Peer review – credibility and quality

Ulf Sandström
Swedish Institute for Studies in Education and Research
SISTER

Objectives

- Quality
- Risk-taking
- Credibility
- Objectivity/unbiased and fair/
- Reliability
- Effectiveness

Problems

- Selection of peers/danger of normalization/cognitive bias
- Selection of criteria /narrow or broad/
- Secrecy/transparency/feed-back
- Range of decisions /earmarking of funds/
- Recognition for early career/unorthodox research/multidisc. /emerging areas
- Conflict of interest

Main types of peer review organization

- Type 1: permanent panels
- Type: 2 hybrid forms with ad hoc panels and ad hoc mail review
- Type 3 active program managers with ad hoc mail review

Panel issues

- I. Procedure for selection of panel chairmen
  - A) electoral system (election of electors)
  - B) appointment from national academies
  - C) appointment from governing board
- II. Procedure for selection of panel members
  - A) by panel chairmen
  - B) by I a, b, or c

Mail review issues

- Selection bias/balancing/normalization
- Pool of referees or ad hoc?
- Reviewer refusal-how to interpret?
- Payment?
- Stealing of ideas

Improvements

- Transparency of operations
- Feedback to applicants and assessors
- Clear instructions to reviewers
- Experimentation with forms, grants periods, closing dates etc.
- Discuss peer review issues!
- Research for review of procedures!