

Peer Review

Review of: "Open-Access Publishing and the Reviewer Crisis: Rethinking Incentives for Quality Peer Review"

Masanori Arita¹

1. Independent researcher

This work is written as an essay, not as a research article or review. Its subjective viewpoint might appeal to readers who share a similar academic environment, but hardly reaches out if the reader already possesses a different viewpoint in the general review system.

What the author insists on is a kind of reward system for the cost of reviewing, and there have been (indeed) many attempts. Let me list some of them (not at all comprehensive).

1. The journal "Nucleic Acids Research" (OUP) used to provide a CD/book voucher for the review. I received not a few classic CDs.
2. Publons Ltd. was a venturing company to give recognition to review profiles. Now it is a part of Clarivate.
3. MDPI gives vouchers for reviewing its submissions.

There are many ways to reward reviewers, and many attempts have been made. I do not know which were the most effective and appropriate prizes. Probably it is impossible to price each review at the time of reviewing. At least, OUP does not give CD books to reviewers anymore. After 10 or 20 years, maybe we can assess 'superve' reviewers who excavated golden eggs of science. The balance of tracking past reviews and the reward process is subtle because senior researchers (probably) wish to be awarded while they are active.

I suggest the author first survey such past and ongoing trials and establish the opinion or remedies after analysing background politics.

Declarations

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.