



Review of peer review

Sebastian Nordhoff
August 22, 2019

- › scarce: grants, conferences
- › not-so-scarce: journal articles, books
- › hypothesis: reviews for scarce goods create more frustration and are more often perceived as “unfair”.

Is there reviewer fatigue?

- › are too many reviews solicited from individual researchers?
- › probably differences between books, journals, abstracts, grants
- › LangSci series editors do not report any particular problems in recruiting reviewers
- › getting reviewers to submit reviews in time requires some nagging, but seems feasible

- › In an competitive job market, researchers have to choose what to devote their time on
 - › articles
 - › data curation
 - › reviewing
 - › ...
- › articles figure prominently on your CV, data curation less, reviews even less so
- › reviews don't really offer return on your time investment
- › “I would like to thank two anonymous reviewers for helpful comments”
 - › does not really help your job prospects

- › not at all
- › once a year in summary note in the journal frontmatter
- › review statement “book reviewed by John Goldsmith and Mark Gibson”
- › open review: full review is available for inspection together with the book
 - › also said to improve civility and constructiveness in reviews
- › Publons: service which aggregates confirmed reviews.
 - › very commodified

- › Ross-Hellauer T. What is open peer review? A systematic review. F1000Research 2017, 6:588
<https://doi.org/10.12688/f1000research.11369.2>
- › shortcomings of traditional closed peer review
 - › reviewers have only weak levels of agreement, only slightly greater than chance
 - › “Peters and Ceci’s classic study found that eight out of twelve papers were rejected for methodological flaws when resubmitted to the same journals in which they had already been published”
 - › “Reviewers often fail to detect major methodological failings”
 - › “The global costs of reviewers’ time estimated at £1.9bn in 2008”

- › Tennant JP, Dugan JM, Graziotin D et al. A multi-disciplinary perspective on emergent and future innovations in peer review. F1000Research 2017, 6:1151 (<https://doi.org/10.12688/f1000research.12037.3>)
- › “we have little or no evidence that peer review ‘works,’ but we have lots of evidence of its downside”
- › “These dysfunctional issues should be deeply troubling to those who hold peer review in high regard as a ‘gold standard’”.

- › Based on the available empirical evidence, we should actually stop closed peer review right away
 - › expensive
 - › unreliable
 - › cumbersome
 - › slowing down research

Is closed peer review going to go away any time soon?

- › grants: unlikely because conflict of interest
- › conferences: unlikely because conflict of interest
- › books: unlikely because no crowd
- › journal articles: possibly

