

MAIL³⁶⁰



We'd like your views – write to: The Editor, *Bone & Joint*³⁶⁰,
22 Buckingham Street, London WC2N 6ET or email editor360@boneandjoint.org.uk

Dear Sir,

The UK Government Science and Technology committee has recently concluded a parliamentary debate on peer review in scientific publications.¹ The current model of peer review has been accused of being slow, expensive, ineffective, and biased.² Innovative models of publishing have been discussed, including open post-publication peer review. It has been demonstrated that open reviews are of higher quality, more courteous and take longer to complete than anonymous reviews.³ In fact, reviewers who revealed their names were more likely to recommend publication.³ Open post-publication peer review may actually improve the quality of publications and will do away with certain drawbacks of the current models of publication.^{4,5} There is, however, a reluctance by the scientific community to engage in this exercise.⁶ In this generation of rapid advancement of information technology, are we ready to embrace an evolution in publishing and peer review models?

Ajay Malviya *FRCSEd (Tr & Orth)*, Consultant Orthopaedic Surgeon
Newcastle upon Tyne, UK

REFERENCES

1. <http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm201012/cmselect/cmsctech/856/85602.htm>. 2011/08/23 (date last accessed 5 December 2011).
2. <http://blogs.bmj.com/bmj/2011/04/06/richard-smith-what-is-post-publication-peer-review/> (date last accessed 5 December 2011).
3. *Br J Psychiatry* 2000;176:47-51.
4. *Nature* 2007;448(7152): 408.
5. *BMJ* 2010;341: c5148.
6. *BMJ* 2010;341: c3803.