Open Science Discovery for PhD students

Julio Larios and Jellina Prinsen

Julio Larios, Jellina Prinsen

Published on: May 30, 2021

License: [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License \(CC-BY 4.0\)](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)

Julio Larios, PhD researcher in Neurorehabilitation, makes a comparison between traditional peer review and open peer review. Whilst traditional peer review is a quality assurance system for scientific publications, it also has flaws. It is a slow process that takes times, does not necessarily mean papers are high quality (shown by the increase in paper retractions), and prone to bias as it may favour positives and exciting results. Peer review (blind) is not transparent, takes time and lacks public recognition. Preprints can speed up the process but lack scientific discussion. Open peer review can improve quality and reduce bias, with the review report published alongside the paper. But it may be difficult to find reviewers. Alternatives are journals organised by researchers, grant-specific platforms and recommendation systems such as Peer Community In.

Presentation in collaboration with Jellina Prinsen

[Watch Julio Larios and Jellina Prinsen's presentation](#)