

# WORLD SCIENCE FORUM

Budapest 2024

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



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](#)

# 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