

Resource Summary Report

Generated by [RRID](#) on Sep 10, 2026

Publons

RRID:SCR_014020

Type: Tool

Proper Citation

Publons (RRID:SCR_014020)

Resource Information

URL: <https://publons.com>

Proper Citation: Publons (RRID:SCR_014020)

Description: A service resource which allows peer reviewers to record and showcase the peer reviews they have completed, both those that led to publication and to rejection. Peer reviews can be recorded on Publons by forwarding review receipts from journals to the site. The merit of reviewers is accrued by pre- and post-publication peer review, discussion papers in Publons, and comments on or endorsement of the contributions of other reviewers. Reviewers may publish their own reviews so long as the reviewed manuscript is published and the review policies of the journal allow for it. Users can choose what personal information is displayed and easily export their profile in a format suitable for inclusion in promotion and funding applications.

Resource Type: data or information resource, document, narrative resource, service resource

Defining Citation: [DOI:10.1038/nature.2014.16102](https://doi.org/10.1038/nature.2014.16102)

Keywords: peer review, review history, review record, service resource, catalog

Availability: Free for academic users, The community can contribute to this resource

Resource Name: Publons

Resource ID: SCR_014020

License URLs: <https://publons.com/about/terms/>

Record Creation Time: 20220129T080318+0000

Record Last Update: 20260905T132742+0000

Ratings and Alerts

No rating or validation information has been found for Publons.

No alerts have been found for Publons.

Data and Source Information

Source: [SciCrunch Registry](#)

Usage and Citation Metrics

We found 46 mentions in open access literature.

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

Ansari N, et al. (2025) The top 100 papers on prostate cancer-associated exosomes on social media: an altmetric study from the MENA region. *Frontiers in oncology*, 15, 1481406.

Clavel N, et al. (2025) Barriers and facilitators to implementing reusable personal protective equipment in hospitals, and their impacts on environment, care safety, costs, and supply chain resilience: a scoping review protocol. *BMJ open*, 15(5), e096504.

Oliveira VGB, et al. (2024) Scientific contribution of the Brazilian CNPq Research Productivity fellows in dentistry. *Brazilian oral research*, 38, e125.

Sharp MK, et al. (2024) Altmetric coverage of health research in Ireland 2017-2023: a protocol for a cross-sectional analysis. *HRB open research*, 7, 36.

Park K, et al. (2023) Greetings from the Editorial Team. *Investigative and clinical urology*, 64(1), 1.

LeBlanc AG, et al. (2023) Scientific sinkhole: estimating the cost of peer review based on survey data with snowball sampling. *Research integrity and peer review*, 8(1), 3.

Severin A, et al. (2023) Relationship between journal impact factor and the thoroughness and helpfulness of peer reviews. *PLoS biology*, 21(8), e3002238.

Rice DB, et al. (2022) Characteristics of 'mega' peer-reviewers. *Research integrity and peer review*, 7(1), 1.

Perkins NH, et al. (2022) Physical and Emotional Sibling Violence in the Time of COVID - 19. *Journal of family violence*, 37(5), 745.

Mondal H, et al. (2022) A Brief Review on Article-, Author-, and Journal-Level Scientometric Indices. *Indian dermatology online journal*, 13(5), 578.

Llewellyn NM, et al. (2022) Predicting citation impact from altmetric attention in clinical and translational research: Do big splashes lead to ripple effects? *Clinical and translational science*, 15(6), 1387.

Raittio E, et al. (2022) The use of the phrase "data not shown" in dental research. PloS one, 17(8), e0272695.

Van Calster B, et al. (2021) Methodology over metrics: current scientific standards are a disservice to patients and society. Journal of clinical epidemiology, 138, 219.

Divecha CA, et al. (2021) Published a research paper? What next?? Journal of postgraduate medicine, 67(4), 189.

Aczel B, et al. (2021) A billion-dollar donation: estimating the cost of researchers' time spent on peer review. Research integrity and peer review, 6(1), 14.

Skapetis T, et al. (2021) Systematic review: bioethical implications for COVID-19 research in low prevalence countries, a distinctly different set of problems. BMC medical ethics, 22(1), 22.

Ferguson C, et al. (2021) Europe PMC in 2020. Nucleic acids research, 49(D1), D1507.

Zimba O, et al. (2021) Peer review guidance: a primer for researchers. Reumatologia, 59(1), 3.

Nüst D, et al. (2021) CODECHECK: an Open Science initiative for the independent execution of computations underlying research articles during peer review to improve reproducibility. F1000Research, 10, 253.

Ahmed S, et al. (2021) Top Central Asian Educational Institutions on Publons: Analysis of Researchers and Reviewers. Journal of Korean medical science, 36(21), e144.