

NEWS RELEASE



Bob Campbell, Publishing Research Consortium

Tel: +44 (0)1865 476118

Robert.Campbell@oxon.blackwellpublishing.com

Mark Ware

Tel: +44 117 959 3726

mark@markwareconsulting.com

Researchers want to improve, not change, Peer Review

London, UK. January 25, 2008

Most researchers are not in favour of changing the current system of peer review for journal articles; they believe that it helps to improve scientific communications and increases the overall quality of published papers. Alternatives such as 'open peer review' (where papers are available for public comment prior to publication) were not popular in a new study of over 3,000 senior authors, reviewers, and editors from around the world. However, some were interested in post-publication review, where a published paper is opened up for public comment, as a useful supplement to, but not a replacement for, traditional peer review.

Researchers did, however, prefer double-blind review (where both reviewers and authors are unaware of each other's identity) to the currently prevalent single-blind system (where only the reviewer is anonymous), seeing this as a way to improve both objectivity and fairness. A majority of reviewers and editors also said it would be desirable to be able to review authors' data as part of peer review.

While of the majority of respondents saw peer review as an effective filter for research, some did not think it was effective at detecting plagiarism, fraud or misconduct.

The report, by Mark Ware Consulting, also underscored that the most productive reviewers are currently overworked, which is an area that may need further monitoring and analysis.

"Publishing peer review continues to be a hot-button topic within most disciplines," said Bob Campbell, Chairman, Steering Group of the Publishing Research Consortium and Senior Publisher, Wiley-Blackwell. "This study will help publishers better understand researchers' perceptions of peer review and underpin future discussions in the scholarly community."

"This is the first study of this size to look at peer review from the perspective of authors and reviewers," said Mark Ware, Director, Mark Ware Consulting. "This survey has produced a wealth of data that will inform the peer review debate and provide a platform for future studies."

The full report, "[Peer Review in Scholarly Journals](#): perspective of the scholarly community. An international study", can be accessed on the PRC site at <http://www.publishingresearch.net>. A summary report, "Peer Review: Benefits, Perceptions, and Alternatives", is also available.

About the Publishing Research Consortium

The Publishing Research Consortium is a group of associations and publishers, which supports global research into scholarly communication in order to enable evidence-based discussion. Our objective is to support work that is scientific and pro-scholarship. Overall, we aim to promote an understanding of the role of publishing and its impact on research and teaching. For more information, visit <http://www.publishingresearch.net>