

NOTEWORTHY

DENIAL OF PEER REVIEW ATTACK

27.07.2024

Lior Pachter created a new expression in response to Elisabeth Bik who complained about a new Nature paper with 45 supplements. Who can peer review or just read and digest this?



Lior Pachter
@lpachter



I think this paper is a Denial Of Peer Review Attack (DOPRA). It's kind of like a DoS (denial of service) attack. There is so much data, so many methods, so much code, so many figures, so many panels, so much supplement, so much text, that it is overwhelming. 18/

1:27 AM · Jul 26, 2024 · **80K** Views



<https://x.com/lpachter/status/1816616175562031120>



Mircea Ivan ✓
@OxygenIvan



What do Nature's editors argue is a reasonable upper limit of "reviewability"? 60 supplements ? Or maybe 100? We should come to our senses and accept the obvious: the race for Nature papers has gone beyond ridiculous. A paper in 1950, 1970, heck even 2000, could be called that, a paper. Could be reasonably expected to be reviewed by a few qualified folks in a decent amount of time, with enough attention given to details. The hundreds of megabytes of files, often with tens of large datasets, math formulas, tables with hundreds of lines... The "devil" has too many places to hide for the few reviewers (in the limited time they can devote). These new megapapers should not be published in conventional journals. Rather they should be made available on open sites and validated or invalidated by comments of tens is not hundreds of peers. The discussions should be ongoing indefinitely, a science Agora if you will. But who can give up the bragging rights of being published in Nature? (and self sabotage own career?) People prefer a short, closed, peer review process, not for the sake of science, but for the sake of having checked a Science publication.

4:22 AM · Jul 27, 2024 · 985 Views

<https://x.com/OxygenIvan/status/1817022596707148042>

[Publish houses of bricks not mansions of straw](#)

CC-BY-NC Science Surf , accessed 01.05.2026, [click to save as PDF](#)