Peer Review: Challenges for Authors, Editors, and Reviewers

90% of researchers believe peer review improves the quality of their published work (CIBER/University of Tennessee 2013) and yet, peer review presents significant challenges for authors, editors and reviewers alike. Securing appropriate reviewers is a universal challenge for editors, a process which not only prolongs time to decision for authors, but contributes to reviewer “burnout” when reviewer pools are not large enough to support demand. Researchers spend an enormous amount of time reviewing manuscripts, estimated at 30.5 million hours per year (Rubric 2013), and are often asked to repeatedly review the same manuscript as it is rejected and submitted to one journal after another, in many cases unchanged. In July 2015, Wiley surveyed 170,000 researchers to better understand their experience with peer review. With 2,982 respondents from around the world and across the full research career arc, we’ve used the key findings to provide robust training resources and recognition initiatives for reviewers and to innovate around peer review to make it more efficient and beneficial for all stakeholders.

• Peer review places a heavy burden on researchers: 49% of reviewers review for five or more journals (61% of reviewers with +5 years experience).
• Peer review affects the author experience: The quality and duration of peer review are influential factors that affect an author’s view of a journal.
• Reviewers want more recognition and training: Acknowledgment and feedback ranked as the most valued forms of recognition. 77% of reviewers want more peer review training.

Consequent challenges for Editors: Finding reviewers quickly can be difficult and time consuming, but speed makes your journal considerably more marketable and attractive to authors.

Advantages of Transferable Peer Review: improving workflow efficiency

- Editors reject and refer scientifically sound manuscripts to other journals both before and after peer review, and authors have the option to revise and respond to reviews before the transfer.
- Automated transfer of manuscripts and associated metadata to new journals saves authors and reviewers time and effort.
- Reviewers aren’t repeatedly asked to review the same work and peer review is streamlined to conserve the utility of their completed reviews: known as portable reviews.
- Previous reviews can provide context to the Editors of second journal, expediting review and the time to final decision.

Peer Review Transfer Networks

Transplant Peer Review Network
- 3 Participating journals:
  - American Journal of Transplantation
  - Artificial Organs
  - Clinical Transplantation
- Pediatric Transplantation
- Transplant Infectious Disease
- Transplant International
- Xenotransplantation

Neuroscience Peer Review Network
- Journals refer to other journals within their tier or to one tier below.
- Manuscripts can also be referred directly to Brain and Behavior, a broad-scope open access neuroscience journal.

OPEN ACCESS REFERRALS
- Portfolio of 24 OA journals accept referrals from other journals of similar or related scope.
- Rigorous review focused on sound science, versus judgement of novelty or perceived impact.
- Widest dissemination of authors published research through immediate free access and Creative Commons licenses.
- Pioneering initiatives to improve reproducibility and transparency of published research.

Journals receiving the highest number of manuscripts transferred with reviews:

Introducing Health Science Reports

An Open Access journal dedicated to the full spectrum of medical and clinical sciences

- Wide scope.
- Broad, multidisciplinary scope.
- Considers all study types (protocols, research articles, reviews, editorials, meta-analyses, clinical perspectives, etc.)
- Fully Open Access: Immediate availability and authors retain copyright.
- Rapid, yet rigorous peer review. Acceptance criteria based on scientific soundness, with no requirement for novelty or perceived impact.
- Considers direct submissions and referrals from over 60 selective journals in Wiley’s health sciences portfolio. Currently looking to include journals from our society partners as well.

www.healthsciencereports.org

Reviewer Recognition and Training

Support is needed throughout the reviewer career arc

- 4 out of 5 researchers agree there is not enough recognition
- 89% Early Career Researchers
- 65% Established Career Researchers
- Would like more training

Wiley partners with Publons to provide recognition for peer review

Reviewers:
- Build a verified record of their reviewing contributions (pre- and post-publication).
- Can showcase their reviewer activity for funding applications and promotions
- Get credit for their reviews: can be synced with ORCID

Editors need to:
- Keep a record of each manuscript handled.
- Recognize reviewers and monitor their review activity.
- Search review profiles to identify suitable reviewers for their journal
- Build a verified record of their reviewing activity.
- Get credit for their reviews: can be synced with ORCID

Training
- Peer review mentorship program and education for early career researchers.

www.wileypeerreview.com

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary: What Wiley is doing to overcome challenges with peer review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The use of transferable peer review, through the creation of networks and referrals, improves the efficiency of the peer review process, reducing burden on peer reviewers, helping to speed up time in review for an author, and helping to make the journal more attractive and useful for the community. Transfers without review help the workflow too as they allow for quick decisions and facilitate the submission to another journal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additionally, referrals to Open Access journals give the opportunity to provide a home for all scientifically sound science and enable wide dissemination of research.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing opportunities and offering tools for reviewer training and recognition, improves the quality of reviews and helps to facilitate the future growth of the reviewer pool.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>