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What is cross-review?

- Once all reviews are in, we invite all reviewers to read the other reviews and make additional comments within 2 business days.

- Cross-review is encouraged, but not required.

- If we do not receive comments we will proceed based on the reviews in hand.

- In cases where the decision is clear, we may proceed without cross-review. In these cases, reviews will be shared for information only.
Path to cross-review

Experiment conducted in 2012

- Pre-experiment survey - 908 respondents
- Post-experiment survey - 164 respondents (36.6% response rate); 8 editors

Implemented as a step in peer review in 2013

Surveyed manuscripts reviewed between Sep 2016 - Feb 2017

- Reviewers - 853 respondents (38.3% response rate)
- Editors - 6 original editors; 19 additional editors
Need for cross-review

- 77% would at least somewhat like the opportunity to see other reviews before an editor makes a decision.
- 96% of reviewers who have seen other comments found them informative.

How much would you like to see other reviews BEFORE the editor makes a decision?
Cross-review's impact on reviewers
Do you find the comments of other reviewers to be INFORMATIVE?
Do you think cross-review has a positive impact on the FAIRNESS of the review process overall?
Did reading over reviewer comments change your overall judgment of the manuscript?

- **Pre-cross-review experiment**
- **Post-cross-review experiment**
- **Fully integrated cross-review survey**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Judgment Level</th>
<th>Pre-cross-review</th>
<th>Post-cross-review</th>
<th>Fully integrated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly to</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significantly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What do you perceive as the BENEFITS of cross-review?

- Allows comment on potential biases: 60%
- Allows comment on technical concerns: 50%
- Improves my skills as a referee: 40%
- Makes the review process less opaque: 30%
- No perceived benefit: 10%
- Other: 0%
Cross-review's impact on editors
Do you think cross-review has had a positive impact on the FAIRNESS of the review process?

Experiment Editors

Other Editors
Do you think cross-review has had a positive impact on the EFFECTIVENESS of the review process?

![Bar chart showing the percentage of Experiment Editors and Other Editors with different levels of impact on the review process.]

- **No positive impact at all:** Experiment Editors: 22%, Other Editors: 22%
- **2:** Experiment Editors: 33%, Other Editors: 44%
- **3:** Experiment Editors: 50%, Other Editors: 50%
- **4:** Experiment Editors: 50%, Other Editors: 50%
- **Strong positive impact:** Experiment Editors: 33%, Other Editors: 44%
Overall how HELPFUL do you find the cross-review process?
Thank you.
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