Seeking reviewers to the ends of the earth
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74% of researchers feel that peer review improves the quality of their published paper

82% of researchers agreed that without peer review there is no control in scientific communication

PRC Survey 2016
30 million researcher hours spent reviewing papers in 2013
31% of researchers disagreed that the current peer review system is the best we can achieve.

PRC Survey 2016

33% of researchers agree that peer review in journals needs a complete overhaul.

PRC Survey 2016
Recruiting reviewers

#1 pain point for editors

On average we invite 4.5 reviewers in order to get 2 completed
Increase the pool

28% of researchers feel peer review is unsustainable because there are too few willing reviewers.
Who is bearing the review burden?
Who says yes?

Median review invitation acceptance rates:

- China: 61%
- USA: 46%
% decline because too busy

China: 20%

USA: 38%
China

- 42% “too busy”
- 15% Paper outside expertise
- 9% Too busy with own research
- 8% Too many other reviewing commitments
- 6% Other

USA

- 25% “too busy”
- 25% Paper outside expertise
- 13% Too busy with own research
- 5% Too many other reviewing commitments
- 4% Other
Who are we asking to bear the review burden?
% of submissions vs reviews

Authors

- China
- USA
- Japan
- Brazil
- India
- Germany
- UK
- Italy, Spain, France

Reviewers

- % of submissions vs reviews
Institutional recognition:

Reviewers would spend more time reviewing if it received better recognition as a measurable research output. [n=2296]
“Reviewing is not sufficiently acknowledged as a valuable research activity by research assessment bodies/my institution.”

Institutional recognition of reviewing

7 out of 10 USA reviewers agree

5 out of 10 Chinese reviewers agree
Motivation to review

Community
Peer reviewing allows the reviewer to be an active participant in their research community.

Reciprocation
Many feel it is important to reciprocate the peer review that they in-turn receive from their community.
Why peer review?

Actively participate in community
Improves writing skills
Professional recognition/credit
Expected behaviour
Reputation development/career progression

Expected behaviour
Improves writing skills
Reciprocation of review effort
First view of new research
PI/Supervisor recommendation

China
USA
Influence on decision to accept review invitations

Prestige & reputation of the journal has most influence
Influencing factors on decision to accept review invitations

Prestige and reputation of the journal
Feedback provided by the journal
Relationship/ networking with editor
CME/CPD credit/accreditation
China

Prestige and reputation of the journal
Relationship/ networking with editor
Acknowledgement in the journal
Reviewer benefits/rewards offered
USA
How can we better distribute reviewer effort?

1. Broaden horizons
2. Improve identification of potential reviewers
3. Provide support (training, feedback, recognition)
Reviewing entry route

31% Become reviewers as a result of publishing a paper

China: 41%

“Approached by an editor I know/personal contact”

China: 1%  USA: 14%
Identifying potential reviewers

Connecting research and researchers to increase discoverability

Get credit for your reviews for Wiley

Wiley has partnered with Publons to give you official recognition for your contribution to peer review. This partnership means you can opt-in to have your reviews for 22 participating Wiley journals automatically added to your Publons profile.

456 Wiley reviewers have already added 4228 of their reviews to Publons.

What is Publons?

Publons helps you to record, verify, and showcase your peer review contributions for use in promotion applications. You get credit even if your reviews are anonymous and the manuscript is never published.

Take a look at a Publons reviewer profile or browse our top reviewers if you want to learn more. If you’d like to get a head start on your reviewer profile,
Globally, 77% of reviewers would participate in peer review training sessions.

- China: 88%
- USA: 64%
Providing constructive, useful feedback was most popular training topic for 50% of all regions.

- **How to handle re-reviews**
  Popular in UK, Ireland and US.

- **How to become a reviewer**
  Popular in Asia, Middle East and North Africa.
Preferred recognition initiatives

Recognition
Recognition (in the form of feedback and acknowledgment) is more valued more than rewards (like cash payments).

3/6 top preferred initiatives are related to Feedback
- on the quality of their review
- being informed of the decision outcome for the paper
- seeing other reviewer comments

2nd most preferred category of reward is Acknowledgement
- in the printed journal
- on the journal’s website
- or a personal note from the editor
What would make you more likely to accept an invitation to review?

A certificate from Journal
Info on decision for reviewed paper
Visibility of other reviewer reports
Ed feedback on quality of review
Reviewer of the year award

Info on final decision for reviewed paper
Ed. feedback on quality of review
Acknowledgement in the journal
Acknowledgement on journal's website
Personal access to journal content

China
USA
We need to:

1. Increase the reviewer pool
2. Ensure reviewers are well trained, trustworthy, and produce good quality reviews
3. Reward reviewers in order to recognise their work and maintain motivation
Sources of data

Wiley Peer Review Study 2015
3000 reviewers across all regions and subject disciplines

Publishing Research Consortium Peer Review Survey 2015
2004 responses reviewers across all regions and subject disciplines
Thank you