

Elsevier trails Publishing Peer Review Reports as articles


Peer Review: Past, Present and Future

Presented By Bahar Mehmani

Date 22-04-2015, Zürich

Reviewer Recognition Program

- Reviewer Recognition Platform
- Publishing Peer Review Reports
- Cross-Review
- Reviewer Dashboard
- Single/Double-blind



Reviewer Recognition Platform


Reviewer Recognition Platform

Objective:

Recognize important contribution of reviewers

Current status:

500 journals across all subject areas, +220,000 Reviewer Profile page







My Elsevier Reviews Profile BETA

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.

Bookmark this page for easy access to *My Elsevier Reviews Profile* in the future.

Welcome **EN MEI JIN**
✉ jinenmei@chungbuk.ac.kr 📍 Chungbuk National University


Share my profile:    

My Latest Review: April 2014, Biomass and Bioenergy

[Claim your Book discount](#) [Claim your Webshop discount](#)

My Review Status

Please find an overview of your review recognitions below.



Recognized reviewer - Biomass and Bioenergy

Achieved: April 2014

— You are awarded this status because you completed at least one manuscript review. View details for your review record and to claim your free certificate and reviewer badge.

You are 2 review(s) from becoming an Outstanding Reviewer.

[View Detail...](#)

Outstanding reviewer


Materials Science in Semiconductor Processing


Achieved: June 2013

You are awarded this status as you are within the top 10% percentile of reviewers for the Journal, in terms of the number of manuscript reviews completed in the last two years. For Materials Science in Semiconductor Processing, this means a minimum of 5 reviews in two years.

[Download your certificate](#) [Claim your badge](#)

Review Record





Recognized reviewer - Applied Surface Science

Achieved: March 2014

— You are awarded this status because you completed at least one manuscript review in the last two years for Applied Surface Science. View details for your review record and to claim your free certificate and reviewer badge.

You are 3 review(s) from becoming an Outstanding Reviewer.

Volunteer for review



Endocrinology.

View details for your review record and to claim your free certificate and reviewer badge.

You are 3 review(s) from becoming an Outstanding Reviewer.

[View Detail...](#)

Volunteer for review

Connect with my

☒ ORCID

 Connect your ORCID ID

☒ Scopus ID

Lookup in **Scopus**

☐ I have neither ORCID nor Scopus ID

Continue

ELSEVIER

The Elsevier journals I am interested in reviewing for are:

The reasons I have chosen these journals are: *

I am available: *

- ☐ Monthly
- ☐ Quarterly
- ☐ Annually
- ☒ On a case by case basis

Submit

My Elsevier Reviews Profile

You are a Recognized Reviewer!

>> [Access My Elsevier Reviews Profile](#)

We recognize the important contribution all reviewers make to Elsevier's journals. Based on your contribution, we have awarded you Recognized Reviewer Status.



My Latest Review

General and Comparative Endocrinology
September 2014

You are awarded this status as you have completed at least one manuscript review in the last two years for *General and Comparative Endocrinology*.

My Elsevier Reviews Profile BETA is a personalized page where you can:

- Track your reviewer status
- Claim reviewer discounts
- Collect your certificate
- Share your reviewer record.

Emails are sent to reviewers after review with link to personal profile page


[ACCESS YOUR PROFILE](#)


Survey Results

Rated: 8.3/10
NPS: 19

How do you plan to use your reviewer status & profile?

Answered: 2,411 Skipped: 5





Publishing Peer Review Report

Publishing Peer Review Reports on Science Direct

- Which Journals?
- Why?
- How?

What? Publishing peer review reports for 5 journals

- Annals of Medicine and Surgery
- International Journal of Surgery
- Engineering Fracture Mechanics
- Journal of Hydrology
- Agricultural and Forest Meteorology

Why?



Annals of Medicine and Surgery

Volume 4, Issue 1, March 2015, Pages 58–63



Open Access

Long-term results of open repair of popliteal artery aneurysm

M.U. Wagenhäuser  , K.B. Herma¹ , T.A. Sagban¹ , P. Dueppers¹ , H. Schelzig¹ , M. Duran¹ 

 [Show more](#)

doi:10.1016/j.amsu.2015.01.005

Under a Creative Commons license

Referred to by



onte

Transparency

Recognition

Peer review report 3 on Long-term Results of Open repair of Popliteal Artery Aneurysm

Annals of Medicine and Surgery, Volume 4, Supplement 1, January–December 2015, Page 1

 PDF (101 K)

Peer review report 2 on Long-term Results of Open repair of Popliteal Artery Aneurysm

Initial Pilot results

Hub | **ScienceDirect** | Scopus | Applications

Register | Login | Go to SciV

Search | My settings | My alerts

DF (992 K) More options...

Agricultural and Forest Meteorology
Volume 170, 15 March 2013, Pages 89–102
Agricultural prediction using climate model ensembles

**climate change impacts on potential C4 crop
over tropical regions**

N. de Noblet-Ducoudré^b, B. Sultan^a, M. Lengaigne^a, M. Guimberteau^a

France

format.2011.12.003, How to Cite or Link Using DOI

on agriculture could arguably be most
ns rely importantly on agriculture and c
ate and adapt to climate change, and p
ity in those regions. Current projections
average negative, remain largely uncertain. there is need for more consistent, large

Supportive Survey results from an initial pilot

Implementation of Reviewer's suggestions:

- Visibility: DOI
- Proper format: typesetting

• 27% authors, 45% reviewers say they got new insights

• No influenced on evaluation
• No influenced on writing report
• No influenced on recommendation

Search ScienceDirect

Bibliographic information

Citing and related articles

Applications and tools

Peer Review Reports

More information on this application

Download review reports

Share

Like Tweet

Reviewer Feedback

Positive: *It hasn't affected the way that I write reports, since I generally try to be as constructive as I can. However I think that this policy is an excellent one since it will encourage people to improve the quality of their reviews (and discourage them from writing ones that are just nasty).*

Negative: *I do not support the open peer review policy. If, however, it is to be continued, a far more useful document would be the editor's summary and recommendations. After that, the author's response to reviewers should also be a priority. In the end, however, this policy would create much more work for everyone with little, if any, improvement in science.*

Author Feedback

Positive: *The reviews often allow you as a reader to realise how was the study initially conceived and what were the initial flaws. It is often useful to see what are the things that people overlook and that reviewers pick up.*

Negative: *Reviewer's comments should be private between the author and reviewer. Is this supposed to be a way to "shame" authors into submitting a more final product? Even the best of articles can benefit from constructive criticism and a different point of view. With this new policy, you are essentially taking away that benefit of the publication process. In addition, I believe many scientists will refuse to act as a reviewer.*

How?

- Only Peer Reviews of Published articles
- Only those approved by the Editor
- Reviewer's consent to reveal his/her name

Peer review reports as articles on Science Direct









Annals of Medicine and Surgery

Volume 4, Issue 1, March 2015, Pages 58–63



Open Access

Long-term results of open repair of popliteal artery aneurysm

M.U. Wagenhäuser  , K.B. Herma¹ , T.A. Sagban¹ , P. Dueppers¹ , H. Schelzig¹ , M. Duran¹ 

 [Show more](#)

doi:10.1016/j.amsu.2015.01.005


[Get rights and content](#)

Under a Creative Commons license

Referred to by

Peer review report 3 on Long-term Results of Open repair of Popliteal Artery Aneurysm

Annals of Medicine and Surgery, Volume 4, Supplement 1, January–December 2015, Page 1

 [PDF \(101 K\)](#)



Annals of Medicine and Surgery

Volume 4, Supplement 1, January–December 2015, Pages 1

Peer Review Report 2015



Open Access

Peer review report

Peer review report 3 on Long-term Results of Open repair of Popliteal Artery Aneurysm

Available online 30 March 2015

☐ Show less

doi:10.1016/j.amsu.2015.02.003

Freely available

Separate DOI

Get rights

Interlinked to the article

Refers To

M.U. Wagenhäuser, K.B. Herma, T.A. Sanban, P. Duenners, H. Schelzig, M. Duran

Long-term result:

Annals of Medicine and

PDF (928 K)

Annals of Medicine and Surgery 4 (2015) S1

Contents lists available at ScienceDirect



Annals of Medicine and Surgery

journal homepage: www.annalsjournal.com



Peer review report

Typeset


Peer review report 3 on Long-term Results of Open repair of Popliteal Artery Aneurysm

[H1]Original Submission

[H2]Recommendation

The outcome of this paper is not accordance with the title. The descriptions of the long-term results are few and weak. The operation technique could be better described in details. The anatomic

Survey Results



Thank you!