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What exactly are we talking about?

- Open peer review
- Peer review
- P2P review or Peer-to-peer review
- Open review (degrees of open review)
- Blind peer review
An array of new publication and review models

Peer-to-peer moderated depository: arXiv.org
- Registered, endorsed users submit content through template
- Moderators screen for appropriate quality and classification
- Content must be of refereable quality
- Versions archived

Peer-to-peer Wikipedia
- Registered users submit content through template
- Open articles
- Registered users edit, review, flag concerns
- Superusers patrol, improve, flag, lock entries
- Changes archived

Partially-open SQ issue
- If warranted and authors agree, posted for expert commentary
- Experts review each others commentary as well as the submission
- Editor makes final publication decision
- No changes archived

NINES.org Editorial
- Editors establish guidelines and distribute submissions for peer review
- Peer reviewers review submissions
- New entries published continually
- No changes archived

Encyclopedia of Egyptology
- Users suggest new topics to editorial board through standard template; Ed board reviews and commissions as warranted
- Closed articles
- 5 year updates triggered by editorial board; authors may also trigger updates
- Changes archived

From Katherine Rice, "Scanning current practices of scholarly peer review." 17 Feb 2012.
http://mediacommunes.futureofthebook.org/papers/ShakespeareQuarterlyNewMedia/2010/02/13/scanning-current-practices-of-scholarly-peer-review/
Traditional Journals Experiment

- Little participation (both authors and reviewers)
- Comments not generally helpful
- Comments were allowed to but reportedly did not impact final publishing decision
- Rethink expert
- Many to many review
- Labor intensive
- Collegial
- Tech lags

Overview: Nature’s peer review trial
http://www.nature.com/nature/peerreview/debate/nature05535.html

Rowe, Katherine. From the Editor: Gentle Numbers.
Shakespeare Quarterly: Open Review: ‘Shakespeare and New Media.’ MediaCommons Press.
http://mediacommons.futureofthebook.org/mcpress/ShakespeareQuarterly_NewMedia/
New Article Publishing Models

Preliminary Editor or Reviewer review criteria, signing of name encourages:
1. Is the manuscript technically sound, and do the data support the conclusions?
2. Has the statistical analysis been performed appropriately and rigorously?
3. Does the manuscript adhere to standards in this field for data availability?
4. Is the manuscript presented in an intelligible fashion and written in standard English?

Article posted: Open comments by registered users encourage review of content.

Funded: Author fee $1,350 per article

- Single blind peer review default
- Reviewers encouraged to sign review
- Author has option to publish full review correspondence with article
- Ex.: https://peerj.com/articles/155/

Funded:
Funded:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Free</th>
<th>Basic</th>
<th>Enhanced</th>
<th>Investigator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>One-time price</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$99</td>
<td>$199</td>
<td>$299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If paid before first manuscript is accepted</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+ $40</td>
<td>+ $40</td>
<td>+ $40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If paid after first manuscript is accepted</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PeerJ publications per year</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>One</td>
<td>Two</td>
<td>Unlimited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PeerJ PrePrints per year</strong></td>
<td>One public / Zero private</td>
<td>Unlimited public / One private</td>
<td>Unlimited public / Unlimited private</td>
<td>Unlimited public / Unlimited private</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[https://peerj.com/pricing/](https://peerj.com/pricing/)
Monograph, Collection of Essays, Many Authors, Single Release

- 4 Expert, named, paid reviewers
- General open, identified reviewers/commenters
- Selection based on all review but done by 4 experts and editors
- Final product free online and pay print on demand
- University affiliated press
- Funded through university contributions

http://webwriting.trincoll.edu
Monograph, One Author, Serial Release

- Conversational nature was rewarding
- Additional regular time commitment
- Not seeing forest for the trees (or not?)
- Experts not necessarily academics

Why should librarians care?

- Scholarly communication conversation
- Technology expertise
- Publishing as service
  - library press cooperatives
- Experience with metrics tools
- Expert weeders
- Information literacy teachers
Comment Press

http://www.futureofthebook.org/commentpress/
Why should librarians care?

- Scholarly communication conversation
- Technology expertise
- Publishing as service
  - library press cooperatives
- Experience with metrics tools
- Expert weeders
- Information literacy teachers
Campus-Based Publishing Partnerships: A Guide to Critical Issues, by Ryan Crow, SPARC
http://www.sparc.arl.org/resources/papers-guides/campus-partnerships
Why should librarians care?

- Scholarly communication conversation
- Technology expertise
- Publishing as service
  - library press cooperatives
- Experience with metrics tools
- Expert weeders
- Information literacy teachers
**Altmetrics**

"Altmetrics is the creation and study of new metrics based on the Social Web for analyzing, and informing scholarship." -altmetrics.org

- measure how scholarship shared
- open impact measurement to more
- push notion of proof of impact

[ImpactStory.](http://impactstory.org/DillJankeLebowski)
Why should librarians care?

- Scholarly communication conversation
- Technology expertise
- Publishing as service
  - Library press cooperatives
- Experience with metrics tools
- Expert weeder
- Information literacy teachers
What's happening at IUPUI

• Open Scholarship Project
• Evaluating impact workshops
• P2P in the classroom
Open Scholarship Project

"...we fetishise [books]. We wax lyrical over their feel and smell; the sound of their rustling pages and haptic beauty. And we invoke the journey into the library and archive, and into print, as shared experiences – as rituals of initiation into a community of scholarship. In the process, we tend to lose sight of that book historian’s simple and self-evident observation, that hard copy text is a technology for moving and exchanging information."

Key Characteristics
1. Diamond Open Access
2. Versioning
3. Open Peer Review
4. Badging

Dr. Jason Kelly, Director of the IUPUI Arts and Humanities Institute and Assoc. Prof. British History
Prof. Timothy Hitchcock, School of Humanities, University of Hertfordshire

http://www.historyworkshop.org.uk/reinventing-the-academic-journal-the-digital-turn-open-access-peer-review/
What's happening at IUPUI

- Open Scholarship Project
- Evaluating impact workshops
- P2P in the classroom
P2P Forum: Library Science Course in Scholarly Communication

Discoveries

- Too much commenting
- Timing off
- Commenting is not peer review...maybe?
  - difficult to compare
- Closed peer review promoted critical review
- Desire full closed peer review experience
- P2P Forum vs. Oncourse
I also see how peer review comments helped us to develop some skills at offering constructive criticism to one another in a rather succinct format. . . The open format generated discussion and led to the sharing of some pretty interesting ideas and the formation of new questions.

-Andrew Cougill

Instead of providing critiques and reviews, I think the P2P forum was a venue for sharing questions, ideas, experiences, and opinions. While review or critique may have been the initial goal for this interaction, I still found the experience helpful.

On the other hand, the closed peer review allowed for a more honest and critical review. While the forums certainly allowed the class to exchange opinions, it was a polite and positive venue. However, the closed peer review included specific points for evaluation, and it required us to take a more critical stance. I think that the anonymity of the closed review helped me to focus on providing constructive criticism.

-Elizabeth Murray
It would have been interesting if for a single posting, we, as a group or with a pre-determined editor in charge, had to make a decision on which two or three were the ones "chosen for publication", with those people receiving a little extra credit. If the number of students and weeks works out right, then each week might see a different "editor" making final decisions for that week. This would take us past the point of mandatory singular replies and lead to some real engagement and discussion of merits and flaws. There is a risk that it could create some strife in the class, but it would also expose the students to some of the conflicting ideas and interests that can come into play when trying to publish. Can you fight the urge to put your own interests over the fair play of seeing the best article win? Do you trust that everyone else did the same, or do you start assuming that there's some level of gamesmanship going on?

- Robert Light
"We must collectively consider what new technologies have to offer us, not just in terms of the cost of publishing or access to publications, but in the ways we research, the ways we write, and the ways we review."

-Kathleen Fitzpatrick, Planned Obsolescence

**Conclusions Drawn**

- Open review = more work
- Open review = valued conversation
- Tech should support not dictate (but...)
- New expert discovery
- Culture shift
  - Valuing and Proving impact shift
References

- “Overview: Nature’s peer review trial. Despite enthusiasm for the concept, open peer review was not widely popular, either among authors or by scientists invited to comment. Nature, December 2006. doi:10.1038/nature05535.