPR by scientists.
- John Budd will serve as a discussant to highlight the points of the panelists and synthesize the poll responses and interactive discussions

The interactive session following the brief panelist presentations will be open discussion and debate on the future of OPR in information science and the initial poll results. [30 minutes]

The session will conclude with a new poll where audience members report on what they have taken away from the session. [10 minutes]

### **Goals or Outcomes:**

The goals of this interactive panel session are to:

- 1) make audience members more aware of emerging OPR trends in scholarly communication
- 2) solicit spontaneous responses from the audience on perceptions of OPR as authors, reviewers, and editors, or publishers
- 3) shed light on the potential for adopting OPR in scholarly communication in information science

### **Relevance to the iConference:**

This topic addresses the conference theme of “Information for a better world” by highlighting how more open processes for peer review can help the scientific enterprise to ensure high-quality research literature output and integrity in the peer-review process. This is something that impacts all researchers. OPR also has the potential to help inform the next generation of researchers by opening up the closed nature of peer review by publishing peer review reports.

**Duration:**

The proposed session will run for 90 minutes.

**Special Requirements:**

There will be no special requirements.

**References:**

Godlee, Fiona (2002) Making Reviewers Visible: Openness, Accountability, and Credit. *JAMA*. 287(21):2762–2765. doi:10.1001/jama.287.21.2762.

Wang, Peiling & Wolfram, Dietmar (2020). Trends in Open Peer Review: Research by Information Scientists. Guest Post at <https://asapbio.org/trends-in-open-peer-review>

Waltman, Ludo (forthcoming) Making my peer review activity more useful. [Blog post].

Wolfram, Dietmar., Wang, Peiling., Hembree, Adam., & Park, H. (2020). Open peer review: Promoting transparency in open science. *Scientometrics*, 125, 1033-1051.