

Editorial

Dear reviewer: double blind, blind or open review?

Prezado revisor: revisão duplo cega, cega ou aberta?

Angelita Cristine de Melo and RBFHSS 2018 peer reviewers

Doi: 10.30968/rbfhss.2019.101.0451

"Publish or perish," an oppressive phrase for researchers as well as magazine editors. The publisher fundamentally wants to reduce review time, publish excellent articles, and have authors and readers satisfied with their numbers. These goals often bump into peer review, the Achilles heel of the editorial process. Even today many authors ignore the huge and complex web of collaboration contained in that *paper* that his research group, with a lot of sweat, published. At the tip of the iceberg it is usually visible the delay in returning the reviewers' opinions and, not infrequently, the complaint about one or another of the "reviewer's suggestions" that "has neither foot nor head".

The definition of the body of reviewers of a given article is based on the premise that those who publish in the area are competent reviewers and thus the invitations to *peer-review* are issued. With each opinion effectively given to an article, there are several requests rejected or ignored. Worse yet, some invitations are accepted and even after several reminders, the opinion does not see. Are potential reviewers unmotivated for such an activity? There is, however, no possibility to publish without *peer-review*. How to solve this difficult equation?

Review a *paper* is laborious, so credit should be given to those who have looked at text and eventually made suggestions that made it clearer or more appropriate^{1,2}. Saint-Exupéry already warned that we became eternally responsible for what we captivate, so when accepting to review a *paper*, the reviewer must be aware that it is co-responsible for it. This is one more reason to identify the reviewer of a particular publication.

Some say it is impossible to credit reviewers for the need for double blindness of this process. It turns out that the blindness of the authorship of the works is almost impractical task, because even with the omission of the authors, it is easily deduced by the content of the *paper* (object of work of research group "X" or researcher "Y"), by the Ethics Committee that approved the study, by references or even by the place where the research took place. In addition, the possibility of conflicting interests of a reviewer in reviewing a colleague's work should be considered. This will not always be known to the invitation editor. Thus, blinding on the one hand may hypothetically protect the author, but on the other hand contributes to more demanding opinions as well as may favor the identification of conflicting opinions. Discussions in this field are still broad and sometimes heated, but some aspects are already quite clear as identified below^{1,2,3}.

Double blind review: the reviewers are unaware of the authors' identities and vice-versa.	Blind review: the author does not know who the reviewers are.	Open peer-review: the authors' and the reviewers' identities are known by all the participants.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Advantages<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The research is assessed in a fair manner regardless of its authorships.• The author or reviewer benefits from some level of protection against criticism.• Disadvantages<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Anonymity is not guaranteed, since it can be quite easy to discover the authors' identities.• The referee can be more demanding with the paper for not being introduced to the authors.• The reviewers can make a less accurate review than needed, since they will not be linked to that publication.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Advantages<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The anonymous reviewer can be honest about the quality of the paper without fear of criticism or retaliations by the author.• Knowing who the authors are lets the reviewer identify plagiarisms or clarify doubts by consulting the authors' or the group's previous publications.• Disadvantages<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Identifying the authorship can alter the quality analysis of the paper, mainly if it is the work of:<ul style="list-style-type: none">• An important author of the area;• An author from a nationality not fluent in English (predominant language in scientific publications) or;• A group or author antagonist to that reviewer (no ethics in this case).	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Advantages<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Transparency incentivates responsibility and civility, generally improving the quality of the review and of the article.• The reviewers are more motivated to make a complete work, since their names and sometimes the comments appear as part of the accepted published article.• Disadvantages<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Some reviewers can refuse to review for being concerned about being identified as a source of a negative opinion.• Older or reknown researchers can have their papers reviewed in a more condescending way than beginners.• The reviewers can fear retaliations from the authors.

Brazilian Journal of Hospital Pharmacy and Health Services
Revista Brasileira de Farmácia Hospitalar e Serviços de Saúde

Open access: <http://www.rbfhss.org.br>

Editors-in-Chief

Angelita Cristine Melo
Federal University of São João del Rei – Divinópolis, Brazil
Elisangela da Costa Lima
Federal University of Rio de Janeiro, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil

Associate Editors

Fernando Fernandez Llimós
University of Lisbon, Lisbon, Portugal
Luciane Cruz Lopes
University of Sorocaba, Sorocaba, Brazil
Maria Rita Garbi Novaes
Health Sciences Education and Research Foundation, Brasília, Brazil
Mario Jorge Sobreira da Silva
National Cancer Institute, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil
Renata Cristina Rezende Macedo do Nascimento
Federal University of Ouro Preto, Ouro Preto, Brazil
Vera Lucia Luiza
Oswaldo Cruz Foundation, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil

Editorial Board

Adriano Max Moreira Reis – Federal University of Minas Gerais, Belo Horizonte, Brazil
Ahmed Nadir Kheir – Qatar University, Doha, Qatar
Alberto Herreros de Tejada - Puerta de Hierro University Hospital, Majadahonda, Spain
Carine Raquel Blatt – Federal University of Health Sciences, Porto Alegre, Brazil
Claudia Garcia Osorio de Castro - Oswaldo Cruz Foundation, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil
David Woods - University of Otago, Otago, New Zealand
Dayani Galato – University of Brasília, Brasília, Brazil
Divaldo Pereira Lyra Junior – Federal University of Sergipe, Aracaju, Brazil
Eduardo Savio - Uruguayan Centre for Molecular Imaging, Montevideo, Uruguay
Inés Ruiz Álvarez – University of Chile, Santiago de Chile, Chile
João Carlos Canotilho Lage - University of Coimbra, Coimbra, Portugal
Lúcia de Araújo Costa Beisl Noblat - Federal University of Bahia, Salvador, Brazil
Marcela Jirón Aliste - University of Chile, Santiago de Chile, Chile
Marcelo Polacow Bisson - Military Police of São Paulo State, São Paulo, Brazil
Maria Teresa Ferreira Herdeiro - University of Aveiro, Aveiro, Portugal
Marta Maria de França Fonteles - Federal University of Fortaleza, Fortaleza, Brazil
Selma Rodrigues de Castilho - Fluminense Federal University, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil
Sonia Lucena Cipriano, University of São Paulo, São Paulo, Brazil

Editorial Design: Liana de Oliveira Costa

Website support: Periódicos em Nuvens

ISSN online: 2316-7750

Data de submissão: 24/01/2020

Data de aceite: 27/01/2020.

Mission

To publish and divulge scientific production on subjects of relevance to Hospital Pharmacy and other Health Services.

Publication of Hospital Pharmacy and Health Services Brazilian Society / Sociedade Brasileira de Farmácia Hospitalar e Serviços de Saúde

President - Maely Peçanha Favero Retto

Vice-President - Valéria Santos Bezerra

Rua Vergueiro, 1855 - 12º andar
Vila Mariana - São Paulo - SP, Brazil
CEP 04101-000 - Tel./Fax: (11) 5083-4297
atendimento@sbrafh.org.br/www.sbrafh.org.br

The open review allows us to move towards giving credit, responsibility and appreciation to the *peer-review* activity and can facilitate the editorial process⁴. There are some peer review initiatives such as Publons. However, we are at the beginning of this movement and there are still universities that do not include peer review in the list of activities relevant to functional progression.

The Brazilian Journal of Hospital Pharmacy and Health Services has expanded the modalities of *peer-review* including open and blind review to choose from our review body. Thus, those who choose open reviews may be credited for their invaluable work with the mention of their name in the article as a reviewer when it is published. Another appreciation initiative is the public thanks to all reviewers of the previous year in the first editorial published the following year to identify their impact that year. Dear Reviewers of *papers* of 2018 receive our thank you very much.

Reviewers:

Adriano Max Moreira Reis, Brasil	Leonardo Régis Leira Pereira, Brasil
Alcidesio Sales de Souza, Brasil	Lisiane Leal, Brasil
Aldo Rodrigo Alvarez Risco, Brasil	Livia Lima Madruga, Brasil
Álvaro Vigo, Brasil	Lucas Okumura, Brasil
Ana Paula Soares Gondim, Brasil	Luciana de Mello Oliveira, Brasil
Andre de Oliveira Baldoni, Brasil	Luciane Cruz Lopes, Brasil
Annemeri Livinalli, Brasil	Marcelo Gonzaga de Freitas Araújo, Brasil
Camila Guimaraes Polisel, Brasil	Marco Túlio Gualberto Cintra, Brasil
Célia Chaves, Brasil	Maria Cristina Werlang, Brasil
Cesar Augusto Antunes Teixeira, Brasil	Maria Goretti Santos, Brasil
Clarice Chemello, Brasil	Maria Rita Carvalho Garbi Novaes, Brasil
Claudia du Bocage, Brasil	Mariana Martins Gonzaga do Nascimento, Brasil
Claudia Garcia Serpa Osorio de Castro, Brasil	Mario Jorge Sobreira da Silva, Brasil
Cléber Domingos Cunha Da Silva, Brasil	Melissa Negro Dellacqua, Brasil
Cleverton Kleiton Freitas De Lima, Brasil	Mércia Pandolfo Provin, Brasil
Cristiani Silveira Netto Trentim, Brasil	Mônica Vinhas Souza, Brasil
Daniela Oliveira de Melo, Brasil	Nadja Mara de Sousa Lopes, Brasil
Dayani Galato, Brasil	Nirla Rodrigues Romero, Brasil
Diana Domingues da Camara Graça, Brasil	Pablo Moura Santos, Brasil
Eduardo Ricci, Brasil	Priscila Rosalba Oliveira, Brasil
Eugenie Desirée Néri, Brasil	Renata Aline de Andrade, Brasil
Evandro de Oliveira Lupatini, Brasil	Rita de Cássia Elias Estrela, Brasil
Fabiola Giordani Cano, Brasil	Rodrigo Santos, Brasil
Gracita Leal da Cunha, Brasil	Sueli Yamauti, Brasil
Izabela Fulone, Brasil	Thais Emanuelle Pompeu de Lima, Brasil
Júlia Hiromi Hori Okuyama, Brasil	Thais Piazza, Brasil
Karina Valerim Teixeira Remor, Brasil	Thais Rodrigues Penaforte, Brasil

References

1. Wiley Online Library. Types of peer review. Disponível em: <https://authorservices.wiley.com/Reviewers/journal-reviewers/what-is-peer-review/types-of-peer-review.html>. Accessed March 2019.
2. Budden AE, Tregenza T, Aarssen LW, Koricheva J, Leimu R, Lortie CJ Double-blind review favours increased representation of female authors. *Trends Ecol Evol.* 2008;23(1):4-6. doi: 10.1016/j.tree.2007.07.008
3. Working double-blind. *Nature.* 2008; 451: 605–606(2008) doi: 10.1038/451605b
4. Fernandez-Llimos F et al. Pharm Pract (Granada). Scholarly publishing depends on peer reviewers. *PharmPract.* 2018;16(1):1236.