

Peer Review

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

Reme Melero¹¹. Spanish National Research Council, Madrid, Spain

The author raises the issue of the existing problem of accepting to peer review due to the high scientific output, which increasingly saturates researchers with work to evaluate. As an alternative to this situation, the author believes that an economic incentive could solve this problem. He puts the focus on gold open access journals, which in reality does not matter whether the journal is open access or not, since the problem is the same. He states that young researchers have no experience in evaluation and that this can lead to a decrease in the quality of the articles published, which I do not agree with at all, and I will explain why. According to my experience as an editor and when I have requested evaluations from young people, the result has been very satisfactory, being meticulous, even with more care and detail than a senior because they put more effort into doing it with greater responsibility. On the other hand, based on my experience, there is no scientific basis to think that a young researcher does not have the scientific foundation to make an evaluation. Therefore, I believe that the author does not take much advantage of what has already been described in other forums; he suggests an alternative to the recognition of reviewers based on an economic reward. From my point of view, this would be an even greater argument for publishers when they say that peer review is expensive. Peer review is not expensive for them because they do not pay for this service, which is done altruistically by researchers under the motto "today for you, tomorrow for me."

Declarations

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.