

# EXTENDING ARXIV.ORG TO ACHIEVE OPEN PEER REVIEW AND PUBLISHING

AXEL BOLDT

ABSTRACT. Today's peer review process for scientific articles is unnecessarily opaque and offers few incentives to referees. The publishing process is unnecessarily inefficient and its results are only rarely made freely available to the public. We outline a comparatively simple extension of the ARXIV.ORG preprint archive that addresses both of these problems: editors invite referees to write signed and public reviews to be attached to the posted preprints, and then elevate selected articles to "published" status.

## 1. THE STATUS QUO

In the system of peer review that is currently used in the sciences, an editor invites one or more referees to review an article submitted to a scientific journal. Based on the referees' recommendations, the editor will accept the article, demand modifications, or reject it. Referee reports are generally made available to the article's author in anonymized form but are not otherwise published.

The system is completely opaque to outside observers. Neither the quality and timeliness of reviews, nor the standards of a journal, nor the amount of modifications made after initial review, nor the number of times an article has been rejected by other journals are publicly available.

Other than professional integrity, referees have little legitimate incentive to produce timely and high-quality reviews. Since the reviews are not published, referees are not accountable for their work and cannot use it to improve their standing in the academic community. Probably the biggest (and most problematic) incentive for referees is accumulation of editor goodwill, to be expended during future article

submissions. It is also conceivable that some referees reject articles whose results conflict with their own research agendas. Finally, editors may circumvent the peer review process altogether in order to promote their own or their associates' work. For case reports of recent scandals involving breakdown of the peer review process in mathematics and physics, see [Baez 06, Schiermeier 08].

Authors, editors and referees are not paid for their work in this publication process. Nevertheless, publishers charge exorbitant amounts for the resulting product, journals which have typically been hidden away in university libraries, inaccessible to the public who funded the research in the first place. Independent researchers and researchers in poor countries have often been cut out of the loop entirely.

The need for a system of open electronic publishing of scientific articles has long been recognized (see e.g. [Odlyzko 95]). Several electronic journals have now been created; some of these charge readers for access, others are free to read but charge authors for publication, still others are free for all parties involved. Perhaps the largest success for the Open Access movement was a 2007 U.S. law requiring all NIH-supported research to be submitted to an open archive one year after publication.[Weiss 07] Alternatives to the current peer review process have been discussed in [Harnard 00].

## 2. ARXIV.ORG

The website ARXIV.ORG (formerly XXX.LANL.GOV) is an electronic archive of freely accessible research preprints. [Ginsparg 97] It was started by physicist Paul Ginsparg in August 1991 and has since become an indispensable tool for researchers in physics, mathematics and, increasingly, computer science and quantitative biology. Authors submit their articles to the archive prior to peer review and official publication by a scientific journal; the preprints are posted on the website in perpetuity after superficial moderator review. To participate, authors need an affiliation

with a recognized academic institution or an endorsement by an established author. Interested parties can sign up for regular e-mail announcements containing the abstracts of new preprints in their chosen fields.

Once a manuscript has been peer reviewed and accepted for publication, authors should ideally post an updated version to the archive. Not all authors remember to do this, and some journals explicitly prohibit the practice, claiming a copyright on the final result of peer review.<sup>1</sup>

Consequently, ARXIV.ORG in its present incarnation (and similar preprint archives in other fields) do not serve as authoritative Open Access repositories of peer reviewed research.

### 3. A PROPOSED SOLUTION

To address the problems outlined in section 1, I propose the following extension to the ARXIV.ORG preprint archive. A new class of users is created, the “editors”. Each editor works for an electronic journal. Authors, after having uploaded a preprint to the archive, may elect to submit their article for review and official publication in one of these electronic journals. An editor will then invite referees to write public reviews, to be attached to the article. The article author may subsequently post a public rebuttal to the reviews. Based on the referee reports and rebuttals, the editor decides whether to accept, demand changes to, or reject the article. The original article, reviews, rebuttal and publication decision are published in perpetuity. If accepted, the author posts a final version of the article to ARXIV.ORG; as a peer reviewed and officially published article, it is visibly set apart from mere preprints and added to the electronic journal’s collection of published articles. Rejected articles may be submitted to another electronic journal.

Reviews should be signed with the referee’s full name and affiliation. This maximizes transparency and allows referees to receive academic credit for their work. However, some reviewers might be reluctant to participate in such a system, for

---

<sup>1</sup>See for instance Elsevier’s policy on electronic preprints at <http://www.elsevier.com/wps/find/authorhome.authors/preprints> (accessed 26 December 2008)

instance because they want to avoid openly rejecting the work of friends or influential researchers, or because they do not want to publicize their ignorance of some of the issues discussed in the reviewed article. Thus it is probably necessary to offer referees the option to publish their reviews under a pseudonym. Over time, such a pseudonym might naturally develop a reputation as a solid reviewer, completely divorced from the writer's real-world identity.

Some electronic journals may wish develop a process for attaching notes to published articles, for instance to point out prior work, mistakes or scientific misconduct discovered after publication. It might even be desirable to attach a moderated discussion forum to each article, as a natural gathering place for interested researchers.

It is to be expected that under the proposed system the act of refereeing will rise in prestige and the quality of referee reports will improve. Outside evaluations and comparisons of the standards and practices of electronic journals become possible. The process becomes completely transparent and the results are made freely available. In short, the world becomes a better place.

#### REFERENCES

- [Baez 06] John Baez. *The Bogdanoff Affair*. 21 June 2006. <http://math.ucr.edu/home/baez/bogdanov.html> (accessed 26 December 2008)
- [Ginsparg 97] Paul Ginsparg. First Steps towards Electronic Research Communication. In: *Gateways to Knowledge: The Role of Academic Libraries in Teaching, Learning, and Research* by Lawrence Dowler. MIT Press, 1997
- [Harnad 00] Stevan Harnad. The Invisible Hand of Peer Review. *Exploit Interactive*, issue 5, April 2000. <http://eprints.ecs.soton.ac.uk/2862/1/nature2.html>
- [Odlyzko 95] Andrew M. Odlyzko. Tragic Loss or Good Riddance? The Impending Demise of Traditional Scholarly Journals. *Notices of the American Mathematical Society*, vol 42, no 1, pp. 49 - 53. January 1995. <http://www.ams.org/notices/199501/forum.pdf>
- [Schiermeier 08] Quirin Schiermeier. Self-publishing editor set to retire. *Nature* 456 (2008), 432
- [Weiss 07] Rick Weiss. Measure Would Require Free Access To Results of NIH-Funded Research. *The Washington Post*, 21 December 2007. <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2007/12/20/AR2007122002115.html>

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, METROPOLITAN STATE UNIVERSITY, SAINT PAUL, MINNESOTA,  
U.S.A.

*E-mail address:* `Axel.Boldt@metrostate.edu`