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2. Open peer review – alternativ peer review tools and services

3. Peer review to data journals in Humanities
Significance of open science

Answering to the current state of scholarly communication:

- Slow, redundant, wasteful
- Moved by commercial interest
- Chaotic state of copyright
- Crisis of science:
  - Access, reproducibility, serial, evaluation
- Illusion of scientific freedom


@melimming; quote from @chartgerink
4 Fundamental Rules of Open Science

Accessible

Reusable

Available & Free

Transparent
You can make your workflow more open by ...

- adding alternative evaluation, e.g. with altmetrics
- communicating through social media, e.g. Twitter
- sharing posters & presentations, e.g. at FigShare
- using open licenses, e.g. CC0 or CC-BY
- publishing open access, ‘green’ or ‘gold’
- using open peer review, e.g. at journals or PubPeer
- sharing preprints, e.g. at OSF, arXiv or bioRxiv
- using actionable formats, e.g. with Jupyter or CoCalc
- open XML-drafting, e.g. at Overleaf or Authorea
- sharing protocols & workfl., e.g. at Protocols.io
- sharing notebooks, e.g. at OpenNotebookScience
- sharing code, e.g. at GitHub with GNU/MIT license
- sharing data, e.g. at Dryad, Zenodo or Dataverse
- pre-registering, e.g. at OSF or AsPredicted
- commenting openly, e.g. with Hypothes.is
- using shared reference libraries, e.g. with Zotero
- sharing (grant) proposals, e.g. at RIO

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.1147025
Success of an OA publishing platform

1. Quality control and moderation
2. Certification and reputation
3. Motivation and engagement


Tennant, J. et al. Thinking outside the black box of peer review
Peer review reevaluated

- How different is the principle of peer review from its practice?
- How do the web technologies change our expectations of scholarly communication (publishing, peer review)?
- Can these technologies change the critical state of peer review?
- Can the strong connection between peer review and journal publishing be broken?
Open peer review is an umbrella term for a number of overlapping ways that peer review models can be adapted in line with the aims of Open Science.

Open identities
• Authors and reviewers aware of each other’s identity

Open reports
• Review reports published alongside relevant article

Open participation
• Wider community able to contribute to review process

Open interaction
• Direct discussion between author(s)/reviewers, and/or between reviewers

Open pre-review manuscripts
• Manuscripts/pre-prints available online in advance of peer review

Open final-version commenting
• Review or commenting on final “version of record” publications.

Open platforms (“decoupled review”)
• Review is facilitated by a different organizational entity than the venue of publication
## Combinations

122 definitions analyzed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>n=</th>
<th>Open identities</th>
<th>Open reports</th>
<th>Open participation</th>
<th>Open interaction</th>
<th>Open pre-review</th>
<th>Open manuscripts</th>
<th>Open final-version</th>
<th>Open commenting</th>
<th>Open platforms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Open identities

Positives
• Increase quality of reports
• Foster transparency to avoid conflicts of interest
• More civil language (in review and response)

Negatives
• Difficulty in taking and giving critical feedbacks (reviewers might blunt their opinions for fear of reprisals esp. from senior peers)
• Labor-intensive process
Open reports

Positives
• Feedback improves work and provide contextual information
• Giving better feedback - increase review quality
• Enable credit and reward for review work
• Help train young researchers in peer reviewing

Negatives
• Higher refusal rates amongst potential reviewers
• Time-consuming and more demanding process
• Fear of being exposed (esp. for early career researchers)
Open participation

Positives

• Expanding the pool of reviewers (including to those non-traditional research actors)
• Support cross-disciplinary dialogue
• Increase number of reviewers
• Being part of the debate

Negatives

• Time issue: difficulties motivating commentators to take part and deliver useful critique
• Self-selecting reviewers tend to leave less “in-depth” responses
• Feedback from non-competent participants

T. Ross-Hellauer / OPR How & Why / PEERE Training School, Split, May 2018
And E. Görögh/OPR workshop results /DARIAH 2018, Paris, May 2018
Modes of Peer Review:

- Blind Peer Review
- Open Identities
- Open Reports

Decoupled peer review

Post-publication peer review

Interactive peer review

Pre-publication peer review and commenting

Collaborative peer review

Alternativ peer review tools and services

Publishers
Publishing platforms

Independent review services

Repository based review platforms & tools

Review/Annotation applications

Publishing platforms

Collaborative peer review

Interactive peer review

Post-publication peer review
Decoupled peer review
Preprint based publishing

Should researchers publish their findings before peer review?

BY IVAN ORANSKY AND ADAM MARCUS MAY 27, 2016
Any scientist can publish an assessment of the publications that she/he has read lately in less than one minute, by going to epistemio.com, searching the publication, and adding a rating. Ratings and reviews can be either anonymous or signed, according to authors’ choice. Epistemio hosts freely these ratings and reviews and provides them under an open access licence.

The Hypothesis Project is a new effort to implement an old idea: A conversation layer over the entire web that works everywhere, without needing implementation by any underlying site.
Redefining the roles

- Gatekeeping function as a content filter
- Typically closed system with a secretive and selective process
- Organised around journals
- Non-accountable editor-controlled “black box of peer review”
- Structurally limited (2-3 people)

- Collaborative, constructive peer review: quality control is achieved by consensus
- Self-organised, open and unrestricted communities
- Unrestricted content types and formats
- Elected ‘moderators’ accountable to communities
- Semi-automated matching of content to reviewers
Growing demands

1. Transparency


Growing demands

2. **Incentives to review**

   **Crediting peer review**
   - ✓ Publons, Peerage of Science.
   - ✓ Peer review in academic promotion.

![Table showing incentives to review across different fields]

3. **Training young scholars**
OPR in Humanities

This visualisation shows journal policies on (1) reviewers signing their peer reviews and (2) peer reviews being published. The information is sourced from Publons. The size of the bubbles on the plot corresponds to the number of journals in each subject for which Publons contains journal information. (2017)
https://publons.com/blog/who-is-using-open-peer-review/
Humanities data journal
Defining data

Data: something to be measured, collected, reported, and analyzed,

Data in the humanities: a digital, selective, machine-actionable construction of the object of humanistic inquiry.

2 types of data in the humanities:

1. big data (relatively unstructured, messy and implicit, relatively large in volume, and varied in form),

2. smart data (semi-structured or structured, clean and explicit, as well as relatively small in volume and of limited heterogeneity)

(Schoch, 2017)

The contextualization of data is needed to understand research data management.
Data storage and sharing


Figure 4: Access to research data (n=209)

Word processors and spreadsheets are the most common applications used to store and manage research assets

https://zenodo.org/record/260101#.XEB7v1xKjcv
Data sharing standards

**FAIR guiding principles** for research data stewardship

- set of principles, focused on ensuring that research objects are reusable
- rendering data and services Findable, Accessible, Interoperable, to serve the reuse of research objects
- FAIR simply describes the qualities or behaviors required of data resources to achieve.

**Data Citation Principles**

- cover purpose, function and attributes of citations
- recognize the dual necessity of creating citation practices that are both understandable by humans and machine-actionable
- Importance: data should be considered legitimate, citable products of research.
- Access: Data citations should facilitate access to the data themselves and to such associated metadata, documentation, code, and other materials,
- Persistence: Unique identifiers, and metadata describing the data, and its disposition,
- Interoperability and Flexibility: Data citation methods should be sufficiently flexible to accommodate the variant practices among communities but should not differ so much that they compromise interoperability of data citation practices across communities.
Data evaluation

Criteria for evaluating data

• Do the description and data make sense?
• Do the authors adequately explain the data’s utility to the community?
• Are the protocol/references for generating data adequate?
• Data format: is it standard for the field? Potentially re-usable?
• Does the article follow the required data article template?
• Is the data well documented?

Technical and subject-area review includes assessment of:

• Data logic
• Consistency
• Formatting
• Non-proprietary (i.e., open sourced/accessible)
• Plausibility
• High quality
• Handling & reuse
• Units of measurement
• Quality of collection method
• Presence of any anomalies


Elements

The data journal framework should include the following attributes:

- assignment of persistent identifiers (PIIDs) to datasets
- peer review of data
- metadata information and technical check
- links to related outputs (journal articles)
- facilitation of data citation
- standards compliance
- discoverability (indexing of the data)
Research data publication workflow

RDA-WDS Publishing Data Workflows Working Group (WG) has developed a data publication process:
Benefits

• Visibility of research
• Acknowledgement of work (DOI)
• Linking data to published results
• Complying with H2020 data mandate
• Enhancing findability of data (metadata)
• Finding new collaborations and new research topics
• Adding to the researchers profile (ORCID, OpenID, VIAF)
Thank you.
goeroegh@sub.uni-goettingen.de