

Anonymous peer-review in a nutshell...

SORRY FOR OUR LONG SILENCE,
DUE TO SOME PERPLEXITY ON
OUR SIDE AT READING YOUR
MANUSCRIPT

HIGH WAS MY EXPECTATION,
AND SO MUCH DEEPER WAS
MY DISAPPOINTMENT

SUCH A PRESTIGIOUS
JOURNAL CAN SURELY
MAKE BETTER USE OF
ITS LIMITED SPACE.

THE AUTHORS CONCLUSIONS
NOT ONLY CONTRADICT THEIR
OWN DATA BUT ALSO THE
LAWS OF THERMODYNAMICS

THE PAPER IS PRESENTED AS
A RATHER UNDIGESTIBLE AND
TORTUOUS COLLECTION OF
DISPARATE RESULTS

IT IS VERY LENGTHY, FULL OF
MISTAKES, IRRELEVANT INFORMATION,
AND COMPLETELY FAILS TO ATTRACT
READERS

IN ORDER TO BE ABLE TO
PUBLISH THIS MANUSCRIPT IT
NEEDS TO BE REWRITTEN IN THE
FORM OF A SCIENTIFIC ARTICLE

THE BIGGEST PROBLEM WITH THIS
MANUSCRIPT, WHICH HAS NEARLY
SUCKED THE WILL TO LIVE OUT OF
ME, IS THE TERRIBLE WRITING STYLE.

(SMITH, 2006)

A **flawed process** at the heart of science and journals

Slow and expensive

- “Two weeks review!”, but only once reviewers have been found, and then...
- Estimated global cost was \$1.8 billion in 2008

Inconsistent

- Reviewer A: “I found this paper an extremely muddled paper with a large number of deficits”
- Reviewer B: “It is written in a clear style and would be understood by any reader”

Deficient

- Ghost peer-review (review handled to someone else, a.k.a. student)
- Doesn't guarantee validity at all

Biased

- Mathew effect: “*To those who have, shall be given; to those who have not shall be taken away even the little that they have*” (see also Matilda effect).

Abused

- Writing your own peer-review
- Stealing ideas from the reviewed paper

DIFFÉRENTES MÉTHODES DE PEER-REVIEW

Reviewers

Anonymized

identified

Authors

Anonymized

DOUBLE BLIND

BLIND REVIEW

identified

SINGLE BLIND

OPEN REVIEW