

Review of: "An Empirical Study of Goal Intentions and Monetary Compensation for Reviewers in Information Science"

Liliana Katinas¹

¹ Universidad Nacional de La Plata

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Page 2:

- Reviewers are essential to control the scientific quality... "Control" may not be correct. Evaluate?
- The problem is that the effort required of them continues... their effort?
- (Johnson, Watkinson and Mabe 2018) ... Usually the citation is: Johnson, Watkinson and Mabe (2018), but it may be a journal format.

This is so because they are usually authors in the research

field, but also manage research centers' processes What does research centers' processes mean?

In the literature, several articles have studied the different aspects of academic

procrastination The following paragraphs on procrastination seem to focus more on authors than reviewers, deviating from the objective of this manuscript. The main reasons for procrastination of the reviewers are already mentioned above. Maybe you can reduce those paragraphs.

Page 4: In this paper, the research question addressed is: What motivates reviewers in

Information Science?... The terms 'Information Science', which are also in the title, should be defined prior to the objective of the manuscript.

Page 5:

However, what do we understand by reviewer

profiles? To explain this, let us consider a simple example of two professors with different

reviewer profiles: Mary and Max..... I believe that this example is an oversimplification of the reality. Not always choosing the order of the reviewers' tasks has to do with organization.

For example, a major problem that should be contemplated is that in many countries the scientific system does not contemplate the review tasks in the periodic scientists reports. At the same time, scientists are required to publish in high-ranked journals, leaving little time for other tasks (such as reviews). Therefore, they focus their efforts on publication and not on performing reviews. In addition, the scientific communication system as a whole, and particularly the publication of scientific journals, has mainly become business-driven, governed more by the laws of the publishing market than by the

laws of science. Scientists thus become free labor for a lucrative business. In many cases, those same scientists have to pay for publishing in certain journals. This influences scientists when receiving requirements to review.

His editor then wrote Max again to remind him of the review deadline, and as a result, I think that it is not the editor of Max, but the editor of the authors of the manuscript that Max has to review.

Page 6:

Even though the survey did not collect any basic demographic information ... it should be interesting to know also the country of the reviewer.

Page 7:

Q1.4 Networking opportunities. Maybe you can define 'networking opportunities' in the context of a review process.

Page 8:

We also found that between "Q1.1: Quality control" and "Q1.2: Helping the profession" there does not exist a significant difference ... This could be because they are interrelated.

Page 11:

2.2.3 Monetary incentives In this item, it would be interesting to know the country of the reviewer. The need for payment for a reviewer of the underdeveloped country vs. a developed country would not be the same. This could bias the results of this manuscript.

Question 3 (compensation) Some journals offer a one-year free subscription instead of monetary compensation.

Page 12:

Question 4: I work hard in the peer review process. It is unlikely that a reviewer (even when anonymous) will accept that they do not work hard in a review process. It would be accepting that you are not good enough in your work. The same with Q 5-8.

Page 15: 2.2.7 Reviewer's utility gain I cannot evaluate this part; it is not my area of expertise.

Page 26:

Therefore, using an online survey, our answer to the first two questions would be as follows: (1) complex review processes carried out by reviewers who show severe present bias would have to be financially rewarded in a sufficiently high amount; If these results are to be implemented, how will editors know if



reviewers show severe bias?