

Peer Review

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

Aleksandar Dekanski¹

1. University of Belgrade, Serbia

The manuscript discusses a long-known and often discussed dilemma of whether peer review should be paid or not. General and already well-known views are presented without going deeper into the advantages and disadvantages, except in the most general sense.

Even if one ignores that peer review is a professional and moral "obligation" of anyone who receives a request to review a scientific paper (I expect my paper submitted for publication to be carefully, professionally, and quickly reviewed – it is my obligation to do the same when I am called upon to review someone else's paper), I think that paying reviewers can do more harm than good. First of all, there is a great danger of accepting the review of a work for the sake of profit even when the reviewer is not an expert in the field, or of doing it negligently, superficially, and carelessly. On the other hand, paying reviewers is a new cost for publishers, so it is logical that fees for authors will increase even more. (A special story is the justification of the hitherto high fees for publishing articles, and the fact that publishers have turned from promoters and entities whose main goal is the advancement of science into almost exclusively commercial companies that make high profits, with less and less regard for what and how they publish.)

The author would have to take a look at these and other downsides of paid peer reviewing, and especially analyze other possibilities for recognizing and valuing the work of reviewers. I will mention only a few possibilities: that reviews are evaluated and "scored" similarly to published papers, primarily open reviews (although a suitable evaluation method can be devised for incognito reviews – impact of the journal for which the review was made, responsibility and speed of review, etc.); that reviewers have benefits when they want to publish a paper in the journal (or with the publisher) for which they reviewed the paper (some publishers already practice this); inclusion of good reviewers in editorial boards....

To summarize, the text does not bring anything new, and it is very questionable whether it makes sense to publish it in this form.

Declarations

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.