



ЦЕНТАР
ЗА
ПРОМОЦИЈУ
НАУКЕ



PODRŠKA IZDAVAČA I WEB PLATFORMI VREDNOVANJU RECENZIRANJA I RECENZENATA

IVANA DRVENICA

RECAPITULATIO:

- **Recenziranje**-kamen temeljac u objavljivanju naučnih radova!

“It is the method by which grants are allocated, papers published, academics promoted, and Nobel prizes won”

(Smith, R. Peer review: A flawed process at the heart of science and journals. J.R.Soc. Med. 2006, 99, 178–182, <https://doi.org/10.1258/jrsm.99.4.178>)

- **Nedovoljno vrednovan (zanemaren) faktor razvoja celokupne nauke**
- **Odobrenje od recenzenata za razmenu naučnih informacija je jedan od najsnažnijih izraza profesionalnog priznanja pojedinaca/grupe i instrument društvene kontrole u naučnoj zajednici**

(Daffidof F. Improving peer review: who's responsible? BMJ 2004;328 <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.328.7441.657>)



Neophodnost kompetentnih recenzenta

“publish or perish”




Root Causes of the Crisis

- **Misleading Metrics:** Emphasis on publication count and journal impact factors encourages quantity over quality.
- **Technology & AI:** Generative AI, preprint servers, and automated submission systems accelerate publication, increasing volume but sometimes compromising rigor.
- **Commercial Incentives:** Pay-to-publish models can boost output but occasionally reduce editorial scrutiny, prioritizing revenue over scientific quality.
- **Systemic Pressures:** Career advancement, funding expectations, and academic evaluation criteria all contribute to the flood of papers.

Druga strana sve većeg pritiska da se objavljuje je sve veći pritisak da se recenzira !!!

3.4 million scientific papers in 2025!


“21st Century Science Overload”



Number of papers increasing exponentially at a rate of ~10% per year (Raoult 2020, doi:10.3390/publications8010004)



NEODRŽIVOST RECENZIRANJA I KRIZA KVALITETA NAUKE

“Peer reviewers are overwhelmed, editors stretched thin, and the signal-to-noise ratio is collapsing”



20.4%

annualized publication growth (2020-2023)




Consequences for Science and Society



Low-Value Literature:

Thousands of retractions each year highlight a reliability crisis (Live Science, 2024).



Academic Burnout:

Researchers devote excessive time to reviewing and reading papers, leaving less for original research.



Eroding Public Trust:

Low-quality studies, particularly in health, climate, and technology, can mislead policymakers and the public.



„Is Peer Review a Thankless Task ?“

Plaćanje recenziranja ? Nije mit !

[New England Journal of Medicine](#)
[American Economic Association](#)

podsticajni programi velikih
izdavača i posebnih web
platformi



PREPOZNAVANJE DRUŠTVENOG ZNAČAJA VRŠENJA RECENZIJE I VREDNOVANJA RECENZENATA



Emerging Solutions

- **Registered Reports:** Research protocols are peer-reviewed before data collection, reducing bias and emphasizing methodological rigor.
- **Open Peer Review:** Publishing reviewer reports enhances transparency and accountability.
- **Community Review Platforms:** Peer Community In (PCI) provides expert review for preprints, helping prioritize quality over speed.
- **Reviewer Incentives:** Programs recognizing and rewarding reviewers can reduce burnout and increase evaluation reliability.
- **Responsible Metrics & Open Science:** Initiatives like the Leiden Manifesto and EQUATOR Network encourage careful evaluation, transparency, and adherence to ethical research standards.

Individualne
zahvalnice

Časopisi sa
otvorenim
pristupom-rad
prati izveštaj

Popust pri
plaćanju
troškova

Online treninzi
za mlade
recenzente

E

Abstract
Background
Methods
Results
Discussion
Conclusions
Reviewers' comments
Declarations
References

Conclusions

As novel method for the integration of multiple *omics* data, the INF method is applied to the three datasets proposed for the CAMDA 2017 Neuroblastoma Data Integration challenge. We compared INF classification performance with simple juxtaposition and rSNF, proving that it performs comparably or better than either in most cases, with the advantage of very compact feature sets (on average 75% reduction with similar accuracy). We additionally tested an *omics*-integration framework based on deep learning to identify a novel set of “meta-features” able to distinguish patient groups with markedly different survival curves. The relationship between meta-features derived from the deep learning autoencoder and the INF features is currently under development.


Reviewers' comments

Reviewer's report 1: Djork-Arné Clevert, Bioinformatics Department, Bayer AG, Berlin, Germany

Reviewer comment: Quality of written English. Needs some language corrections before being published.

Primer kako izgleda dobra recenzija sa visokom PEQ ocenom u Peerage of Science

There are various typos and very minor errors, which I have not listed here (e.g. in line 22 it should be 'Main conclusions').



Secure | <https://www.peerageofscience.org/solutions/for-reviewers/>

Peerage of Science

Home [Solutions](#) How it works Peers Journals ProcPoS FAQ

LOG IN

A free service for scientific peer review and publishing

your science, your call

Solutions For Reviewers

For Authors
For Reviewers
For Editors
For Publishers

Why should you review in Peerage of Science?

- **Build peer reviewed reputation showing your expertise**
In Peerage of Science, you get quantitative, peer-reviewed, externally verifiable measure of your expertise in the scientific fields you provide reviews for. You can show your activity (the number of reviews done) and your average Peerage Essay Quality (PEQ) in your Profile – and in your CV!
- **Get peer reviewed publications**

Line 230-231 - I do not follow the end of the same sentence! It does not seem to relate to results reported in Fig.2. Is it referring to a possible alternative first-level split?

Line 252 -- "a minimum of four neighbouring plots". I do not understand. From lines 172-174 I thought that the final predictions would use a fixed number of neighbouring plots, once the 'best' k had been established, NOT a variable number with a fixed minimum. Also Table 2 legend suggests it is k=4 not k>=4.


Line 270 -- better to join this paragraph to the previous one so the first paragraph of the discussion summarises the key findings.

Lines 312-313 -- Surely you can investigate this by sub-sampling your data. I suggest you either do this section properly or remove it. From what you say on page 15 the better option seems to be to keep the section and do the extra analysis.



Peer Community In & Peer Community Journal

From preprint evaluation to publication
in a diamond open access journal



Following submission by authors, thematic PCIs evaluate preprints in their respective scientific fields through rigorous peer review. Upon positive evaluation, the PCIs validate and publicly recommend those preprints, making them complete, reliable, and citable. Authors who need to publish their PCI-recommended article in a journal can transfer it for publication, free of charge, in the diamond open access Peer Community Journal or submit it to a PCI-friendly or other journal



"My Elsevier Reviews Profile aims to create a standard way of recording and acknowledging reviewers contribution in high quality scientific publication."

Godišnji izveštaji o aktivnosti (arhiva 5 godina)

Popust pri plaćanju WebShop and BookStore

Urednici dodeljuju sertifikate IZVRSNOSTI

PEERfull
<https://www.elsevier.com/connect/reviewers-update/peer-review-using-todays-technology>

← → ↻ Secure | <https://www.reviewerrecognition.elsevier.com>

ELSEVIER Home FAQs Contact Us

My Elsevier Reviews Profile

Peer review is the cornerstone of science, and Elsevier is dedicated to supporting and recognizing our journals' reviewers. *My Elsevier Reviews Profile* aims to create a standard way of recording and acknowledging your efforts

<https://www.reviewerrecognition.elsevier.com/>

ELSEVIER

Volunteer for Peer Review with JMB

JMB provides high quality and broad coverage in all areas of molecular biology. Editorial decisions are made by the editorial board members who are active scientists and recognized experts in their respective fields. The editorial board works very closely with a large number of dedicated reviewers to offer expert and constructive comments to authors with the goal of improving their manuscripts.

Register as a reviewer for Journal of Molecular Biology
(<https://www.reviewerrecognition.elsevier.com/reviewmore/?journal=JMB>)

Please make sure to specify your areas of expertise, your short CV, your motivation for choosing this journal to review for and indicate your availability. It is then up to the relevant editors to contact volunteer reviewers in order to request a review.

ELSEVIER

Computer Methods in Applied Mechanics and Engineering

2012

Certificate of Excellence in Reviewing

awarded to
Xx Xx

in recognition of an outstanding contribution to the quality of the journal

Thomas J.R. Hughes, Editor
J. Tinsley Oden, Editor
Manolis Papadrakakis, Editor

Carrie Christensen
Publisher



Guidelines for Reviewers

“We are sincerely grateful to scholars who give their time to peer-review articles submitted to MDPI journals. Rigorous peer-review is the corner-stone of high quality academic publishing.”

— The MDPI editorial team.



Objava imena recenzenata opciona

Find a journal in your field

Agriculture

Aims & Scope

Become a Reviewer

Voucher code	Voucher type	Voucher discount	Issued for	Valid from	Valid to	Valid journal
71b9060ebcdc6c62	Invited	40%	ivana.drvenica@imi.bg.ac.rs	2021-12-15	2022-12-15	Processes
ad13b4768d76a9b4	Reviewer	50 CHF	ivana.drvenica@imi.bg.ac.rs	2022-04-07	2024-04-07	All
7c6f000c2b50cba7	Reviewer	100 CHF	ivana.drvenica@imi.bg.ac.rs	2022-06-07	2024-06-07	All
503a17edb9c18e65	Reviewer	100 CHF	ivana.drvenica@imi.bg.ac.rs	2022-08-17	2024-08-17	All
cfd20aff8024286f	Reviewer	50 CHF	ivana.drvenica@imi.bg.ac.rs	2022-11-30	2024-11-30	All
fa49ccd584435a66	Reviewer	50 CHF	ivana.drvenica@imi.bg.ac.rs	2022-12-13	2024-12-13	All
ae94539024e21509	Reviewer	100 CHF	ivana.drvenica@imi.bg.ac.rs	2023-03-10	2025-03-10	All
959c0ed7571dd0ab	Reviewer	100 CHF	ivana.drvenica@imi.bg.ac.rs	2023-08-23	2025-08-23	All



Resources

Your role as an author

Our peer review process

About our peer review

[Peer review guidelines](#)

At Frontiers, our collaborative peer review objectively certifies the quality, validity, and rigor of research. The process is handled by experts in the field, and reviewers are carefully chosen by the editorial board to ensure the highest quality of research.

Inbox 50

Sent

Frontiers



Dear Dr

Frontiers

The auth

For Imm

<http://www.frontiersin.org>

00a01dc

After rev

1. Endors

reviewer

2. Post c

under ea

3. Recon

the manuscript to contain objective errors or ethical issues. Your recommendation will be sent to the handling

editor while you will remain anonymous to the authors and will not be asked to participate any further in the



<http://www.springer.com/authors/manuscript+guidelines?SGWID=0-40162-6-1386841-0>



Home Subjects Services Products Springer Shop About us

Manuscript Guidelines Journals Home > For Authors & Editors >

Reviewer Reward Program

As part of a new incentive by JRTIP, all reviewers who complete 5+ high quality reviews can request a certificate in recognition of their efforts. These certificates can be used in support of assessment of academic achievement and/or community involvement. In addition, reviewers will be offered a complimentary Springer book, in acknowledgement of their dedication to the journal.

If you feel you are eligible for this, please contact the Journal Editorial Office by following the hyperlink on the right of this page.

Participation in the reviewer reward program requires 5 or more personal classifications to be selected in Editorial Manager.

In addition, reviewers who complete 10+ high quality reviews can request to join the Editorial Board of JRTIP by expressing their interest to the Editors-in-Chief.

My Account

Shopping Cart
MySpringer
Login/Registration

About Springer

Company
Media
Compliance

Help & Contact

Help Overview
Order FAQ
Contact Us

INBOX (410)
Drafts
Sent
Trash [Purge]
Junk
Spam

Journal of Solid State Electrochemistry

Editorial Manager

HOME • LOGOUT • HELP • REGISTER • UPDATE MY INFORMATION • JOURNAL OVERVIEW
MAIN MENU • CONTACT US • SUBMIT A MANUSCRIPT • INSTRUCTIONS FOR AUTHORS • PRIVACY

Role: Reviewer Username: dekanski

Reviewer Recommendation and Comments for Manuscript Number JSEL-D-19-00980

Facile fabrication of Cu₂O/Cu columnar arrays electrode through dealloying and

Original Submission
Aleksandar Dekanski (Reviewer)

Recommendation: Major Revision

Cancel Save & Submit Later Upload Reviewer Attachment

Transfer Authorization

[Instructions]

* If this submission is transferred to another publication, do we have your consent to include your identifying information?

Please Select Response Yes No

* If this submission is transferred to another publication, do we have your consent to include your original review?

Please Select Response Yes No

ORCID Reviewer Credit

[Instructions]

* **ORCID Reviewer Recognition.** Springer Nature can send verification of this review directly to ORCID. If you would like to take advantage of this service: 1. Please click on then be transmitted to ORCID. 4. ORCID will display this information as a verified item from Springer Nature on your unique ORCID researcher profile

Yes No

Review Questions

* **Publons Reviewer Recognition.** Springer Nature can send verification of this review directly to Publons (a subsidiary of Clarivate Analytics). If you would like to take advantage of this service, please click on the "Yes" option below. Your name, email address, title of the reviewed manuscript, name of the journal, and date of your review submission (the "Review Data") will then be transmitted to Publons upon publication of the manuscript. If you have already registered at Publons, they will notify you of the receipt of this review and update your profile as per your settings and their policy. If you are not registered with Publons, you will receive an email from them asking you to register in order for them to be able to recognize your review on your new profile page. Publons may use the Review Data to generate derivative metadata for the benefit of Publons and you as a reviewer, carefully considering the sensitivity of such information. For example, Publons may verify your record as a reviewer by updating your profile published on its webservice if you have registered for such service or help editors to identify candidate reviewers. Please find the details of processing in Publons' privacy policy <https://publons.com/about/terms>

Please select a response
 Yes
 No

JALCOM-D-19-145...pdf



©Springer Nature

Masterclasses.nature.com

nature masterclasses



Free online course for peer reviewers

For researchers new to peer review or wishing to develop their skills

Register for free access at masterclasses.nature.com

Taught by Nature Research editors • 3-4 hours' learning • Free completion certificate

W masterclasses.nature.com

In Follow us on LinkedIn

f Skills and Careers Forum for Researchers

Lista recenzenata
u prvom
godišnjem broju

Besplatan pristup
časopisu

Individualne
zahvalnice

[Reviewers](#) > [Journal Reviewers](#) > Recognition For Reviewers

- ▶ Author Resources
- ▼ Reviewers
 - ▼ Journal Reviewers
 - ▶ What is Peer Review
 - ▶ How to Perform a Peer Review
 - Becoming a Reviewer
 - Recognition For Reviewers**
 - ▶ Tools and Resources
 - ▶ Wiley Peer Review Study
 - Review Confidentiality Policy
 - ▶ Book Reviewers



Recognition for Reviewers

A reviewer's input to the editorial process is invaluable, and as publishers, we seek recognize the efforts of reviewers.

The ways reviewers currently receive recognition varies from journal to journal, and can include:

- Being included in a journal's annual list of reviewers, typically in the year's first or last issue. This is the most common form of recognition
- Receiving complimentary online access to the journal, or package of journals, for a specific time period
- Getting a letter or certificate of contribution from the journal editor

Exploring New Methods

At Wiley, we're looking into other ways to acknowledge a reviewer's contribution. We currently have some initiatives underway which look at recording reviewer activity as a measurable research output. For example, we are undertaking a pilot which enables peer reviewers for selected Wiley journals to get credit for their peer reviews on [Publons](#).



Od 2013. <https://publons.com/home/>

"Our mission is to speed up research by harnessing the power of peer review"

Javno prikazivanje
sveukupne
aktivnosti jednog
recenzenta

CILJ:

Recenziranje
pretvoriti u
merljiv pokazatelj
stručnosti i
doprinosa
pojedinačnih
istraživača u
oblasti kojom se
bave

Winners of Publons Peer Review Awards Announced! See the top reviewers of 2017 here.

publons

Search or Import

ACTIONS BROWSE COMMUNITY FAQ SIGN IN REGISTER

Harness the power of
peer review

JOIN THE GLOBAL COMMUNITY OF PEER REVIEWERS

210,000+ Researchers 1.1 million+ Reviews 25,000+ Journals

REVIEWERS EDITORS PUBLISHERS INSTITUTIONS

Publons helps you get the recognition you deserve for keeping watch over science and research.

Easily import, verify, and store a record of every peer review you perform and every manuscript you handle as an editor, for any journal in the world, in full compliance with all editorial policies.

File0025.PDF images (3).jpg

Show all

17:13 31/10/2017



PEER REVIEW WEEK 2016
 19TH TO 25TH SEPTEMBER 2016
 Theme: Recognition for review



Sentinel /sentin(ə)l/
 Noun: 'A soldier or guard whose job it is to stand and keep watch.

Expert peer reviewers are the Sentinels of Science. They protect the world from false findings that could set back advances in human knowledge by decades. When researchers are committed to peer review, we discover cures, develop innovative technologies and realise human

- Top 10% of reviewers for each discipline
- Top 3 overall contributors to peer review
- Top 3 peer review contributors from the top five reviewing countries (by number)
- Top 3 contributing editors (most manuscripts handled, by number)
- Top 3 recognition advocates (top 3 editors that have invited reviewers to add a review record to Publons).



<https://publons.com/community/academy/>

Februar 2017



Graduates of the Publons Academy will:

Break into the world of expert peer reviewers

Overcome fears about performing their first pre-publication reviews

Fully understand how the peer review process works



















Have reviewed published papers in their area of expertise

Be endorsed by their supervisor

Connect with editors at relevant journals

„ The establishment of the Publons Academy is a key step in helping to ensure reviewers have access to rigorous training for this task of truth-seeking.“

214,106 results

#	RESEARCHER	INSTITUTION
1	 Jonas Ranstam	 Lund University
2	 Grigorios Kyriakopoulos	 National Technical U
3	 Gaetano Santulli	 Columbia University
4	 Mohammad Mehdi Rashidi	 University of Birmin
5	 Carsten H. Meyer	 Phillips-Universität M
6	 George N. Rouskas	 North Carolina State
7	 Prof. Tamer A. Gheita	 Cairo University
8	 G N George K. Nikas	 Imperial College Lon
9	 Dirk W. Lachenmeier	 Chemisches und Vet

Clarivate Log In Register Products

Your Web of Science publications are queued for import.

Register or sign in to continue.

Register to continue with Publons

Email address*

Password*

Re-enter password*


First Name*

Last Name*

4194 Pre-publication Reviews

Show your research impact! Join over 10,350,156 researchers on Publons to track your publications, citation metrics, peer reviews, and journal editing work in a single, easy-to-maintain profile.

- All your publications**, instantly imported from *Web of Science*, ORCID, or your bibliographic reference manager (e.g. EndNote or Mendeley)
- Trusted citation metrics**, automatically imported from the *Web of Science Core Collection*
- Your verified peer review and journal editing history**, powered by partnerships with thousands of scholarly journals
- Publons CV** summarising your scholarly impact as an author, editor and peer reviewer.




- Is it healthy for the advancement of science that academics review three or more papers per week?
- Is it worth to reward this frenzy over peer-reviewing more and more papers and try to excel in yet another metric imposed on us?
- Is there a need to control the profiles of the world's top reviewers in platforms like Publons and the journals for which they review in order to avoid that the places high up in the list are often populated by inexperienced academics reviewing for predatory journals?
- Can one still be considered an academic if their full-time job is reviewing other people's papers?
- Is the current peer-reviewing system best suited to meet the future challenges of academic publishing with impressive annual growth rates of papers produced?

Reviewer Credits - Metrics for peer review

Peer reviewing is a very demanding, effort driven and time consuming undertaking. It requires great professionalism, but it is often under recognized"

Prepoznavanje
doprinosa
recenzenata kroz
"kredite"



The screenshot shows the website <https://www.reviewercredits.com>. The page is titled "REVIEWERS" and contains a list of reviewers with their profiles and metrics. An orange arrow points to the profile of Elena Cristina Rada.

Reviewer Name	Index	City	Country	Topics
Elena Cristina Rada	59	Trento	Italy	Waste Management and Disposal - Pollution - Energy(all)
Laurent DORTET	46	Le Kremlin-Bicêtre	France	Microbiology - Infectious Diseases - Epidemiology
Paulo Favas	41	Vila Real	Portugal	Environmental Science(all) - Earth-Surface Processes - Plant Science

<https://blog.mendeley.com/2018/07/10/supporting-and-recognizing-your-peer-review-activity/>



reviewers.

How Mendeley helps you as a reviewer

- A private view on your reviewed publications

Mendeley users get a private view into the impact made by articles they have reviewed that were published in Elsevier journals, including how often the article has been viewed, cited and read. Their anonymity as a reviewer is maintained, as their reviewed publications are not visible to others.

A screenshot of the Mendeley interface. At the top, there are two tabs: 'Last 12 months' (selected) and 'Historical view'. Below this is a section titled 'Mentions in the media' with a close icon. It lists two media mentions from 2010. The first mention is titled '2010' and includes a quote: '"S LEFTOVERS RAIDED IN FLU VACCINE SHORTAGE BY SOPHIE BORLAND FAMILY doctors have been ordered to give patients last year's leftover swine flu jabs as"'. It is dated January 7, 2011, from The Daily Mail and Mail on Sunday (London) (United Kingdom). The second mention is titled 'Plea Over Beds As Flu Cases Soar' and includes a quote: '"HEALTH chiefs have asked North East hospitals to make extra beds available following a stark rise in the number of flu admissions. The most recent"'. It is dated January 6, 2011, from the Newcastle Chronicle & Journal (United Kingdom). Below this is a section titled 'Reviewed Publications'. It shows two entries. The first entry is titled 'A fully automated analytical platform integrating water sampling-miniscale-liquid-liquid extraction-full evaporation dynamic headspace concentration-gas chromatography-mass spectrometry for the analysis of ultraviolet filters' by Liew C, U X, Zhang H et al. It has 4 Readers and 1 Citation. The second entry is titled 'A genetic algorithm with exact dynamic programming for the green vehicle routing' and has 6 Readers.

<http://about.scienceopen.com/peer-review-guidelines/>

Javno i otvoreno
“post publication
recenziranje

Za recenzentski
izveštaj (uz određeni
nivo ekspertize) se
dobija Cross Ref DOI

The screenshot shows a web browser window with the URL <http://about.scienceopen.com/peer-review-guidelines/>. The page header includes the ScienceOpen logo (research+publishing network) and navigation links for BLOG, ABOUT, and a SEARCH button. A left sidebar contains a 'Categories' menu with 'About ScienceOpen', 'For Publishers', and 'For Researchers' (the active category). Below the menu is a 'Join for FREE' banner with a checkmark icon and the text 'and become part of the ScienceOpen network'. The main content area features the article title 'Peer Review' under the sub-header 'In: For Researchers'. The article date is 'June 13, 2017 *'. The text describes Post Publication Peer Review (PPRR) for ScienceOpen Research articles and all content on the platform (currently more than 28 million article records). It includes a section titled 'Why Review for ScienceOpen?' which explains that peer review is an essential part of the scientific publishing process and that ScienceOpen is set to change the traditional model by making reviewers visible and their comments constructive. The footer of the page shows the URL about.scienceopen.com/category/about-scienceopen/.



Connecting Research
and Researchers

**Od 2015. godine je uvedeno
dodavanje recenzentske aktivnosti
ORCID profilu!**

Secure | <https://members.orcid.org/api/workflow/peer-review>

ORCID Main Site API Documentation

Search

ORCID
Connecting Research
and Researchers

Member
Support Center

Home

Research Funders Research Organizations Publishers Resources

WORKFLOW: PEER REVIEW

This workflow sets out a process in which a typical peer review system may integrate with the ORCID API. It gives a walkthrough of the process of receiving validated ORCID IDs from reviewers, retrieving data from ORCID records, adding peer review groups and review activity to ORCID records, and updating review activities which you have previously added to ORCID records. It is based on version 2.0 of the ORCID message schema. Not every peer review system will fulfil every element of this process—many systems may only collect reviewers' IDs and display them within your system or in metadata.

Introduction

Peer review is central to the evaluation of research – not just for journal article publication, but also for conference programming, for awarding grants, and for making hiring, promotion, and tenure decisions. Embedding ORCID IDs into your workflows can help streamline your processes, improve the management of people databases, and improve discoverability. And importantly, you can play your part in building a trusted research information infrastructure by asserting the connection between individuals and their peer review activity.

Common integration points for publishing systems:


- Index
- [Get started with your integration](#)
- [Request API access](#)
- [API 2.0 tutorials](#)
- [Integration points](#)
- [Workflows](#)
- [Graphics & resources](#)
- [API news & updates](#)
- [API FAQ](#)

www.peere.org

TD COST Action TD1306



COST is supported by the EU Framework Programme Horizon 2020



NEW FRONTIERS OF PEER REVIEW

[NEWS](#)[PUBLICATIONS](#)[EVENTS](#)[PHOTOS](#)[VIDEOS](#)[MEETING PRESENTATIONS](#)[NEWSLETTER](#)[CONFERENCE](#)[SCHOOL](#)

PEERE IN A NUTSHELL

New Frontiers of Peer Review (PEERE)

PEERE New frontiers of peer review is a COST Action running from 12/05/2014 to 11/05/2018. It includes 26 countries and 60 participants (see the [Management Committee](#) page)

Abstract

Peer review is a cornerstone of science, whose quality and efficiency depends on a complex, large-scale collaboration process, which is sensitive to motivations, incentives and institutional contexts. Recent proofs of the failures of peer review, due to judgment bias and parochialism and cases of misconduct, have contributed to calls for a reconsideration of the rigour and quality of the process. This Action aims to improve efficiency, transparency and accountability of peer review through a trans-disciplinary, cross-sectorial collaboration. The objectives of this Action are: (i) to analyse peer review in different scientific areas by integrating quantitative and qualitative research and incorporating recent experimental and computational findings; (ii) to evaluate implications of different models of peer review and to explore new incentive

PEERE

SEARCH ARTICLE



SOCIAL MEDIA



<https://peerreviewweek.net/index.php>

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=CmhVQrpM_cU

**PEER
REVIEW**
WEEK 2016

19TH TO 25TH SEPTEMBER 2016

Theme:
Recognition
for review

**PEER
REVIEW
WEEK**
2017

**TRAN
SPAR
ENCY**

11-17 SEPTEMBER 2017

**PEER
REVIEW
WEEK**

DIVERSITY IN PEER REVIEW
SEPTEMBER 10-15, 2018

**Let's Reimagine
Peer Review in
the AI Era**

15-19 September 2025

Register now

editage in partnership with ease/



WILEY
Taylor & Francis Group
an informa business

THE ROYAL SOCIETY
Public

scienceOPEN.com
research + publishing network

OSA[®]
The Optical Society

ORCID
Connecting Research
and Researchers

FEDERATION OF EUROPEAN MICROBIOLOGICAL SOCIETIES
FEMS

emerald PUBLISHING

ISMTE
International Society
of Manufacturing and
Technical Education

Editorial Office Ltd

AAP

**WHEEL OF AI FORTUNE:
WHICH PEER REVIEW
TOOL IS BEST FOR YOU?**

Join Maria, Gareth, and special guests for a game-show twist on peer review! Spin the wheel, explore top AI-powered tools, and uncover which one is best for your paper.

Date: Fri., 19 September
Time: 2 PM - CEST

SPIN WITH US - REGISTER NOW!

Special Event
Live on LinkedIn

Fri, Sep 19, 2:00 PM CEST




Journal Peer Review

QUT Library and Office of Research Ethics & Integrity

Office of Research Ethics & Integrity
orel.enquiries@qut.edu.au

QUT Library
library.research@qut.edu.au



“One old-fashioned way to acknowledge peer reviewers that shouldn’t be left out is simply saying THANK YOU!”