

- Open participation or public commenting could add significant value – if scientists and scientific communities used it appropriately.
- Other ways to improve peer review include
 - Leverage expertise – review would mirror the way we do science. Collaboration among reviewers to evaluate their area of expertise for each article.
 - Split gatekeeping vs technical into different layers: Technical side at the preprint level, suitability for the journal and ethical standards at the journal level.
- ASAPBio is proposing a journal agnostic assigned peer review system. “Peer feedback” is the name for their proposed infrastructure where review of technical merit comes after submission to preprint server, but before submission to journals. Journals check suitability and ethics etc and function more as curators. See page 10 of full summary.
- HHMI has proposed Article-specific Tags or Badges which would be easily generated and consumed (to replace JIF) post-publication tags or badges that were indicators of article-level scientific quality and impact, that changed over time. See page 11 of full summary.

NEXT STEPS:

HHMI and CZI will partner to support experiments in transforming peer review. Experimental details and all data must be shared openly. All are welcome to apply. Stay tuned for additional details.

Platforms of which to be aware:

F1000 – [F1000Research](#) is an Open Research publishing platform for life scientists, offering immediate publication of articles and other research outputs without editorial bias.

Crossref - [Crossref](#) Makes research outputs (including funding) easy to find, cite, link, and assess.

Publons - [Publons](#) is a website and free service for academics to track, verify and showcase their peer review and editorial contributions across the world's academic journals.

[hypothes-is](#) - Hypothes.is uses annotation to enable sentence-level note taking or critique on top of news, blogs, scientific articles, books, terms of service, ballot initiatives, legislation and more.

[PubPeer](#) is another post-publication commenting tool. It seems great for science but harsh for authors.

Speaker list and links to slides:

Opening session:

Meeting Objectives (Ron Vale) – [slides](#)

Keynotes

- Erin O'Shea (HHMI) – [slides](#)
- Jeremy Berg (Science) – [slides](#)
- Mike Lauer (NIH) – [slides](#)

Session 1:

- Tony Ross-Hellauer (KnowCenter) – slides
Open Peer Review – Researcher Attitudes and Next Steps
- Rebecca Lawrence (F1000) – [slides](#)
F1000: Our experiences with preprints followed by formal post-publication peer review
- Theo Bloom (BMJ) – [slides](#)
Open peer review at BMJ: What we know and what we don't
- Joyce Backus (NIH NLM) – [slides](#)
MEDLINE and PMC – Role of journal peer review in journal evaluation.
- Jennifer Lin (Crossref) – [slides](#)
Peer Review Metadata: Provisioning it to systems across the research enterprise
- Andrew Preston (Publons) – [slides](#)
Publons: Recognizing review and the challenges we've faced along the way.