

## Peer Review is Just Brass Plating — not a Gold Standard

A primary defense of many unscientific claims is that they have been “peer-reviewed.” The implication is that the peer-review process confers an imprimatur of scientific accuracy — *but that is totally false.*

A superb [summary](#) of the situation was made by Dr. Richard Horton, editor of the respected medical journal, the *Lancet*:

“The mistake, of course, is to have thought that peer review was any more than a crude means of discovering the acceptability — not the **validity** — of a new finding.

“Editors and scientists alike insist on the pivotal importance of peer review. We portray peer review to the public as a quasi-sacred process that helps to make science our most objective truth teller.

“But we know that the system of peer review is biased, unjust, unaccountable, incomplete, easily fixed, often insulting, usually ignorant, occasionally foolish, and frequently wrong.”

The following is a tiny sample of studies, reports and articles about some of the issues with “peer-review”. The bottom line is that peer review is a purposefully corrupted process that does little more than endorse accepted “wisdom”:

1. [Is Peer-Review a Requirement of Good Science?](#)
2. [Peer review: a flawed process at the heart of science and journals](#)
3. [Science Is Suffering Because of Peer Review’s Big Problems](#)

4. [Nobel Prize winner calls peer review “very distorted,” “completely corrupt,” and “a regression to the mean”](#)
5. [Who reviews the reviewers? Feasibility of using a fictitious manuscript to evaluate peer reviewer performance](#)
6. [Peer-review practices of psychological journals: The fate of published articles, submitted again](#)
7. [Publishing stings find predatory journals, shoddy peer review](#)
8. [The peer-review system for academic papers is badly in need of repair](#)
9. [Modeling the effects of subjective and objective decision making in scientific peer review](#)
10. [Problems with peer review](#)
11. [Is Peer Review Broken?](#)
12. [The problem with peer review in scientific publishing](#)
13. [The relationship of previous training and experience of journal peer reviewers to subsequent review quality](#)
14. [How science goes wrong](#)
15. [Open access is not the problem – my take on Science’s peer review “sting”](#)
16. [House of Commons, Science and Technology Committee: Peer review in scientific publications](#)
17. [What's the verdict on peer review?](#)
18. [Open access publishing hoax: what Science magazine got wrong](#)
19. [Problems with Peer-Review: A Brief Summary](#)

20. [Fake Paper Exposes Failed Peer Review](#)
21. [Publish-or-perish: Peer review and the corruption of science](#)
22. [Scientific Peer Review in Crisis](#)
23. [Hospital peer review is a broken process](#)
24. [The case against peer review](#)
25. [Rethinking Peer Review](#)
26. [Why Scientific Peer Review is a Sham](#)
27. [Nepotism and sexism in peer-review](#)
28. [Is the Peer Review Process for Scientific Papers Broken?](#)
29. [Problems with peer review](#)
30. [Who's Afraid of Peer Review?](#)
31. [Sham peer review ... is currently at epidemic proportions](#)
32. [The many problems with peer-review \(yet again\), and some proposed solutions](#)
33. [An Incentive Solution to the Peer Review Problem](#)
34. [107 Cancer Papers Retracted due to Peer Review Fraud](#)
35. [Publisher fined \\$50M for Fake Peer Reviews](#)

—> How about [this](#) as a partial solution?

Again, this is a small cross-section of material on this topic. If there are errors in any of the above references, or if you know of better discussions, please email me.

John Droz, jr. Physicist “aaprjohn” at “northnet” dot “org” 8/21/20