

Resource Summary Report

Generated by [RRID](#) on Aug 4, 2026

F1000: Faculty of 1000 Post-Publication Peer Review

RRID:SCR_006537

Type: Tool

Proper Citation

F1000: Faculty of 1000 Post-Publication Peer Review (RRID:SCR_006537)

Resource Information

URL: <http://f1000.com/>

Proper Citation: F1000: Faculty of 1000 Post-Publication Peer Review (RRID:SCR_006537)

Description: Service that identifies and evaluates the most important articles in biology and medical research publications. The selection process comprises a peer-nominated global "Faculty" of the world's leading scientists and clinicians who rate the best of the articles they read and explain their importance. Faculty Members and their evaluations are organized into over 40 Faculties (subjects), which are further subdivided into over 300 Sections. On average, 1500 new evaluations are published each month; this corresponds to approximately the top 2% of all published articles in the biological and medical sciences. F1000 is a subscription service paid for by academic and corporate institutions. Users at subscribing institutions automatically receive full access to the F1000 service when using internet facilities provided by their institution.

Abbreviations: F1000

Synonyms: F1000 Evaluations, Faculty of 1000, F1000 Evaluated Articles

Resource Type: commercial organization

Keywords: biology, medicine, biomedical science, clinical, database, peer review, medical research

Availability: Subscription

Resource Name: F1000: Faculty of 1000 Post-Publication Peer Review

Resource ID: SCR_006537

Alternate IDs: nlx_71290, Wikidata: Q5428884, grid.466681.b, ISNI: 0000 0000 8758 3069

Alternate URLs: <https://ror.org/019tc7185>

Old URLs: <http://www.facultyof1000.com/>

Record Creation Time: 20220129T080236+0000

Record Last Update: 20260801T190309+0000

Ratings and Alerts

No rating or validation information has been found for F1000: Faculty of 1000 Post-Publication Peer Review.

No alerts have been found for F1000: Faculty of 1000 Post-Publication Peer Review.

Data and Source Information

Source: [SciCrunch Registry](#)

Usage and Citation Metrics

We found 14 mentions in open access literature.

Listed below are recent publications. The full list is available at [RRID](#) .

Cipriani A, et al. (2023) New living evidence resource of human and non-human studies for early intervention and research prioritisation in anxiety, depression and psychosis. *BMJ mental health*, 26(1).

Tian X, et al. (2021) Clinical efficacy and security of glycyrrhizic acid preparation in the treatment of anti-SARS-CoV-2 drug-induced liver injury: a protocol of systematic review and meta-analysis. *BMJ open*, 11(7), e051484.

Yang M, et al. (2020) Efficacy and safety of Chinese herbal medicine for Coronavirus disease 2019: A protocol for systematic review and meta-analysis. *Medicine*, 99(22), e20157.

Hu Z, et al. (2020) Efficacy and safety of Lian-Hua Qing-Wen granule for COVID-2019: A protocol for systematic review and meta-analysis. *Medicine*, 99(23), e20203.

Zhou H, et al. (2020) Efficacy and safety of Xiyanping for COVID-2019: A protocol for systematic review and meta-analysis. *Medicine*, 99(46), e22962.

Wu J, et al. (2020) The efficacy and safety of Yuxingcao eye drops in the treatment of COVID-19 conjunctivitis: A protocol for a systematic review. *Medicine*, 99(49), e23093.

Murphy LS, et al. (2018) Measuring Scholarly Productivity: A Primer for Junior Faculty. Part III: Understanding Publication Metrics. *The western journal of emergency medicine*, 19(6), 1003.

Tracz V, et al. (2015) The five deadly sins of science publishing. *F1000Research*, 4, 112.

Kok DJ, et al. (2014) Academic development for urologists in the Kurdistan region of Iraq. *Arab journal of urology*, 12(1), 79.

Eyre-Walker A, et al. (2013) The assessment of science: the relative merits of post-publication review, the impact factor, and the number of citations. *PLoS biology*, 11(10), e1001675.

Ietto-Gillies G, et al. (2012) The evaluation of research papers in the XXI century. The Open Peer Discussion system of the World Economics Association. *Frontiers in computational neuroscience*, 6, 54.

Kriegeskorte N, et al. (2012) Open evaluation: a vision for entirely transparent post-publication peer review and rating for science. *Frontiers in computational neuroscience*, 6, 79.

Florian RV, et al. (2012) Aggregating post-publication peer reviews and ratings. *Frontiers in computational neuroscience*, 6, 31.

Birukou A, et al. (2011) Alternatives to peer review: novel approaches for research evaluation. *Frontiers in computational neuroscience*, 5, 56.