

WORLD SCIENCE FORUM

Budapest 2024

*The science and policy interface at
the time of global transformations*

Rethinking Research Assessment to Shape Innovative, Inclusive, and
Impactful Science in Europe
November 20, 2024



WORLD SCIENCE FORUM
BUDAPEST

Peer Review Matters: A KEY PILLAR IN Transforming Research Assessment

By Tung Tung Chan, Co-Chair of the CoARA Working Group on Recognizing and Rewarding Peer Review, Erasmus University Rotterdam



The undervaluing of peer review

- Peer review is essential for evaluating and validating research publications and proposals. BUT: it is insufficiently recognized and rewarded:
- Reviewing work is rarely included in performance reviews or research applications
- Reviews are invisible and inaccessible, so it is hard to evaluate their contribution

Traditional practice

- Most peer review in Europe is managed by journals and book publishers in a closed, often opaque, system.

Emerging trends

- Growing support among researchers for preprint review, open peer review and collaborative peer review.

Academic publishers must respond to reviewer fatigue

Institute of Physics Publishing is making innovative efforts to broaden the referee pool beyond the usual suspects, says Laura Feetham-Walker

July 7, 2024



Why Recognize and Reward Peer Review?

- Inappropriate value is being placed on the number of publications in certain journals.
- The peer review process is controlled by the publishing companies.
- The growth of scientific publishing is placing a burden on the peer review process, exacerbated by ethical issues in AI.

SCIENCEINSIDER | SCIENTIFIC COMMUNITY

Web of Science index puts *eLife* 'on hold' because of its radical publishing model

Journal that is experimenting with peer reviewing but not accepting manuscripts could lose its impact factor

24 OCT 2024 · 6:55 PM ET · BY [JEFFREY BRAINARD](#)

WORLD VIEW | 05 November 2024

ChatGPT is transforming peer review – how can we use it responsibly?



At major computer-science publication venues, up to 17% of the peer reviews are now written by artificial intelligence. We need guidelines before things get out of hand.

By [James Zou](#)



WORLD SCIENCE FORUM
BUDAPEST



Challenges in Integrating Peer Review in Research Assessment

- Closed nature of the process
- Difficulty accounting for trans-, inter-, multi-disciplinary approaches
- Substantial disciplinary differences in academic culture, habits, and preferences
- Lack of alignment between multiple stakeholders in the research ecosystem

How Can You be a Part of the Solution?

- Share your feedback on our recommendations to recognize and review peer review
- Join our mailing list to pilot our recommendations at your institution



Recommendations



Our recommendations are aimed at organisations that **perform research assessment**, organisations that **coordinate peer review**, and researchers (as **reviewers**).



We outlined shared responsibilities and actions for key stakeholders to recognize and reward peer review in research assessment for **scholarly articles, books, and funding proposals**. They represent the most common intellectual products across various academic disciplines.



Five areas of recommendations: **openness, credit and recognition, infrastructure and training, fairness and sustainability, and assessment**.

THANK YOU!



WORLD SCIENCE FORUM
BUDAPEST