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Method comparison - duration

Old Henry’s

unpredictable, long

Peerage of Science
Peerage of Science

Author decides, enforced
Peerage of Science

Author decides, enforced

20 days...

... 2.8 peer reviews
Method comparison – who reviews

Old Henry’s Peerage of Science

Editor solicits reviews
Peerage of Science

Editor may solicit reviews

Current stage: Revision is due by April 9th, 15:38 (GMT)

Tracking: Fighting severe carbon loss of degraded ecosystems by jump-starting functions with restoration

STAGE 1: Number of reviews received: 5
MANUSCRIPT

Author Comment PDF
Peerage of Science

Editor may solicit reviews + Peers can engage freely

Current stage: Proceeding terminated

Tracking: Adaptive radiations and the biogeography of speciation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Peer</th>
<th>Revision</th>
<th>Identity</th>
<th>Profile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peer 325:</td>
<td>Major revision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer 313:</td>
<td>Minor revision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer 314:</td>
<td>Minor revision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer 328:</td>
<td>Major revision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer 324:</td>
<td>Major revision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer 312:</td>
<td>Major revision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Method comparison – quality control

Old Henry’s

Editor knows reviewers

Peerage of Science
## Peerage of Science

Editor knows reviewers

Current stage: Proceeding terminated

Tracking: Adaptive radiations and the biogeography of speciation

### STAGE 1: Number of reviews received: 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manuscript</th>
<th>Author Comment</th>
<th>PDF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RESEARCH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer 325:</td>
<td>Major revision</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alfred R. Wallace (<a href="mailto:arw@evol.my">arw@evol.my</a>)</strong></td>
<td>Identity</td>
<td>Profile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer 313:</td>
<td>Minor revision</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer 314:</td>
<td>Minor revision</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer 328:</td>
<td>Major revision</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer 324:</td>
<td>Major revision</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer 312:</td>
<td>Major revision</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Peerage of Science

Editor knows reviewers + peer reviews are peer-reviewed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Peer</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Identity</th>
<th>Profile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peer 325</td>
<td>Major revision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alfred R. Wallace (<a href="mailto:arw@evol.my">arw@evol.my</a>)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer 313</td>
<td>Minor revision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer 314</td>
<td>Minor revision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer 328</td>
<td>Major revision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer 324</td>
<td>Major revision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer 312</td>
<td>Major revision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Method comparison – decisions

Old Henry’s

sequential

Peerage of Science
Peerage of Science

first concurrent,
Peerage of Science

first concurrent, then sequential
Time’s Up!
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