87% of Authors
Choose Wiley’s Transparent Peer Review Approach

Transparent Peer Review
Readers can see the process behind editorial decision making, increasing both accountability, and recognition for the work of editors and peer reviewers.

What is Transparent Peer Review?
A cross-industry collaboration from Wiley, ScholarOne and Publons to develop a practical, scalable and flexible solution for journals to introduce transparency to review in research communication.

How does it work?
Workflow for Publons Transparent Peer Review

1. In ScholarOne, authors & reviewers indicate if and how they’d like to participate.
2. Wiley reports accepted articles to Publons.
3. Publons retrieves peer review content from ScholarOne via API.
4. Publons creates article peer review pages and registers peer review content DOIs.
5. Article publication triggers peer review content publication on Publons.

Overview of the main features of this scalable approach to Transparent Peer Review

Publish
We give authors the option to choose to publish unsigned (or signed) peer review reports, author responses, and editor decision letters with journal articles for readers to learn from.

Reward
We enable recognition and reward for the peer review and editorial work that is part of a published study with citable DOIs.

Clarity
We make peer review more accountable, we help address bias, and we make the value of the peer review process itself clearer.

Flex
Our approach is compatible with single- and double-blinded peer review, as well as with open peer review, and reviews can be signed or unsigned.

How many journals are involved?
• September 2018 – initiative began with 1 journal
• January 2019 – additional 10 journals join
• Current – an additional 60 journals across a range of subjects are being added.

Analysis and insights
Data from February – May 2019 across seven journals that were completely new adopters of transparent peer review were analysed.

87% of authors chose Transparent Peer Review (1,841 of 2,107 authors).
On average across the journals, there was no meaningful difference in the time taken to reach a first decision under Transparent Peer Review. However, two journals did show meaningful differences: they were quicker by around 20 days.

When operating Transparent Peer Review, more decisions were made by the editor directly, rather than sending the article out for review. On average, editors declined to send manuscripts out for peer review in 62% of manuscripts compared with 53% previously. Note: this is an observation, without controlling for other factors that may have contributed to this change.

In addition, European Journal of Neuroscience has been operating Transparent Peer Review since 2016 and has received much encouragement and support.

Further information
1. Finding New Robust and Practical Ways to Add Transparency to Peer Review: The Clinical Genetics Story
2. Progressing Towards Transparency – More Journals Join Our Transparent Peer Review Pilot
3. Why More Journals Are Joining Our Transparent Peer Review Pilot
   https://www.wiley.com/network/archive/why-more-journals-are-joining-our-transparent-peer-review-pilot
4. Transparent Peer Review at the European Journal of Neuroscience: Experiences One Year on
   https://www.wiley.com/network/researchers/becoming-a-peer-reviewer/transparent-review-at-the-european-journal-of-neuroscience-experiences-one-year-on

“While this sounds like a radical idea, and in certain respects it is, it’s a first step in the direction of real open science.”
—Paul Kirschner
Editor-in-Chief
Journal of Computer Assisted Learning
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