

Issues Concerning the Remuneration of Peer Reviewers by Academic Journals

Authors: Gu Liping

Date: 2024-10-26T00:00:00+00:00

Abstract

A discussion has emerged in academia regarding whether researchers who participate in peer review should receive monetary compensation. In academic research, scholarly journals serve as vital platforms for knowledge dissemination and exchange, bearing the critical responsibility of screening, evaluating, and publishing high-quality research papers. As a key mechanism for ensuring academic quality, the peer review system has long relied on reviewers who invest substantial time and effort without receiving any form of remuneration. In recent years, with the continuous evolution of the academic landscape and the growing volume of review work, voices questioning this tradition have become increasingly prominent. Many scholars have begun advocating for a re-examination of peer reviewers' labor value and exploring the establishment of more equitable incentive mechanisms. This article investigates the potential implications of providing compensation by analyzing historical context, existing literature, and empirical data, examining both positive outcomes—such as enhanced review quality and efficiency and reduced review times—and potential drawbacks, including increased operational costs and research ethics concerns, while proposing several viable solutions.

Full Text

Preamble

Regarding the Payment of Remuneration to Peer Reviewers by Academic Journals

Gu Liping¹²

¹ National Science Library, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing, 100190

² Department of Information Resource Management, School of Economics and Management, University of Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing, 100190

Abstract

The question of whether researchers who participate in peer review should receive compensation has recently emerged as a significant topic of debate within the academic community. Academic journals serve as vital platforms for knowledge dissemination and exchange, bearing the critical responsibility of screening, evaluating, and publishing high-quality research papers. As the cornerstone of ensuring academic quality, the peer review mechanism has long relied on reviewers who dedicate substantial time and effort to evaluating manuscripts without receiving any form of remuneration. In recent years, however, as the academic landscape has evolved and review workloads have increased substantially, this longstanding tradition has faced growing criticism. Many scholars now advocate for a fundamental reassessment of the labor value of peer reviewers and the establishment of more equitable incentive mechanisms. This paper examines the historical background, existing research, and empirical data to analyze the potential impacts of remunerating reviewers, including positive outcomes such as improved review quality and efficiency and shortened review cycles, as well as potential risks like increased operational costs and research ethics concerns. Finally, it proposes several possible solutions to address these challenges.

Keywords

Academic Journals; Peer Review; Compensation Payment; Incentive Mechanism; Academic Ethics

1. Introduction

In academic research, journals function as essential platforms for knowledge dissemination and scholarly exchange, shouldering the critical responsibility of screening, evaluating, and publishing high-quality papers. When a manuscript is submitted, editorial offices typically adhere to a rigorous peer review process, inviting external experts (usually two) to conduct comprehensive and objective evaluations. These invited scholars, known as peer reviewers, leverage their profound expertise and scholarly insight to provide invaluable assessment reports that inform editorial decisions on publication. However, despite investing considerable time and intellectual effort in this work, peer reviewers traditionally receive no compensation. For decades, this unpaid labor has been accepted as standard practice within academia, yet recently, as the academic environment has transformed and review burdens have intensified, this convention has faced mounting scrutiny. An increasing number of scholars now argue that we must reexamine the value of reviewers' labor and explore more sustainable incentive mechanisms to safeguard review quality and ensure the long-term viability of the system.

2. Should Academic Journals Pay Peer Reviewers \$450?

At the “Researcher to Reader Conference” in February 2021, the specific proposition of whether journals should pay peer reviewers \$450 sparked vigorous and substantive debate, with participants offering sharply contrasting perspectives. Proponents of payment contend that fair compensation would substantially enhance both the quality and efficiency of peer review. They argue that appropriate financial incentives would motivate reviewers to engage more conscientiously with manuscripts, yielding more precise and comprehensive evaluations, while also accelerating review timelines and reducing unnecessary delays that burden both authors and journals. Conversely, opponents warn that such payments could introduce significant adverse consequences. They point out that compensating reviewers would increase operational costs for journals, likely driving up subscription fees and imposing greater financial strain on institutions and scholars. Additionally, they express concern that monetary compensation might compromise research ethics, potentially leading reviewers to relax their standards due to financial interests and thereby undermining the impartiality and objectivity essential to scholarly evaluation.

3. Why Peer Review Is Unpaid: Historical Context

Examining the historical evolution of academic journals and the peer review system reveals that peer review originated as a voluntary contribution among academic society members. In that era, scholars undertook review work out of genuine passion for research and shared commitment to disciplinary advancement, willingly contributing their expertise to uphold academic standards. Remarkably, this tradition of unpaid service persisted even as academic publishing gradually commercialized and scaled up. Despite the introduction of market mechanisms, commercial journals have largely maintained this practice, with reviewers continuing to uphold an ethos of academic public service, offering their intellectual labor without expectation of payment. This tradition of pro bono peer review has become a distinctive feature of academic culture, reflecting scholars’ dedication to and investment in the scholarly enterprise.

4. Consequences of Paid Peer Review: Cases and Research

Although unpaid peer review remains the dominant model in academia, some journals and institutions have experimented with compensating reviewers, prompting scholarly investigation into this practice. Research indicates that payment can indeed reduce review times and improve efficiency, as financial incentives often motivate reviewers to complete their assessments more promptly, thereby decreasing authors’ waiting periods. However, the impact of compensation on reviewer participation rates appears modest at best; even with monetary incentives, willingness to participate has not increased significantly. This suggests that for many scholars, academic prestige and professional responsibility serve as more powerful motivators than financial reward. Fur-

thermore, researchers have developed theoretical models to explore the complex relationship between payment and participation, incorporating variables such as economic incentives, academic reputation, and review workload to more comprehensively understand the dynamics at play.

5. Conclusion

Peer review constitutes a critical mechanism for ensuring quality in academic publishing, and while many researchers desire recognition for their contributions, few consider monetary compensation their primary expectation. This phenomenon reflects a distinctive value system within academia that distinguishes between scholarly contribution and material reward. As academic publishing continues to evolve, the question of whether peer reviewers should be paid will undoubtedly remain a subject of ongoing discussion and reflection. Based on a comprehensive analysis of diverse perspectives and empirical evidence, this paper concludes that although remunerating reviewers may enhance efficiency and quality while stimulating reviewer engagement, whether such a model is truly feasible and beneficial for the long-term health of the scholarly ecosystem remains a controversial and open question requiring deeper investigation.

References

- [01] Heathers, J. “The 450 Movement”[J/OL]. Medium, (2020-09-04)[2023-07-14]. <https://jamesheathers.medium.com/the-450-movement-1f86132a29bd>
- [02] Brainard, J. “The \$450 question: Should journals pay peer reviewers?”[J/OL]. Science, (2021-05-01)[2023-07-14]. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.abh3175>
- [03] Baldwin, M. Making “Nature”: The History of a Scientific Journal[M]. University of Chicago Press, 2015: 328p.
- [04] Fyfe, A., et al. A History of Scientific Journals: Publishing at the Royal Society, 1665-2015[M]. UCL Press, 2022: 664p[2023-07-14]. <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv2gz3zp1>
- [05] Baldwin, Melinda. Making “Nature”: The History of a Scientific Journal[M]. University of Chicago Press, 2015: 328p.
- [06] Garcia, J A., et al. The cross-subsidy and buy-one-give-one models of compensated peer review: A comparative study for mission-driven journals[J]. Journal of Information Science, 2022[2023-07-14]. <https://doi.org/10.1177/01655515221125321>
- [07] Davis, P. “Rewarding Reviewers: Money, Prestige, or Some of Both?”[J/OL]. The Scholarly Kitchen, 2013-02-22[2023-07-14]. <https://scholarlykitchen.sspnet.org/2013/02/22/rewarding-reviewers-money-prestige-or-some-of-both/>
- [08] Garcia, J A., et al. Can a paid model for peer review be sustainable when the author can decide whether to pay or not?[J]. Scientometrics, 2022, (127):

1491-1514[2023-07-14]. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-021-04248-8>

[09] European Open Science. “Paid Peer-Reviewing Model”[EB/OL]. [2023-07-14]. <https://europapublishing.org/reviewers.html>

[10] Zaharie, MA; Osoian, CL. Peer review motivation frames: A qualitative approach[J]. European Management Journal, 2016, 34(1): 69-79[2023-07-14]. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.emj.2015.12.004>

[11] Publons. “Report for Publons State of Peer Review 2018 Survey”[R]. 2018: 61p[2023-07-14]. <https://doi.org/10.14322/publons.GSPR2018>

[12] Warne, V. Rewarding reviewers – sense or sensibility? A Wiley study explained[J]. Learned Publishing, 2016, 29(1): 41-50[2023-07-14]. <https://doi.org/10.1002/leap.1002>

[13] Hamermesh, DS. Facts and myths about refereeing[J]. Journal of Economic Perspectives, 1994, 8(1): 153-163[2023-07-14]. <https://doi.org/10.1257/jep.8.1.153>

[14] Thompson, GD., et al. Does Paying Referees Expedite Reviews?: Results of a Natural Experiment[J]. Southern Economic Journal, 2010, 76(3): 678-692[2023-07-14]. <https://doi.org/10.4284/sej.2010.76.3.678>

Note: Figure translations are in progress. See original paper for figures.

Source: ChinaXiv — Machine translation. Verify with original.