

Corrigendum

Amos Grünebaum*, Joachim Dudenhausen and Frank A. Chervenak

The FAIR framework: ethical hybrid peer review

<https://doi.org/10.1515/jpm-2025-0658>

Corrigendum to: Grünebaum A, Dudenhausen J, Chervenak FA. The FAIR framework: ethical hybrid peer review. *J Perinat Med.* 2025;53 (8):993–999. (DOI: 10.1515/jpm-2025-0285).

Corrigendum text: The authors regret that the originally published reference list contained inaccuracies. The correct and updated reference list is provided here and replaces the previously published version in its entirety.

The FAIR framework: ethical hybrid peer review

<https://www.degruyterbrill.com/document/doi/10.1515/jpm-2025-0285/html>

References

1. Lee CJ, Sugimoto CR, Zhang G, Cronin B. Bias in peer review. *J Am Soc Inf Sci Technol* 2013;64:2–17.
2. Drozd JA, Ladomery MR. The peer review process: past, present, and future. *Br J Biomed Sci* 2024;81:12054.
3. Smith R. Peer review: a flawed process at the heart of science and journals. *J R Soc Med* 2006;99:178–82.
4. Link AM. US and non-US submissions: an analysis of reviewer bias. *JAMA* 1998;280:246–7.
5. Opthof T, Coronel R, Janse MJ. The significance of the peer review process against the background of bias: priority ratings of reviewers and editors and the prediction of citation, the role of geographical bias. *Cardiovasc Res* 2002;56:339–46.
6. Korfitsen CB, Nejstgaard CH, Hróbjartsson A, Boutron I, Bero L, Lundh A. Peer reviewers' conflicts of interest in biomedical research: scoping review. *BMJ Evid Based Med* 2025;30:104–17.
7. Malički M, Aalbersberg IJ, Bouter L, Mulligan A, Ter RG. Transparency in conducting and reporting research: a survey of authors, reviewers, and editors across scholarly disciplines. *PLoS One.* 2023;18:e0270054. Erratum in: *PLoS One.* 2023;18:e0283443. 10.1371/journal.pone.0283443.
8. Aczel B, Szaszi B, Holcombe AO. A billion-dollar donation: estimating the cost of researchers' time spent on peer review. *Res Integr Peer Rev* 2021;6:14.
9. Stahel PF, Moore EE. Peer review for biomedical publications: we can improve the system. *BMC Med* 2014;12:179.
10. Manchikanti L, Kaye AD, Boswell MV, Hirsch JA. Medical journal peer review: process and bias. *Pain Physician* 2015;18:E1–14.
11. Glonti K, Cauchi D, Cobo E, Boutron I, Moher D, Hren D. A scoping review on the roles and tasks of peer reviewers in the manuscript review process in biomedical journals. *BMC Med* 2019;17:118.
12. Kemal Ö. Artificial intelligence in peer review: ethical risks and practical limits. *Turk Arch Otorhinolaryngol* 2025;63:108–9.
13. Bauchner H, Rivara FP. Use of artificial intelligence and the future of peer review. *Health Aff Sch* 2024;2:qxae058.
14. Eggmann F, Hildebrand H, Bornstein MM. Who reviewed this? Toward responsible integration of large language models for peer review of scientific articles in dental medicine. *Swiss Dent J* 2025;135:1–15.
15. Silverman JA, Ali SA, Rybak A, van Goudoever JB, Leleiko NS, JPGN Editorial Board. Generative AI: potential and pitfalls in academic publishing. *J Pediatr Gastroenterol Nutr* 2023;77:573–4.
16. Amann J, Blasimme A, Vayena E, Frey D, Madai VI. Precise4Q consortium. Explainability for artificial intelligence in healthcare: a multidisciplinary perspective. *BMC Med Inform Decis Mak* 2020;20:310.
17. Doshi-Velez F, Kim B. Towards a rigorous science of interpretable machine learning. *arXiv* 2017;1702:08608.
18. Marcus G. The next decade in AI: four steps towards robust artificial intelligence. *arXiv* 2020 2002:06177. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2002.06177>.
19. Bender EM, Gebru T, McMillan-Major A, Mitchell M. On the dangers of stochastic parrots: can language models be too big? *Proc ACM Conf Fairness Accountability Transparency* 2021:610–23. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3442188.3445922>.
20. Cullis PS, Gudlaugsdottir K, Andrews J. A systematic review of the quality of conduct and reporting of systematic reviews and meta-analyses in paediatric surgery. *PLoS One* 2017;12:e0175213.
21. Lerback J, Hanson B. Journals invite too few women to referee. *Nature* 2017;541:455–7.
22. Tomkins A, Zhang M, Heavlin B. Reviewer bias in single- versus double-blind peer review. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A.* 2017;114:12708–13.
23. Nguyen VM, Haddaway NR, Gutowsky LFG, Wilson ADM, Gallagher AJ, Donaldson MR, et al. How long is too long in contemporary peer review? Perspectives from authors publishing in conservation biology journals. *PLoS One* 2015;10:e0132557.
24. Wenneras C, Wold A. Nepotism and sexism in peer-review. *Nature* 1997;387:341–3.
25. Mebane CA. Double-blind peer review is detrimental to scientific integrity. *Environ Toxicol Chem* 2025;44:318–23.
26. Kovanis M, Porcher R, Ravaud P, Trinquart L. The global burden of journal peer review in the biomedical literature: strong imbalance in the collective enterprise. *PLoS One* 2016;11:e0166387.
27. Tite L, Schroter S. Why do peer reviewers decline to review? A survey. *J Epidemiol Community Health* 2007;61:9–12.

***Corresponding author: Amos Grünebaum**, MD, Northwell Health, Zucker School of Medicine, Hempstead, NY, USA, E-mail: amos127@gmail.com

Joachim Dudenhausen, Department of Obstetrics, Charité – Universitätsmedizin Berlin, Berlin, Germany

Frank A. Chervenak, Northwell Health, Zucker School of Medicine, Hempstead, NY, USA

28. van Dis EAM, Bollen J, Zuidema W, van Rooij R, Bockting CL. ChatGPT: five priorities for research. *Nature* 2023;614:224–6.
29. Stokel-Walker C, Van Noorden R. What ChatGPT and generative AI mean for science. *Nature* 2023;614:214–16.
30. Gao CA, Howard FM, Markov NS, Dyer EC, Ramesh S, Luo Y, et al. Comparing scientific abstracts generated by ChatGPT to real abstracts with detectors and blinded human reviewers. *npj Digit Med* 2023;6: 75.
31. Thorp HH. ChatGPT is fun, but not an author. *Science* 2023;379:313.
32. Tennant JP, Ross-Hellauer T. The limitations to our understanding of peer review. *Res Integr Peer Rev* 2020;5:6.
33. Else H. Abstracts written by ChatGPT fool scientists. *Nature* 2023;613:423.
34. Liebreinz M, Schleifer R, Buadze A, Bhugra D, Smith A. Generating scholarly content with ChatGPT: ethical challenges for medical publishing. *Lancet Digit Health* 2023;5:e105–6.
35. Ferdush J, Begum M, Hossain ST. ChatGPT and clinical decision support: scope, application, and limitations. *Ann Biomed Eng* 2024; 52:1119–24.
36. Singhal K, Azizi S, Tu T, Mahdavi SS, Wei J, Chung HW, et al. Large language models encode clinical knowledge. *Nature*. 2023;620:172–80. Epub 2023 Jul 12. Erratum in: *Nature*. 2023;6207973:E19. 10.1038/s41586-023-06455-0.
37. O'Brien BC, Harris IB, Beckman TJ, Reed DA, Cook DA. Standards for reporting qualitative research: a synthesis of recommendations. *Acad Med* 2014;89:1245–51.
38. Morley J, Machado CCV, Burr C, Cows J, Joshi I, Taddeo M, et al. The ethics of AI in health care: a mapping review. *Soc Sci Med* 2020;260: 113172.
39. Liu R, Jecmen S, Conitzer V, Fang F, Shah NB. Testing for reviewer anchoring in peer review: a randomized controlled trial. *PLoS One* 2024;19:e0301111.
40. Cheng K, Sun Z, Liu X, Wu H. Generative artificial intelligence is infiltrating peer review process. *Crit Care* 2024;28:149.
41. Kaissis G, Ziller A, Passerat-Palmbach J, Ryffel T, Usynin D, Trask A, et al. Secure, privacy-preserving and federated machine learning in medical imaging. *Nat Mach Intell* 2020;2:305–15.
42. Raji ID, Smart A, White RN, Mitchell M, Gebru T, Hutchinson B, et al. Closing the AI accountability gap: defining an end-to-end framework for internal algorithmic auditing. *Proc ACM Conf Fairness Accountability Transparency* 2020:33–44. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3351095.3372873>.
43. BaHammam AS. Peer review in the artificial intelligence era: a call for developing responsible integration guidelines. *Nat Sci Sleep* 2025;17: 159–64.