### Providence

## **Providence Digital Commons**

Articles, Abstracts, and Reports

5-2023

## Peer Review Validation: Tracking Scholarly Activity in a Repository

Amanda Schwartz Providence

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.providence.org/publications



Part of the Health Sciences and Medical Librarianship Commons

#### **Recommended Citation**

Schwartz, Amanda, "Peer Review Validation: Tracking Scholarly Activity in a Repository" (2023). Articles, Abstracts, and Reports. 7223.

https://digitalcommons.providence.org/publications/7223

This Presentation is brought to you for free and open access by Providence Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Articles, Abstracts, and Reports by an authorized administrator of Providence Digital Commons. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@providence.org.

# Peer Review Validation: Tracking Scholarly Activity in a Repository

### Background

Providence's institutional repository Digital Commons launched in 2018, serving as the enterprise's scholarly activity repository.

After several years of successful repository usage and readership tracking, research administration initiated a new request: peer review tracking. The repository previously tracked number of article submissions but did not assess if content was published in peer reviewed journals.

How can we retroactively and proactively track peer reviewed articles on our institutional repository?

Simple ask, complicated answer.

### Description

Library staff had no previous practices in place to record whether content was peer reviewed or not. The initial request seemed simple, yet became increasingly complex to create both a cumulative list of current peer reviewed content and best practice guidelines for tracking future materials. While always looking to automate processes, this specific request required considerable manual work.

Library staff created a four-point guideline to identify peer reviewed submissions to the repository. To complete deliverables at zero-cost, staff reviewed options to identify lists and databases of peer reviewed journals. Staff exported journal lists and, using a cumulative spreadsheet, implemented duplicate data identifiers to mark peer reviewed journal titles. This identifier helped cut out overall worktime for assessing peer reviewed journal titles. Finally came the task of hand-identifying peer versus non-peer reviewed journal titles in the repository for all titles not captured in online lists.

### Creating a Peer Review Plan:

MONTH	JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JULY	AUG	SEPT	OCT	NOV	DEC	TOTAL
ALL Scholarly Activity	119	111	99	135	170	123	10	5 177	119	127	136	21	4 1635
ALL Publications	84	89	59	92	62	73	7.	4 93	96	86	84	9	2 984
TOTAL Peer Review	84	89	59	89	61	70	7:	91	. 93	84	78	9	961
TOTAL Non Peer Review				3	1	3		1 2	3	2	6		2 23

- Assess all articles collected on repository
- 2. Check for duplicate journal titles
- 3. Pull preexisting lists of peer reviewed content
- 4. Check unknown journal titles on publisher sites

journals all time	Peer Reviewed
A A Pract	у
AACN	у
AACN Adv Crit Care	у
AANA J	y
AANA journal	y
Abdom Radiol (NY)	у
Acad Pathol	у
Academic emergency medicine : official journal of the Society for Academic Emergency Medicine	У
Academic medicine : journal of the Association of American Medical Colleges	У
Academic psychiatry: the journal of the American Association of Directors of Psychiatric Residency Training and the Association for Academic Psychiatry	у
Academic radiology	у
ACR Open Rheumatol	у
ACS Chem Biol	V
ACS Chem Neurosci	ý
Acta Derm Venereol	у
Acta Myol	у
Acta neurochirurgica	у
Acta Neuropathol	у
Acta paediatrica (Oslo, Norway : 1992)	у
Acta Radiol Open	у
Addictive behaviors	у
Adv Anesth	у
Adv Chronic Kidney Disease	у
Adv Genomics Genet	у
Adv Healthc Mater	у
Adv Nutr	у
Adv Radiat Oncol	у
Adv Ther	у
Advances in chronic kidney disease	У
Advances in neonatal care: official journal of the National Association of Neonatal Nurses	У
Advances in therapy	у
Aesthet Surg J Open Forum	у
Aesthetic plastic surgery	у
Aging cell	У



### Conclusion

After finalizing the cumulative spreadsheet and duplicate identifier rules, staff could quickly add journal titles from monthly scholarly submissions, compare titles to what exist on the cumulative spreadsheet, and identify potentially new titles for reporting.

The project was well received by research leadership and administration and gives library staff a unique foothold with new and emerging research metrics for the healthcare system. Collecting peer reviewed data has allowed the repository to better report on the number of journal titles submitted, peer versus non-peer reviewed articles, and break down reporting structures monthly and annually for stakeholder needs.