

????????????

Author
???

Post Url
<https://www.enago.com/academy/tw/is-open-transparent/>

??

default watermark

??

default watermark



TRANSPARENCY IN PEER REVIEW

Traditional Peer Review

Single-blind & Double-blind



- Improves quality and readability
- Evaluates and filters high quality research



- Biased
- Slow
- Overworked referees
- Difficult to hide author's identity



IMPROVE

- Accountability
- Rewards/credit
- Training
- Author-reviewer interaction

Alternatives

Open: PLOS ONE; BMJ Open

Pre submission: arXiv;

bioRxiv; ChemRxiv

Post-publication: PubMed Commons; Publons; PubPeer



- Transparency
- Credit/encourages reviewers




- Less rigorous and less critical review
- Possibly harsh comments



Author's and reviewer's attitude towards different peer review models

Post-publication



On a scale of 1 to 10

1-4: Uncomfortable


5-7: Moderately comfortable

8-10: Very comfortable

Open



Double-blind



Cite this article

????, ??????????????. Enago Academy. June 27, 2018. <https://www.enago.com/academy/tw/is-open-transparent/>

default watermark