**Evaluating scientific work:**

  Session 4

1.     Peer review: Flag as non-peer reviewed? Post publication peer review? Open to comments (free for all)? What would it look like?

2.     Important: accessibility and speed, but what is the goal?

3.     Conventional peer review – what does that look like? Why do we do peer review? To have experts comment on the value and rigor. Two purposes – free dissemination of information – the second is evaluation (traditionally with journals).  Favor first making it accessible.

4.     Beer and tacos – don’t put too much on open access.

5.     Why duplicate the current system with no resources – keep the journal system but make it better. Add to it with the preprints.

6.     When a paper is peer-reviewed for a journal, one question is whether the papers is a good fit for the journal.

7.     Get feedback that might help them to target an article to the appropriate journal.

8.     Are journals necessary? People don’t read journals. People don’t find content based on the journal in which it is published. Want your research out there without huge delays and get content accessible.

9.     Benefit of preprint – no selection.

10.  The benefit of peer review: benefit of post-publication peer review – authors won’t put something out for public if they think they can get criticized (I disagree).

11.  Preprint server helps level the playing field by allowing them to get comments.  Maybe they are isolated and don’t have a network for feedback.

12.  Journals could invite submissions from preprints.

13.  If make commenters register then that seems to keep the crackpots from “trolling” on the preprint site. Comments should be signed.

14.  \*\*Could have web-based journal clubs on preprints.

15.  Anonymous reviews to have value and should not be replaced.

16.  Could you run an experiment to find the best way to navigate the review process for preprints.

17.  Is interest in reading referees reviews (F1000 puts doi’s on reviews). Gives benefits to authors and community.

18.  Volume that could be coming to preprint server is potentially huge and needs to be considered in review plans.

19.  A problem is that can’t say senior people have to start flow of papers to preprint servers since the students and postdocs are junior and have say in whether submissions are going to be submitted there.

20.  Ideal path is to post on an arxiv and then have the journals invite you to submit to them.

21.  Comparison to genome – big adjustment of community to having the research be exposed to the public at such an early stage.

22.  Main benefit of preprints is making the content discoverable. The comments could help you sift through the noise.  Needs to be much consideration about infrastructure.

23.  Many practical questions about funding and infrastructure design, and how to get people to submit is a big challenge.

24.  Format of the paper is an important issue. Make it easy and common and looks like an article not a “manuscript”.

25.  What weight do you give to different points of view.

26.  Reward system for peer-reviewing from postdocs and graduate students to get reviews on preprints.

27.  Be careful about bias.

28.  Not a level playing field – some people won’t be critical without being anonymous – balance against advantages of transparency.

29.  Let the journals be responsible for peer-review at the first pass.

30.  Some cultures might inhibit open review.

31.  Reviewer Signups – verifiable email address, ORCHID

32.  Perhaps could have system to notify potential reviewers, inviting them to review.