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DIGITAL.CSIC services to support Open Science

- Services to manage, deposit, track usage, mint DOIs for datasets and software applications
- Promotion of new types of collections (open conferences, full cycle of projects...)
- Open Peer Review Module
- Authors profiles
- Altmetrics
- Track and showcase reuse of DIGITAL.CSIC contents available in Open Access:
  http://proyectos.bibliotecas.csic.es/digitalcsic/reutilizacion/
  https://digital.csic.es/handle/10261/158375
Different key traits of Open Peer Review definitions: what components are in OPRM?

- Open identities
- Open reports
- Open participation
- Open interaction
- Open final-version commenting
- Open pre-review manuscripts
- Open platforms
OPRM on DIGITAL.CSIC: A timeline

- **Design phase and implementation of this EC funded project between June 2015 and March 2016.** Pilot implementation in 2 Spanish institutional repositories: DIGITAL.CSIC (DSpace-CRIS) and e-IEO (DSpace).

- **Official Launch of Open Peer Review Module (OPRM) at the end of April 2016**
  - First open reviews and comments in both repositories and promotional campaigns.

- **Fall 2017:**
  - DIGITAL.CSIC launches an institutional survey about peer review practices and starts new workshops to recruit OPRM takers.

---

**OpenAIRE**

**Official Launch & Workshop**

**Open Peer Review Module**

**April 27th, Madrid 2016**

**ENCUESTA SOBRE LA EVALUACIÓN POR PARES Y EL MÓDULO "OPEN PEER REVIEW" DE DIGITAL.CSIC**

In 2016 DIGITAL.CSIC participated in a project of the European Union to evaluate the visibility and opportunities of sharing research evaluations in repositories and encourage the participation of researchers on open peer review. This survey was designed to collect data on the use of open peer review and the experiences of researchers in the use of this module in DIGITAL.CSIC.

The time estimated to complete the survey is 10 minutes.
Open Peer Reviews, Open Comments and Reputation System in OPRM

- All DIGITAL.CSIC users (with log-in permissions) and administrators can send review invitations
- Open comments available for those users with DIGITAL.CSIC log-in permissions
- Administration filter in place before review publication to block spam/unappropriate inputs
- Open reviews and comments generate their own items, with a specific set of metadata and associated with the original work and reviews, respectively
- Reputation scores for authors, (CSIC) reviewers, reviewed works and reviews, OPRM Reputation Metrics

RESOURCES OF INTEREST
- OPRM: Challenges to Including Open Peer Review in Open Access Repositories
- OPRM Poster
- OPRM FAQs
- Slides of An Open Peer Review Module for Open Access Repositories
- Open access repositories start to offer overlay peer review services
- First OPR-Module for repositories
- Developing the first Open Peer Review Module for Institutional Repositories
- Public launch of the OPRM Project
- OPRM Code
OPRM WORKFLOW

1. Journal article reviewed with OPRM after publication

2. Open Peer Review

3. Open Comment by the author

4. OPRM Reputation Score in personal page
Challenges identified during OPRM implementation and outreach campaigns

OPRM invitation system should be replaced by an open participation module.

**Long process:** It takes time to select works to be reviewed, invite peers, comment on reviews..

Need to automatically connect the object to be reviewed to potential reviewers on the basis of similarities between the object’s topics and reviewers expertise.

A more user friendly interface to submit reviews.

Need to explain better and refine OPRM reputation sub-module.

Perceived limited applicability for journal articles already published and evaluated.

Lack of support of institutional/funder reward systems.

Absence of reputation metrics that factor open peer review.

Conflicts of interest due to small circle of experts in some disciplines.

**Issues directly linked to OPRM:**

**Constraints of the current system:**
Is the time ripe for OPRM now?

Researchers increasingly advocate for peer review recognition...does this mean support for open peer review?

CSIC researchers practising open peer review/recommendation elsewhere: how representative is it?
50% of respondents between 41 and 55 years old
- Large representation of Social Sciences/Humanities (33%), Natural Resources (19%), Biology and Biomedicine (14%)
- Most of respondents have experience as reviewers and a large group (39%) as journal editor
- A majority (54%) is satisfied with the current peer review system and a bit lower majority (50%) thinks that the current system helps select the best papers
- A majority (52%) also thinks that peer review activities should be included in research assessment exercises
A majority of respondents (57%) prefers the double blind system when they submit a paper to a journal. An interesting percentage is either in favor of open peer reviews (19%) or of public post-publication commentaries (8%).

Same preferences as a reviewer

A priori, a huge majority (83.5%) would not discard publishing in a journal that supports open peer review (another issue is how important this factor is in the author’s decision to publish in the journal).
Preliminary results of DIGITAL.CSIC institutional survey on peer review practices and OPRM (3/4)

18. Actualmente el OPRM funciona solo mediante invitación del autor. ¿Piensa que debería estar abierto al 100% (es decir, que cualquier persona, revelando su identidad y afiliación institucional, pudiera realizar una revisión abierta)?

- Sí: 35.3%
- No: 58.9%
- Otro: 6.9%

17 respuestas

19. ¿Para qué tipología de resultado de investigación puede resultar más interesante el módulo OPRM? (Selecione "Otro" si quiere expresar otra tipología)

Preprints: -12 (70.6%)
Books: -7 (47.1%)
Working papers: -5 (29.4%)
Software: -1 (5.9%)
Datasets: -1 (5.9%)

17 respuestas

- Almost 60% of respondents in favor of opening the module to any person that reveals her identity and affiliation and wishes to review a work

- OPRM perceived as an interesting tool to review preprints (70.6%), books (47%), working papers (41%), software (35%), datasets (29%) mostly
Preliminary results of DIGITAL.CSIC institutional survey on peer review practices and OPRM (4/4)

- A bit more than 40% of respondents would invite peers to review their works available in DIGITAL.CSIC. Other 47% of people with no clear opinion (for instance, as to the benefit of reviewing works already published and validated, or as to ways to make sure that reviewers are experts in the topic to review).

In addition, there is certain reluctance to accept an invitation to review works by other CSIC researcher (for fear of misunderstandings/personal confrontation, another bureaucratic load). Positive attitude if the invitation is motivated for constructive goals, does not become a regular task through the year and is recognised in assessment exercises, for instance.
More (preliminary) conclusions and perceptions from the survey

- **Significant volume of researchers curious to experiment with new types of peer review and increased roles of repository.** Factors such as: reviewers are experts in the field, there is no room for conflict of interests and reviews are made constructively are often mentioned.

- **The feature of open comments on any type of item in DIGITAL.CSIC (which is not necessarily equal to a formal peer review) is catchy.**

- **There is still significant lack of awareness about emerging trends around peer review practices.** For many respondents, journals are still to play a central role and recognition of peer review activities goes through economic compensation and institutional backing.

- **Publons, publishers reviewers recognition systems, alternative peer review practices in some open access journals** (Frontiers, BMC, Copernicus, Nature Communications..) are known by many.

- On the contrary, **peer review options through other channels** such as Peerage of Science, biorXiv, GitHub, Webmed Central, European Peer Review Network are less known.
And new open reviews coming...

**A DIFFERENT STRATEGY:**

- Focus on the potential of the module for non-traditional research outputs (software applications, datasets, learning objects...)
- Awareness Workshops tailored to discipline specifics
- Enthuse researchers with short term benefits
- Take up researchers suggestions to improve OPRM functionality and layout
Is the future of peer review green?

Conflicts of interest in scientific publishing
Ignacio Amigo, Alberto Pascual-García 2017

Gold OA creates a conflict of interest: in a situation where the number of scientists is larger than the number of available positions, both journals and scientists benefit from publishing as many articles as possible (…)

An alternative to Gold OA is Green OA. (…) However, the fact that Green OA lacks peer review discourages many scientists from self-archiving their papers.

Research papers and scientific data should be published in several specialised, open and publicly funded storage repositories (SR). Standardised protocols should be implemented. Librarian services would be critical for these platforms (…)
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