



Reviewer's Side

Bipin CHAURASIA

Neurosurgery Clinic, Department of Neurosurgery, Birgunj, Nepal

Corresponding author: Bipin CHAURASIA ✉ trozexa@gmail.com

The world is unique. It solely concerns wealthier people. They have created regulations just for their own gain. This also applies to journals. Scientific article publication in journals focuses solely around journals, with authors and reviewers doing everything from behind the scenes to make a profit and maintain their businesses. Authors who have worked hard on their research must pay for publishing, either through an article processing charge (APC) or by purchasing their own pdf paper once it has been published. Reviewers are also tricked by receiving nothing for their review process, which also requires a significant amount of work to improve the authors' text. In exchange, they do not even receive a free pdf and must purchase it after publishing. All of the benefits that a journal receives from article processing fees or article sales go to the journal, with no money going to the authors, co-authors, other editorial board members, or reviewers. Authors are at least happy with releasing an essay that is read and enjoyed by many people, earning them a name. The reviewer must be pleased with merely the reviewer certificate, much like a lollipop. Some open-access journals provide the names of reviewers in their articles. This is merely to entice them for future reviews, as they seldom receive reviews. Many non-open access journals disclose the reviewer's identity and provide credit for the review by publishing their names collectively at the end of the year.

Many times, publications were delivered to reviewers who were not experts in the topic but were forced to review them. The journal just requires a few comments from the reviewer before proceeding to process, accept, and publish the paper and get their APC payment. They just want to hasten the acceptance and publication process. They have no intention of conducting research; they only want money, and as a result, they do not perceive the quality of the reviewer or the paper. Open access and predatory journals are attracting many academics into article submission and review just to meet their requirements, with no intention of publishing high-quality articles (1,2).

Ironically, many open access publications lack editorial boards, unlike real society-driven journals. To ensure that the review is

completed on time, they must distribute the piece to random persons. Can we fathom how this will affect the overall quality of research? To write a quality review, the reviewer must have quality and a significant amount of time to evaluate each content. This requires reviewers to devote significant amounts of valuable time to the task. So, in exchange, reviewers should be compensated for their efforts. Otherwise, reviewers show little interest in the paper and provide comments based on a cursory or half-read of the text. That is why the practice of free reviewing should be prohibited. These principles should be considered by all journals and editors.

Like the writers, reviewers must pay for their own pdf. In this method, both parties are deceived. As the world revolves around rich people, no one raises their voice in support of mandatory payment to writers and reviewers in opposition to journal hegemony. A portion of all earnings should also go to authors and reviewers. All journal editors are members of a single group (ICMJE-International Committee of Medical Journal Editors), and they should treat this matter seriously and not exploit the authors and reviewers. Authors and reviewers do not have such a committee/society; all regulations are developed by ICMJE and enforced on authors and reviewers.

Journals are frequently pleased with a single review or comment. Can we think that just one person/reviewer decides the fate of your months/years of research? We don't even know what the quality of that reviewer was. I feel that the reviewers' names and qualifications should be mentioned somewhere in the text for the purpose of both writers and reviewers' pleasure. On this method, the reviewer's name appears on the paper, which should also be searchable on other sites such as Google, PubMed, and Scopus. Journals should limit article reviews to their editorial board in order to prevent misleading comments from reviewers. An editorial board that is diverse enough to cover every topic and area of the subject is needed for this magazine. The entire editorial board need to be compensated as well. If the article is outside the purview of the journal, it should be returned right away, something that many publications fail to do. I've seen articles about brain

tumours published in the Spine magazine. In this process, nothing should be free; each person needs to contribute their fair share to ensure a well-done task. Reviewers of papers are often objective. A title page is frequently provided by the journal with the submission, which further confuses reviewers as to whether to accept or reject the work if they are familiar with the writers.

Continuous emailing from the journal to its reviewer is another mentally upsetting conduct until the reviewer either makes a remark or declines to review. If a reviewer wants to reject, they must offer reasons, as if they are obligated to do so and have been compensated. Many publications allow readers to recommend and oppose reviewers. When proposing reviewers, writers frequently pick recognized pals who provide favourable feedback when reviewing. In many cases, writers will phone or chat to a buddy in order to expedite the review and provide a good answer. This keeps reviewers in a no-man's land. Reviewers may also invest their own money to purchase a plagiarism checker to review an article. To verify for similarities, they pay their own money to download a reference article listed in the article. In this approach, reviewers are doing their best to provide high-quality research, but who considers the reviewer's quiet anguish if everything goes unpaid?

Everything has pros and negatives, as well as benefits and downsides. Some advantages include: Reviewing a paper increases the reviewer's expertise. It also helps them develop their scientific writing and critical thinking abilities. It also helps to improve communication throughout the scientific community.

AUTHORSHIP CONTRIBUTION

The author (BC) confirm responsibility for the following: study conception and design, data collection, analysis and interpretation of results, and manuscript preparation.

■ REFERENCES

1. Deora H, Tripathi M, Chaurasia B, Grotenhuis JA: Avoiding predatory publishing for early career neurosurgeons: What should you know before you submit? *Acta Neurochir* 163:1-8, 2021. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00701-020-04546-9>
2. Tripathi M, Deora H, Chaurasia B, Grotenhuis JA: Predatory publishing and journals: It's ubiquitous! *Acta Neurochir* 163:11-12, 2021. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00701-020-04645-7>