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Value-added services, the natural evolution of institutional repositories

- Impact and usage metrics
- Integration with other institutional/national platforms for evaluation and monitoring purposes
- Recipients of non traditional outputs (code, data, multimedia, digitized material..)
- Researcher pages and integration with CVs
- Science funders tracking
- Maps of scientific networks
- Digital preservation
- Overlay services: a new way to control, validate, evaluate and disseminate science?
Sources to identify candidates for the OPRM pilot project

https://publons.com/author/460519/luis-m-bautista#profile

Anna Traveset

Summary
Professor of Biology at the Mediterranean Institute of Advanced Studies, an institute of the Spanish Research Council and the University of the Balearic Islands. Head of the Terrestrial Ecology Laboratory. Editor of Okios. Diversity and Distributions and Assa PLANTS.

Work details
Research Professor
Spanish Research Council—University of the Balearic Islands
Biodiversity and Conservation

Articles published in PeerJ
The role of sex and age in the architecture of intrapopulation howler monkey-plant networks in continuous and fragmented rain forests
March 13th, 2014
Julie Barion, Mateo, Ana Paola Martinez-Martinez, Wesley Dettling, Ana Maria Gonzalez DiPierro, Rafael Lososio-Salinas, Anna Traveset

First evidence of cryptic species in the plumage of transoceanic migrant birds
October 20th, 2011
https://peerj.com/AnnaTraveset/
First feedback from researchers

- A long awaited service in the repository
- It is a great idea that merits success as currently peer review is not credited in researchers CVs at all due to its anonymity. But researchers will not have time to review and comment on other peers works as long as this activity remains outside of CVs recognition and lacks strong support from the research institutions
- The functionality may be also used to evaluate, accept and comment conference contributions before the event
- The project seems very interesting but I decline to participate right now due to lack of time and current demands [preparation of proposals for a national research call]
- I have contacted 3 reviewers: one has no time available, another is against any type of peer review as reviewing is a subjective activity in such a reduced scholarly discipline and the third one has accepted to do it
- The service should promote spontaneous discussion by anybody willing to send comments
- Inviting peers to an open evaluation may place people in an uncomfortable situation, the module should work 100% open
- The service is great for preprints and other unpublished works but has limited applicability for works that have been already evaluated and published
- Moreover, the service has a difficult application for very recent publications as publishers reserve an exclusive exploitation for a period of time
- How does open peer review operate in relation to “finished” pieces of work (i.e, a book)?
- How will the service compete with Academia.edu open review/comments?
Open peer review and open commentary: main characteristics of OPRM

- For the moment, all DIGITAL.CSIC users (with log-in permissions) and administrators can send review invitations.
- Open commentaries are available for those users with DIGITAL.CSIC log-in permissions. For the moment, the system allows for a comment per user per review.
- Administration filter in place before publication in order to block spam/offensive/unappropriate inputs.
- Open reviews and commentaries generate their own items, with a specific set of metadata and associated with the original work and reviews, respectively.
- All open reviews and commentaries are subject to a CC-BY licence 4.0 by default.
- Reputation scores for authors, (CSIC) reviewers, reviewed works and reviews.
- Reputation scores for authors and (CSIC) reviewers visible at Dspace-CRIS profiles.

The work’s author sends a review invitation to one or more peers by email.
The reviewer must indicate her name and affiliation.

By default, all reviews and comments have a CC-BY license.

New resource types

Qualitative and quantitative peer review

Please provide below your detailed review about the work, including all necessary information to help its authors improve their contribution. Try to be constructive in your comments.

Review text *
Reviews of works and author’s/reviewer reputation at personal page in the repository

Título: Towards a unified paradigm for sequence-based identification of fungi [Review]

Autores: Spouge, John L

Issue Date: 27-Apr-2018

URL: http://hdl.handle.net/10261/131502

Affiliación: National Center for Biotechnology Information, National Institutes of Health

Review: The nuclear ribosomal internal transcribed spacer (ITS) is the official fungal barcode. Collections of ITS sequences do not usually provide either a public reference dataset or a stable, standardized taxonomic nomenclature for all fungal species. As a result, some mycologists have developed software to gather ITS sequences from various sources and to provide them with a standardized taxonomic annotation. The resulting database and its software provide a truly public and open resource to further research, both by mycologists and by other scientists. In particular, the article introduces a term “species hypothesis” to permit the discovery of new taxa by sequence clustering. The software provides systematic unique identifiers for the corresponding species hypothesis and automatically designates as its representatives a sequence closest to the consensus sequence of the cluster. The software also cleans data (i.e., identifying chimeric sequences) and permits experts to add metadata in the form of annotations. With its standardization, the article provides a potential foundation for computerized taxonomic progress in mycology. My rating of 50 in “General interest” and “Usefulness” reflects my uncertainty about whether other taxonomic areas adopt the model for standardization presented in the article and whether this standardization is actually adopted by the general mycological community. The authors have, however, given the standard the potential to scale to a larger database.

https://digital.csic.es/handle/10261/131502

http://digital.csic.es/cris/rp/rp01941
Are repositories late? Value added services of open peer review in institutional repositories

- Strategies to engage the institutional community to use the service
- Opportunity to regain control of validation and dissemination of science in an open access and not for profit scenario
- Will the open peer review service be more useful for the pre-publication or post-publication phase?
- How to make the commentary functionality relevant?
- What is needed for sustainable overlay journals to proliferate on top of such services? Are they needed?
- DOI assignation for open peer reviews in the future – new services?
- How much will these services cost (in terms of managing human resources, “editorial” work, technological developments..)?
- What consequences when opening the review process to all research output types
- We need standards for the open peer review workflow, evaluation criteria and quality control and for the codification of related information