

TECHNOLOGY

The recognition of scientists contributes to the publication of their work

By: Adam

September 22, 2022

- Advertisement -

laboratory life. Peer review, or *Peer review* Scientific studies must ensure their quality. For each article submitted to the journal, several specialists are responsible for evaluating whether the manuscript is suitable for publication. In a study of unprecedented scale, economics researchers at the University of Innsbruck (Austria) note how biased evaluators' judgments can be. This study, available in preprint, was presented Friday, September 9, at the International Peer Review Congress in Chicago.

Jürgen Huber, professor of finance and first author of the study, readily admits this *"The scientific publication process is not perfect"*. *"When you're a researcher, you know there's an element of randomness in peer review, that there's bias, and we wanted to provide new data to quantify that."* His idea: submit an article written by a Nobel laureate and a junior researcher for evaluation, then see if it is evaluated the same way or if only one or the other name is mentioned.

- Advertisement -

Fortunately, Vernon Smith, the 2002 Nobel Prize laureate in economics, was able to provide them with an original article written with Sabiu Inua, a young thesis researcher at Chapman University (California, United States). This article has been submitted *Journal of Behavioral and Experimental Finance* With the participation of the editor-in-chief of the journal, Stefan Palani, and with the support of the publishing house Elsevier. Evaluation invitations were sent to 3,300 researchers in the field and more than 500 evaluation reports were collected. Unprecedented Device: Evaluation in this journal is usually limited to two specialists.

Status Bias

Each reviewer received a version of the manuscript that was either fully anonymized or credited to only one author. Everyone had to judge whether the article was acceptable as it was or after corrections, whether it should be published or the newspaper should reject it.

- Advertisement -

When the manuscript is named after a young researcher, 65% of reviewers reject the article, while only 22% make this decision when a Nobel Prize-winning researcher is mentioned. A completely anonymous article was rejected by 48% of its evaluators. Conversely, 21% of reviewers of an article with Vernon Smith’s name accept it without the slightest correction, compared to only 2% of reviewers who accepted an anonymous manuscript or Sabiu Inua’s name. results “*amazing*” For the authors, who expected differences, but not of this magnitude. Such inconsistencies were observed in the evaluation of the relevance of the work or the quality of the organization of the manuscript. Would they have been even more prominent if the second signatory had been a woman?

Source: Le Monde

- Advertisement -

