

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

Wenceslao Arroyo-Machado¹

¹ Arizona State University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The authors have tackled a highly relevant and timely subject in the general field of science and specifically in information science, exploring the intrinsic and extrinsic incentives that motivate academics to accept manuscript reviews. Unraveling these factors can be extremely beneficial not only in shedding light on what influences reviewers to accept a review and how to improve the quality and efficiency of the peer review process, but also in understanding the broader implications for scholarly publishing. However, there are several aspects that require detailed attention to strengthen the contribution of the work.

Major issues

Firstly, the study exhibits a lack of alignment between the introduction and literature review and the objectives, which are too broad and presented imprecisely. This disconnect is exacerbated by results that mix descriptive data sections with statistical tests without a clear presentation or explanation of investigative expectations, hypotheses, and selected methods, further complicating reader comprehension. To improve clarity and coherence, it would be advisable to reorganize the introduction and objectives to more clearly reflect the literature review, establishing a well-defined theoretical framework. This would involve constructing an argument leading to the research questions and not merely commenting on the results of other papers as a list of related outcomes. Furthermore, given the results, defining specific research questions with very precise objectives to address them (without using i.e. in the delineation of both elements) would be beneficial. These should be directly linked to each statistical analysis. Also, the results section should be directly oriented towards directly answering these questions and structured accordingly, simplifying or reducing redundant or ancillary information (like the correlations from question one), and especially shifting descriptive or introductory aspects of statistical methods to the methodology section so that both sections are well differentiated. These changes would be of great value to the reader and would facilitate understanding of the authors' interests, what they have done, and their responses to these questions.

Secondly, the lack of clear definitions for key terms such as "high-difficulty manuscript" and "reviewer motivations" complicates the interpretation of the results. These terms are central to the study and should be articulated clearly to ensure that both the premises and conclusions are uniformly understood by a diverse audience. For example, the authors query reviewers about high-difficulty manuscripts, but it is essential to clarify what the authors and reviewers understand

by this—whether there is a clear alignment or if it could be somewhat subjective. In an academic work, particularly one involving a survey, such terminology should be very well defined. If the authors have provided guidance in their form to ensure clarity, highlighting this would be of great importance; otherwise, it should be emphasized as a significant limitation.

Thirdly, the questionnaire as posed includes some elements that could benefit from revision, especially for a future survey. It would be advisable to revise the response options to eliminate those that may introduce biases or that are not relevant to a review process, such as "networking opportunities," which reflects more a sign of bad practice than a pertinent motivation for peer review. The low scores on this question clearly reflect this. Moreover, adding options that reflect ethical and professional responsibilities, such as academic duty, would enhance the quality of the data collected. The third question is the most difficult to interpret; it would have been more valuable to know if a monetary reward influences reviewers, but including specific monetary amounts can be confusing and can vary greatly by geographical region. Regarding the question about handling competitive deadlines, clarifying that the options are not mutually exclusive and better explaining the context of "competitive scenario" would help participants provide more accurate and aligned responses with their real experiences. Additionally, for questions related to self-perception, it would be more enriching to reconsider them given the difficulty and subjectivity that can entail assessing quality on such a broad numerical scale. In fact, asking reviewers to rank the elements of the review process to which, in their opinion, they pay most attention might be a better approach.

Despite these comments being related to the reformulation of the survey for a future study, this does not mean that the results should be overlooked. Given the complexity that a repeated survey without these issues entails, the authors should address them as much as possible. Moreover, some complementary aspects that must be revised in the results include the interpretation of the statistics and their discussion, or rather, the articulation of a clear argument reflecting what they imply. For example, in the correlations from the first question and later in Table 6, the presence of correlations (negative or positive) is not really palpable given the low values, making it inappropriate to suggest a correlation exists, and all statistical aspects here seem a bit unnecessary given the results offered, which could easily be discussed more simply using descriptive statistics. Additionally, more information and a more detailed and robust description of the survey form and response would be helpful. If the authors have information about the characteristics of the reviewers who participated in the survey, it would be very enlightening and shed light on possible biases.

Minor issues

- The introduction and literature review need to be improved. In addition to all the previously mentioned aspects about their articulation around a narrative that the paper wants to answer and that connect very directly with the research questions and objectives, there are several works that may be of interest, some of which are:
 - Gallo, S. A., Thompson, L. A., Schmaling, K. B., & Glisson, S. R. (2020). The participation and motivations of grant peer reviewers: A comprehensive survey. *Science and Engineering Ethics*, 26(2), 761-782. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11948-019-00123-1>
 - Nobarany, S., Booth, K. S., & Hsieh, G. (2016). What motivates people to review articles? The case of the human-

computer interaction community. *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology*, 67(6), 1358-1371. <https://doi.org/10.1002/asi.23469>

- Park, I.-U., Peacey, M. W., & Munafò, M. R. (2014). Modelling the effects of subjective and objective decision making in scientific peer review. *Nature*, 506(7486), 93-96. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature12786>
- The example of Mary and Max is interesting but perhaps too lengthy and disrupts the reading of the manuscript. A simplification should be considered at a minimum.
- This statement must be supported by references: "In general, the corresponding authors are senior researchers or highly experienced group leaders. Therefore, they will normally be more representative of associate or full professors than of PhD students."
- It is recommended to replace tables with clearer barplots from the appendices or integrate all of this as they are much clearer.
- Creating a discussion section is essential, as it would establish a link between these results and previous literature, thereby more effectively developing the implications of the work.