

IMPACT ON ACADEMIC PEER REVIEW



Amabile. T., 1983. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology Volume 19, Issue 2,pp. 146-156
[https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-1031\(83\)90034-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-1031(83)90034-3) Available from [Google Scholar](#). 231 Citations

Wennerås & Wold. 1997. Nepotism and sexism in peer-review. Available from
<https://www.nature.com/articles/387341a0>

The Swedish Research Council, 2012; Jämställdhetsobservationer i fyra beredningsgrupper 2011;
https://publikationer.vr.se/butik/?_sf_s=j%C3%A4mst%C3%A4lldhetsobservationer%20

Budden et al. 2014. TRENDS in Ecology and Evolution Vol.23 No.1. doi:10.1016/j.tree.2007.07.008.
Available from SDUB

Kaatz et al. 2014. Trends in Pharmacological Sciences. Vol. 35. No. 8. pp. 371-373
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.tips.2014.06.005>. Available from SDUB

Brilliant but cruel: Perceptions of negative evaluators

Abstract:

Using edited excerpts from actual negative and positive book reviews, this research examined the hypothesis that negative evaluators of intellectual products will be perceived as more intelligent than positive evaluators. The results strongly supported the hypothesis. Negative reviewers were perceived as more intelligent, competent, and expert than positive reviewers, even when the content of the positive review was independently judged as being of higher quality and greater forcefulness. At the same time, in accord with previous research, negative reviewers were perceived as significantly less likable than positive reviewers. The results on intelligence ratings are seen as bolstering the self-presentational explanation of the tendency shown by intellectually insecure individuals to be negatively critical. The present methodology is contrasted to that of previous research which obtained apparently contradictory results.

Amabile. T., 1983. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology Volume 19, Issue 2, pp. 146-156

[https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-1031\(83\)90034-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-1031(83)90034-3) Available from [Google Scholar](#). 231 Citations

Nepotism and sexism in peer-review

Abstract:

In the first-ever analysis of peer-review scores for postdoctoral fellowship applications, the system is revealed as being riddled with prejudice. The policy of secrecy in evaluation must be abandoned.

Wennerås & Wold. 1997. Nepotism and sexism in peer-review. Available from <https://www.nature.com/articles/387341a0>

Observations within four committees within the Swedish Research Council

Abstract:

I två av grupperna observerades skillnader i hur diskussioner fördes om kvinnor och män, vilka även visade sig i det skriftliga materialet. Där var kvinnors kön en av de faktorer som uppmärksammades vid bedömningen av ansökningarna. Diskussioner om föräldraledighet och självständighet/osjälvständighet förekom i betydligt högre grad för sökande kvinnor än för sökande män. Trots att den talade tiden var i det närmaste lika lång för ansökningar från kvinnor och män togs en större del av denna tid i anspråk för diskussioner om självständighet/osjälvständighet för kvinnorna. Mäns kön uppmärksammades inte. Det fanns också könsskillnader i orden som användes för att beskriva de sökande. Män beskrevs oftare som excellenta och produktiva än kvinnorna. Bland de högst rankade kvinnorna var tal om kön mindre förekommande. Detta mönster återkom inte i samtliga beredningsgrupper.

The Swedish Research Council, 2012; Jämställdhetsobservationer i fyra beredningsgrupper 2011;

https://publikationer.vr.se/butik/?_sf_s=j%C3%A4mst%C3%A4lldhetsobservationer%20

The link includes access to four reports on gender and research applications published in 2012, 2013, 2015 and 2017.

Double-blind review favours increased representation of female authors

Abstract:

Double-blind peer review, in which neither author nor reviewer identity are revealed, is rarely practised in ecology or evolution journals. However, in 2001, double-blind review was introduced by the journal *Behavioral Ecology*. Following this policy change, there was a significant increase in female first-authored papers, a pattern not observed in a very similar journal that provides reviewers with author information. No negative effects could be identified, suggesting that double-blind reviews should be considered by other journals.

Budden et al 2014. *TRENDS in Ecology and Evolution* Vol.23 No.1. doi:10.1016/j.tree.2007.07.008.

Available from SDUB

Threats to objectivity in peer review: the case of gender

Abstract:

Women have lower rates of publication and lower success rates for high-status research awards than do men. Theoretically supported experimental and field research make a strong case that gender stereotypes operate in review processes in male-typed domains such as science. Future experimental studies will be necessary to examine the extent to which gender bias may operate in peer review despite the best intentions of reviewers, their personal commitment to egalitarian principles, and their goal of advancing the best and most innovative science.

Kaatz et al. 2014. Trends in Pharmacological Sciences. Vol. 35. No. 8. pp. 371-373 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.tips.2014.06.005>.
Available from SDUB