
Summary: This article is mostly about the downside of peer review. Many are concerned with the fact that some things have been published then discredited in the future. People wonder how errors can slip past the reviewers in the reviewing process. Fraud and flawed articles sometimes slip their way through the editing process which causes science to lose its credibility according to this article.

Assess: This article interested me because it was kind of similar to the articles I read about the downsides of peer review, but it gave specific examples. It is similar to some of the other things I have read, but seems to
be a little bit more in depth. It’s relevant to mostly everything that I have read so far about peer review and I learned a little bit more about it.

Reflect: The examples this article gave about times that peer review had a slip up are great examples that I will be able to use in my paper. It will help my paper a lot because not only can I give information about the problems of peer review, but I can back it up with evidence.

Paraskevi Zarmakoupis
Professor Hugh Culik
English 1190-C1624
15 February 2014

Search Engine: scholar.google
Search terms: peer review, audience, discourse, credibility, publishing


Summary: This article is about three main topics: the internet, publishing and peer review. The internet portion discusses how vast the internet really is and how far it has come. It says how many turn to email to communicate
with others. The publishing portion is mostly about electronic publishing and how it is beneficial. The author says it’s beneficial because it is a lot cheaper than printing material and it can be offered online for free or for a reduced price which is easier for people to gain access of. The peer review part of this article is about how it’s very difficult to sort out good information from bad information on the internet. It says how peer review can help to decide what is “good”. The article states that some reviewers can be harsh and give “vicious” criticisms, while some can be more mild and fair with their criticisms. It also states that a major problem with peer review is how long it can take.

Assess: I think the first part of the article wasn’t really relevant to anything that I needed to know. The peer review area of this paper had several good points. This section was more in depth than other articles that I have read about peer review. It was more about peer review in general. I gained more knowledge about peer review and different sides of it from this article.

Reflect: The first part of the article won’t be entirely beneficial to my topic, but the peer review section will contribute heavily to my paper. It was very helpful because it gave me a different outlook on peer review. It not only gave pros, but it also gave cons. I relate some of the points in this article to others, but this article will allow me to go more in depth about peer review.

Summary: In this short article the author says that peer review is a “scientific strategy designed to assure that only valid science is published.” She states that problems come about when peer review is applied to topics that aren’t scientifically based. She also believes that the reviews are part of an “in-group” which causes her to believe that there is some type of bias or secrecy that they keep from everyone else. She believes that peer review should be in the hands of the audience. That the audience should get a
chance to read materials so that provide information to the reviewers, which will result in better end results.

Assess: This article was completely different from most that I have read. Most articles say that electronic peer review, and letting the public comment on what they are reading isn’t always beneficial because they aren’t the “experts”. But this article is saying that opposite and that the audience is crucial in the efficiency of peer review. This was interesting to read because it was so much different from other things that I have read and made me think a little more in a different direction.

Reflect: I think this article will be beneficial to my paper. It offers a different way that I can talk about peer review and the problems, and also provides a possible solution that many don’t agree with. It can be a bit of a counterargument and offer a new way of thinking about peer review.

Paraskevi Zarmakoupis
Professor Hugh Culik
English 1190-C1624
13 February 2014

Search Engine: scholar.google
Search terms: peer review, reliability, problem, medical field

Summary: This article says that peer review in the medical field does not only depend on quality. Peer review must keep up with the constant change that the medical field provides. The main point of this article is that peer review in the medical field must have a balance of innovation and quality. If such balance does not exist, it peer review will not succeed in this field.

Assess: This article was a little different from my previous readings. It didn’t believe that peer review in the medical field should solely rely on quality control, but that innovation should have also play a key role to keep up with changing ways. This article was written about 24 years ago so it is rather old, but I do believe that it still had many valid points that need to be kept in mind regarding peer review.

Reflect: The different ideas and issues discussed in this article with help me add to previous readings that I have done. It will also help me contrast and add more evidence to my claim in my paper. I think that peer review in the medical field is very important and should be very efficient and keep up with the times. This article will help me link to other articles that I have
found about peer review in the medical field, which will give me stronger
evidence for my paper.

Paraskevi Zarmakoupis
Professor Hugh Culik
English 1190-C1624
13 February 2014

Search engine: Scholar.google
Search terms: peer review, publication, credibility, reliability


Summary: This article aimed to measure the quality of editorial peer review. The authors conducted experiments based on quality of output and the comments of reviewers. They did a variety of different studies to evaluate the quality of peer review. Through all of their studies they came to the conclusion that peer review has many problems and it would take
the cooperation of a lot of the scientific community to better understand everything

Assess: This article interested me because it made me realize that peer review does have problems and can’t always be completely trusted. Especially with electronic publishing these days there is a need for an effective way to evaluate the information posted. 

Reflect: I think that this article will help me with my paper and help me with further investigating that I will to into this topic. It opened up my eyes and helped me realize that peer review does have flaws that need to be kept into consideration. This article will help me with things that I read in the future to determine if I can rely on them or not as being credible.

Kyle Frank
Professor Culik
English 1190-C1624
February, 2 2014

Search: Scholar.google.com
Search terms: Peer Review, Credibility, Discourse Community.

Summary: The article explains how the internet is constantly changing and how knowledge is changing along with it. The internet has brought academic communities much closer and has been enhancing our knowledge and research. The web has forever changed how we publish. There is a debate to decide if we should consider electronic publishing the new standard. It explains how paper articles may be a thing of the past. This article asks, Is there a better way to publish and exchange knowledge?

Assess: This article seemed to be a perfect example on how technology is changing peer review. I found it interesting how they compared the internet to a “sea of information, creating an ever-shifting shoreline”. The way we discover knowledge is changing but the way we review it is not. It made me wonder if the traditional form of publishing was obsolete with today’s technology. The information in the article is from a credible author who comes from a reputable institution. The article was not one sided, it seemed to expose wrong things with both paper and electronic publishing.

Reflect: The article touches base on just about all of the issues regarding how the internet is changing peer review. It never said all the information was false and it did not guarantee everything is credible. It showed the strengths and weaknesses of peer review. I thought it provided great examples on how new technology can help us communicate and share our
knowledge. I realized many people do not see how important peer review is. It gave me stronger beliefs on how our technology can be used to help us make peer review better.

Kyle Frank

Professor Culik

English 1190-C1624

February 2, 2014


Summary: The article gave a brief history of peer review and the things that were wrong with it. It explained that peer review has been used for nearly 300 years. It shows that for most of that 300 years peer review has been controlled by a select few. Peer review has been evolving through the centuries. Even in the beginning people have noticed that it is a flawed system. It makes you think, why do we trust knowledge without facts to back it up? The article points out that when peer review was institutionalized their was no organized fashion to it. Reenies article gives
examples on how the bias of scholars hurts knowledge. It primarily focuses on how peer review is unfair and lacks credibility in many areas.

Assess: I like how this article takes a shot at the traditional form of peer review. It describes how peer review has been corrupt from the start and may as well be corrupt today. The peer review system just isn’t as legitimate as people tend to think. The best policy seems to trust no one but I’m sure some information is true. The goal is to expose the deceit behind publishing articles and finding credible journals. I like how it warns us to be aware of how journals publish their articles. Many people do not realize how the peer review system works and some do not even know one exist.

Reflect: The article shows peer review for what it really is. It helps me because it lets me know what to watch out for when doing research. The journals themselves won’t say how credible their information is, so people need to do it themselves. After reading this I will always question if things are trustworthy. When the words peer review come to mind I will remember that the system is not perfect and should be looked over. After reading this I feel like I have more power to decipher the credible knowledge from the non-credible.

Kyle Frank
Summary: The article explains how publishing in elite journals is a very time consuming process. It demonstrates how the internet can speed up this grueling practice. In the article Cohen explains how the traditional form of peer review is just not efficient enough. It seems using the internet to have people peer review would be much more useful. Although some scholars in the academic world are reluctant to change.

Assess: I noticed that the article was very well written and I could tell it was written by an intelligent person. It explained both sides of the argument on peer review and was not bias. One thing that I particularly liked was when it had an example on how fast something could be peer reviewed with the help of the internet. I like how it used “American Idol” as an example of how peer review could be flawed.
Reflect: Using the internet for peer review seems to be the best way to go. It is such a useful tool it would almost be a crime not to use it. I wouldn’t say it is perfect but Cohens idea of engaging more people in peer review seems like a good idea. After reading this I see how many other people also notice the flaws in peer review. The article has an intelligent insight on how scholars can come to accept a new form of peer review. I think this article is helping to pave the way for the acceptance of internet peer review.

Kyle Frank
Professor Culik
English 1190-C1624
February 2, 2014

Search Engine: Scholar.google.com
Search: Peer review, Credibility, Reliability, Discourse Community.
Work cited:
Summary: This article explains how big of an impact Confirmatory bias has on the peer review system. People tend to believe only what favors them. The way humans process information is distorted. This seems selfish and can hurt the flow of information. The article takes a look at how Confirmatory bias is something that happens on a cognitive level. It describes how reviewers are shutting out the information they do not like, without giving it a chance. The people reviewing articles may not be using the reasoning processes we would expect. The judgment of many individuals is inaccurate. Theses so called “gate keepers” seem to be doing more harm than good.

Assess: I liked how the article took a deeper look at reviewers. I would not have thought that the psychological health of reviews would effect how information is published. Confirmatory Bias was something that never crossed my mind until reading this article. I know now how crucial of a role it can play. It gives me more things to pay attention to when deciding how credible people are. Reviewers have many biases to look out for.

Reflect: This article opened my eyes to realize that the reviewers are only human and will make mistakes. The information only make my argument stronger, the review process has been ignored for far too long. No one is going to be perfect and there is going to be biases. I realize now that those who publish new information need to be evaluated. It give more reason to
have a new type of peer review system. You really cannot trust anyone, especially when we do not know anything about the reviewers. The deeper I seem to dig into peer review the more faith I lose in the system.

Kyle Frank
Professor Culik
English 1190-C1624
February 16, 2014

Search Engine: Scholar.google.com
Search Terms: Peer Review, Scholarly, Academic, Publish, Reliable, Credible.


Summary: The article looks into the credibility of many peer reviewed internet journals. Many of which are legitimate, although some are not. Their is a lot of stigma that comes with getting information from the internet, but with proper knowledge you can tell what is true. It tells us
what to look for when deciding if an article is credible. On the internet anyone can be a publisher or an author, the article explains this issue.

Assess: The objective of this article seems to be to inform people on what to look for in noncredible articles and the bias of publishers. I like how the article provides screen shots of websites for examples. The information provided explains how the quality of an article can be hard to determine. The article is from a credible source and often refers to other credible people and institutions.

Reflect: This article shows how today anyone can be a publisher or an author, making it difficult to separate the blasphemous information from the credible information. It makes me remember that some published articles are a higher quality than others. The changing knowledge requires us to change our way of reviewing. When I decide if something is credible I can always use the information form this article to help me decide.

Dakota Ehrler
Professor Culik
English 1190 MW 8am – 10am
"Peer review" + open review


**Summarize:** This article takes the stance to make peer review an open process, with the authors being known as well as the editors. The article talks about the process they go through to collect data and also the results. The hopes they have are that open review will have a more reliable result and more meaningful reviews. Also they hope that it will be taken more serious if the editor has to put their name on their work. Then they go through and state the process of finding authors that are open to this type of review as well as editors that will participate. It is found out that more editors than authors were against the open peer review process. After all the reviews are completed the authors assess the reviews and score them on a unique scale that has been created. After everything is scored, it is found out that there is no significant difference in review scores from the open reviews to the anonymous reviews. The only major difference was the
fact that a lot more reviews declined to review if their name was known by the author.

**Assess:** The article was very clear in presenting its point and used lots of evidence to enforce the point. The article was in great detail when explaining the process that was used and was easy to follow. The article does seem to take a side more towards having an open review process, but does acknowledge the other side of the argument. This would be a useful source for someone taking the stance that having an open review process does not seem to make a difference in the review quality.

**Reflect:** This article does help me shape my opinion on the subject of peer review. Before I read the article I thought that having an open review would make the reviewers put a lot more effort into the reviews and would make a big difference in the effectiveness of peer review, but that doesn’t seem to be the case. The thought of having to put your name on a review seems to have no effect on reviews and was a surprise to me. I now feel that having the reviewer and author know really doesn’t affect the review process and would do no good to change the effectiveness of peer review.

______________________________

Dakota Ehrler
Professor Culik
Summarize: The article talks about the process of peer review and ways of making it better by using the internet. It talks about how the process is long and drawn out and the author is left sitting there until they either get a yes or no back from the editor. It also discusses the success of peer review when the author and editor are known to one another. It states that there is no substantial between being known or unknown to one another. Then it talks about an experiment that was conducted where they intentionally put mistakes in a paper and sent it to editors. Upon getting the papers back there were on average only two of the eight errors, and no one found more than five. Then it goes on to talk about an Australian experiment that has been going on with open peer review over the internet. They have been allowing and open review of potential published papers, and they are
allowing the public to weigh in on the paper, but they must provide their name. Which brings the last topic of the article, which “after care” is talked about, and how the published papers are kept up to date after publication.

**Assess:** The article does a great job of presenting information. It stays on the topic very well and is clear to understand. It provides useful information and data to back up those points. The article is on the short side so it is very easy to pick out the key things that are being talked about.

**Reflect:** I will most likely use this article in my final paper. It takes the stance of having an open review and using the internet, which is what I feel should happen. Also it’s easy to understand and uses great examples to make points. I thought he easy was great and very useful. The only problem was finding the article farther down the page when I open the pdf. Other then that it was straight to the point it was making and stuck to the topic and had information that I plan to use.

Dakota Ehrler
Professor Culik
English 1190 8am – 10am MW
February 15 2014
Annotated Bibliography
Scholar.Google.com
"Peer review" + reliability + open review

**Summarize:** The article is written about a study done to see the effects of an open peer review process. The article uses information from the British Journal of Psychiatry throughout. The aim of the article is to show that open review is a possible thing to do in the future. The article follows the experiment as it asks reviewers to either sign their name to the reviews they do or not, then looks at the time that is taken for the review and the quality of the review. It then goes through to explain the results that show, in a short version, that open review is a possible process.

**Assess:** The article is very informational. The point is very clear and stays on target. The information given is on topic and very convincing. It stands strongly by the fact that open review is the way that peer review should be handled. The article uses lots of number and walks you though all the steps that are taken and how all the data is broken down. In the end it still stands by the point, and shows lots of data that supports that open review is a possible thing.

**Reflect:** This article will be a great help when I write my paper. The stance that is taken and the data that is presented really strengthens my point, and
stance that peer review should be open. Also the article has strong points to support the data and doesn’t go back and forth on its stance. This is the second article that I have found on this topic so it will be a great help for my paper but not others that don’t think peer review should be open. In the end I feel that the article is a big help to my paper and to anyone else that thinks peer review should be an open process.

_______________________________________

Adam Rybinski
Professor Culik
English 1190-C1608
2/11/14

Search Engine: Google Scholar
Search Terms: Problems with editorial peer review
Ware, Mark. "Peer Review: benefits, perceptions, and alternatives." 
AWSAccessKeyId=AKIAJ56TQJRTWSMTNPEA&Expires=1392225710&Sig
ature=Fn8BeH0Px2Se4Od8PizZ0xq8ARU%3D&response-content-dispos>.
Summary: This article provides an overall view of the many topics revolving around peer review. The article begins by establishing what peer review is and how it is used in scholarly writing. It also goes back in time to show how it started in the 18th century. It then goes on to talk about the problems and benefits of the two common types of review, single-blind and double-blind. One of the alternative to these types of review is open peer review. In the article the author argues and gives data to back that open peer review is a good alternative because it will yield better results if the people know who they are reviewing. They then give a perspective from the reviewers side, showing the arduous work that peer reviewing causes and their opinions on open review.

Assess: This is a useful source because it gives a broad ideas about peer review and it isn’t contained to one specific area like some of my other articles. I believe this information is reliable and unbiased because it was published by the Publishing Research Consortium (PRC), who's goals are to provide unbiased data, support work that is scientific and pro-scholarship, and aim to promote an understanding of the role of publishing and its impact on research and teaching.
Reflect: This article will help with my research because it gives a good idea for an alternative to the peer review style we have in place right now. It was helpful to me because I can use it to give information in many different areas towards my argument. I can use this article as a base to how I think about editorial peer review. This article has allowed me to see the different points of view that can be obtained when talking about the processes and alternatives of editorial peer review.

Adam Rybinski
Professor Culik
English 1190-C1608
2/11/14

Search Engine: Google Scholar
Search Terms: Problems with editorial peer review

Directions to page: 1. Google scholar 2. Type "Effect of Blinding and Unmasking on the Quality of Peer Review." 3. Click 2nd Link.
Summary: This article is about the effects of blinding and masking in the world of peer review. To get results they did a randomized trial of 527 consecutive manuscripts submitted to BMJ, which were randomized and each sent to 2 peer reviewers. Manuscripts were randomized as to whether the reviewers were unmasked, masked, or uninformed that a study was taking place. What they found was that there was little or no difference between the masked and unmasked groups and the blinded and unblinded groups. This led them to the conclusion that blinding and unmasking made no editorially significant difference to review quality, reviewers' recommendations, or time taken to review.

Assess: This is a useful source because it focuses mainly on a specific problem in peer review, which is masking and blinding. This article is unique because it gives useful statistical data from a randomized trial focusing on this topic. This information is reliable because it comes from JAMA (Journal of the American Medical Association), which is a well known journal that was established in 1883. There goals are to publish original research, reviews, commentaries, editorials, essays, medical news, correspondence, and ancillary content.

Reflect: This helps my research because masking and blinding is a huge part of editorial review and the data within the article can help put
together a strong argument to change how we review scholarly articles. This article strengthens my arguments on peer review and helps me think more efficiently on why there needs to be changes in the system that is used so frequently throughout the world. This article allows me to focus on an important part of my argument so that in the end, I have a much stronger claim.

______________________________________

Adam Rybinski
Professor Culik
English 1190-C1608
2/11/14
Search Engine: Google Scholar
Search Terms: Problems with editorial peer review

Summary: This article begins by explaining what peer review is and why it is absolutely necessary for research. The article then explains why they have believe peer review is an applied skill and can only truly be learned
thru experience. This opens the door for questions like “why isn’t peer review part of the curriculum when going for a high degree?”. After all, if your going to be doing it for the rest of your academic career it would make sense to gain some of that experience in college. The author then goes on to say that editors wont be able to singlehandedly fix the problems with peer review. He ends by saying that peer review is such a fundamental element of critical scientific thinking that the entire scientific and scholarly community should arguably take on the responsibility for improving and maintaining its quality—a major, long term commitment.

**Assess:** This is a useful source because it is different than most of my other sources. Its different because my other sources were talking about studying and finding alternatives to the peer review system we use now. This article was discussing ways to make our current system better, not to find different ones. This article is reliable because it comes from PMC (PubMed Central), which is a free digital repository that archives publicly accessible full-text scholarly articles that have been published within the biomedical and life sciences journal literature. This source isn't biased because it includes many different articles from scholars and institutions with varying opinions. The goal of PMC is to provide free scholarly articles to the public.

**Reflect:** This article helps my research because it is always good to get the opposite arguments view on the topic. It helps my argument because I’ll
have a better idea of what topics and areas I need to address in my research. This has slightly changed how I think about this topic because it makes me understand that we don't necessarily have to get rid of peer review, it can just be altered so that it is more effective and yields the best results.

____________________________________

Adam Rybinski
Professor Culik
English 1190-C1608
2/11/14

Search Engine: Google Scholar
Search Terms: Peer Reviewed+Science+Journals+Flawed


Directions to Page: 1. Google Scholar 2. type: Peer Reviewed+Science +Journals+Flawed. 3. click first link.

Summary: Smith begins this article by giving a quick idea of what he is going to talk about. He creates a general idea for the reader and includes a
nice comparison saying that peer review is like democracy, “a system full of problems but the least worst we have.” This comparison allows the reader to have a better understanding for the information that comes later in the paragraph. When looking at the on peer review, smith believes “the practice of peer review is based on faith in its effects, rather than on facts”. He then goes on to say that we have little evidence on the effectiveness but plenty on the defects, saying its “slow, expensive, profligate of academic time, highly subjective, something of a lottery, prone to bias, and easily abused.” He believes the biggest question on peer review isn’t what to replace it with, but how to improve it. Smith concludes by saying that peer review is flawed, but there is no obvious alternative.

Assess: This is a very useful source because it gives organized descriptions of the problems and solutions with peer review. Each problem has its own section making it easier to understand and retain. To me, this article is more helpful than some of my others because it is more organized so you don't feel lost at any point in the reading. I believe this information is reliable because Richard Smith, the author, was editor of the BMJ and chief executive of the BMJ Publishing Group for 13 years. The BMJ is a very reliable source who are described as one of the oldest and most prestigious medical journals.
Reflect: This article was extremely helpful to me because it gave me a whole new view on this topic. I think it's safe to say that it probably even changed my view on this topic. I no longer believe that we need to replace peer review, just improve the system we have in place right now. I can use this source to help come up with a new claim for my paper.

________________________________

Adam Rybinski
Professor Culik
English 1190-C1608
2/11/14

Search Engine: Google Scholar
Search Terms: Measuring+Quality+Peer Review


Summary: The authors begin this article by establishing the fact that peer review is widely used, but say there’s little agreement on how to measure its effects or processes. To measure the effects of peer review, they studied two systematic reviews that measured the effects of editorial peer review.
They came to believe that “until we have properly defined the objectives of peer-review, it will remain almost impossible to assess or improve its effectiveness.” They believe that all scientific and scholarly work must be subjected to critical appraisal. To sum it all up, “In this article we review the criteria used by others to measure the effects of peer review, consider what this implies about the aims of peer review, especially in relation to clinical evidence, and suggest ways in which its effects might be measured more rigorously.”

**Assess:** I found that this article didn’t end up being as helpful as some of my other articles. It wasn’t as helpful because I had a harder time locating the useful information even though it came from JAMA, a very prestigious and reliable medical journal. JAMA, or The Journal of the American Medical Association, has been providing great medical research since it was established in 1883.

**Reflect:** I think this article can be useful to some people because it still has a lot of good information in it that can help somebody with their paper. Although I’m not quite certain what the claim of the article is, I’m sure some of the facts and details can help me in my research. One part I believe it can help you with is making your own claim. It gives ideas for both sides of the argument so I believe if you are undecided on a claim this paper might be able to help you come up with your own.
Annotated Bibliography

Search Engine: Scholar.Google.com, Key Words: Peer Review+editing

**Summary:** Peer review is an established component of professional practice, the academic reward system, and the scholarly publication process. The principle of peer review is experts in a given domain appraise the professional performance, creativity, or quality of scientific work produced by others in their field or area of competence. Peer review abroad covers a wide variety of activities such as, observation of peers, clinical practices, and assessment of colleagues, classroom teaching abilities, the list goes on and on. In many ideal depictions, peer review processes are
understood as providing “a system of institutionalized vigilance” in the self-regulation of knowledge communities. Peer expertise is coordinated to vet the quality and feasibility of submitted work. Authors, in the anticipation of the peer evaluation of their work, aim to conform to shared standards of excellence out of expediency and in accordance with an internalized ethos. This is why critics' charge of bias in peer review is so troubling: Threats to the impartiality of review appear to threaten peer review's psychological and epistemic legitimacy. The charge of bias also threatens the social legitimacy of peer review. Peer review signals to the body politic that the world of science and scholarship takes seriously its social responsibilities as a self-regulating, normatively driven community.

Assess: The authors that wrote this journal are from the “Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology. The authors are also from the Department of Philosophy, University of Washington, Seattle, WA. This article was on peer review: the history, the present, etc. They go into detail on what peer review is, why peer review is the way it is today. And they also talk about some of the pros and cons about it, along the lines of being bias and how credible the person/persons are. They even go as far as defining was peer review is and give examples on what people use peer review on and for.
**Reflect:** I think this article is filled with very good information that would work well for the paper we are getting ready to write soon. It defines peer review, and goes into detail on why and what peer review is used for. Talks about the pros and cons of it, talks about the bias people out there in the world of peer review etc. The article is credible and seems to me it has a lot of use for what we need. I feel there’s a lot you can reference to in this article and it should be very helpful soon enough.

Cody Cilli  
2/12/14  

English 1190-C1624  
Professor Culik  

Annotated Bibliography  

**Search Engine:** Scholar.google.com, **Key words:** "peer review" + "validity" + "publication" + "expertise"  

**Summary:** In the previous essay I introduced the topic of peer review, presenting in abbreviated form its history, its enduring virtues, its problematic considerations presently and some implications for its future
given the impact of electronic information flows and the consequent emergence of e-journals. This author goes on to talk about when he was going to get his journal edited and hopefully published. He had hoped he got people that he was acquaintances with and would put things into his writing so hopefully they would know it was his. He was hoping that they would be able through content and experience to recognize that he was the author. So then when he found out that he was only to make suggestions to the editor and wasn’t able to direct the people who were looking at his paper he didn’t know if his recommendations would be heeded. Later thinking he realized that in the peer review world there is such a thing as people being bias, and the odds of you getting someone you know looking over your paper isn’t as rare as you think. He also goes into talking about publishing the review along with the article because a reviewer would be known by his or her byline being listed along with the review. The purpose of that would be to minimize inappropriateness and irrelevancies that comes along with peer reviewing.

**Assess:** The author Stephen R. Baker. He is from the Department of Radiology in New Jersey, at New Jersey Medical School, Newark, NJ, USA. He has studied a lot about peer review and in this article he talks about how there is bias people in the editing world. Also he started talking about the impact that is slowly taking place as we get further into the internet, and create more and more things. Such as e-journals, blogs, articles, etc. It’s
so easy to voice your opinion online no one is going to want to go through the long process of getting published. Especially when it lingers in the back of your head you might not get published because one of your peer editors is someone who doesn’t like you so they try to degrade you and prevent it from happening. Or you get someone you do know and they write nothing but good things about you just because they know you, they need to come up with ways to prevent these bias things from occurring.

Reflect: Looking at this article I think it’s great for the paper I’m going to be writing here in a few days. It has a lot of good information that goes along and or correlates with the info I need to answer the questions I’m being asked. It’s shaping my argument that there is such a thing as people being bias in the peer review world. I can see this source in my paper when I get into talking how peer review needs to change for the better and can be improved so we can try to prevent this horrible thing from taking place. It honestly hasn’t changed what I think because I agree with this article hands down, I’ve heard it from multiple sources so the credibility of it is growing.

_____________________________________________

Cody Cilli
2/13/14
Annotated Bibliography


Search Engine: Scholar.google.com, Key Words: "peer review" + "discourse community" + "expertise"

Summary: The purpose of this study was to design and examine a computer-supported knowledge-building environment and to investigate both collective knowledge-building dynamics and individual learning in the context of a tertiary education course in mainland China. The participants were 102 students in four intact Year-one tertiary business classes. Two classes experienced a knowledge-building environment (CKB) and the other two were taught using a regular project-based approach (RPBL). Data were obtained from interactions in the forum, writing quality, group-learning portfolios, and surveys. Quantitative analyses indicated that the knowledge-building groups outperformed the comparison groups on academic literacy assessed in terms of conceptual understanding and explanation, and obtained higher scores on beliefs about collaboration. Within-group analyses indicated that the students’ engagement in Knowledge Forum was a significant predictor of their academic literacy.
Qualitative contrastive analyses of high- and low-performance groups identified different patterns of conceptual, metacognitive and social processes, and showed that student groups engaging in more collective and meta-discourse discourse moves performed better on individual scores in academic literacy. The implications of examining both collaborative dynamics and individual learning and designing computer-supported knowledge building for tertiary students are discussed.

Assess: They took students and tested them in different things to see which group was smarter and if that went in correlation with their academic scores in at their 4-year college. The more collaboration the groups had the overall better score. The three authors have affiliation with these groups: Foreign Languages Department, Shanghai University of Finance and Economics, Rm. 623, Red Tile Building, Shanghai, People’s Republic of China, Faculty of Education, University of Hong Kong, Pokfulam, Hong Kong. So what I’m reading and what they discovered seems to be credible enough to me.

Reflect: With looking at what I read I’m sure it could be helpful to someone in there paper. I might personally not use it but its goo information that I’m sure someone can use. Seeing that people working together generates higher scores doesn’t surprise me at all. If you put enough knowledge
together the impossible can happen, just like the YouTube video Professor Culik showed us.

Cody Cilli
2/13/14
English 1190-C1624
Professor Culik

Annotated Bibliography


Search Engine: Scholar.google.com, Key Words: "peer review" + "discourse community" + "expertise"

Summary: As noted by Scott, during the past decade, following the lead of moves in the USA and UK, national governments have scrutinized more closely the cost effectiveness and impact of research funding within higher education. Direct criticism of the overall quality of educational research has emerged, particularly in terms of its scientific rigour, its utility for practitioners, and the manner in which it is assessed. This contribution to the Companion explores the reasons why the quality of educational
research has come to be so questioned, and examines a key discussion framework for assessing quality that has emerged from this debate. It then considers the merits of possible internal and external criteria for the worth of educational research, and the links between these criterial sets and the function and purpose of qualitative and quantitative approaches to educational research. Finally, the question of whether educational research is an art or a science is addressed.

Assess: This article is written by Terence Karran, About the peer review being used to determine whether or not educational research is an art or a science so they can decide if it gets the proper funding or not. She is affiliated with The Centre for Educational Research and Development, University of Lincoln, Lincoln, UK. This story was edited by these three people: Alan D. Reid., E. Paul Hart, and Michael A. Peters. The editors are affiliated with The Faculty of Education, Monash University, Faculty of Education, University of Regina, and Hamilton Campus, University of Waikato.

Reflect: This article to me works really well at giving a prime example on different things people have to use peer review on. There’s a lot of good examples and reasoning’s behind their answers to give you a better understanding about peer review. I don’t know if this is the direction I
Annotated Bibliography


**Search Engine:** Scholar.google.com; **Key Words:** "Credentials" + "Peer Review" + "Publication"

**Summary:** Unless you are over 90 you probably cannot recall a time when peer review was not regarded as an essential qualitative process in the evaluation of manuscripts for inclusion in medical journals. It was and is still believed that peer review ensures that presentations of putative scientific merit will be carefully assessed by disinterested yet committed and qualified experts whose judgments enhance the quality of published papers.

**Assess:** Stephen Baker is the author of this book; it is published by Springer International Publishing in Switzerland. This author is affiliated with the
Department of Radiology, UMDNJ-New Jersey Medical » School, Newark, NJ, USA. He goes into detail on peer review and peer editing, as well as how their judgments can enhance papers or make them worse. Has a lot of info on publications and peer editing.

Reflect: I think this has a lot of good information in it, and has a lot of detail that can help make someone’s paper great. I think it also could go hand in hand with what I’m going to be writing about in my paper. Not sure how I’m going to incorporate it but I definitely think I am going to use it.

Owen Lloyd
Professor Culik
English 1190
07 January 2014

Search: google scholar
Search Term: peer review, scholar
http://ocs.library.utoronto.ca/index.php/Elpub/2008/paper/view/689/0
Summary: This article touches on the academic peer reviewed journal system, namely the number of scholarly, peer reviewed articles published annually. It also touch on why so many articles do not get published and how many are submitted and not even looked at from 2006. Also reason why certain articles are looked at because they are from more country’s then others. Also they speak on the method of using Ullrich's Periodical Directory, setting as parameters active, scholarly and peer reviewed. This article also states of how there way of sorting though to find the articles that should be published.

Assess: This article helps put some different kind of concepts that I can put in my paper. It gives a turn on how peer review is done in my eyes that there's more then just one way of doing peer review. This article also sticks out to me because it goes into why some articles don't get published for different reason and how there are different ways to sort though thousands of articles and how some other publisher decide on what articles to publish also. This information is very bias it dose not just go on how they go through every article and choose the right one but they state how before they even sort through them they only look at articles that are submitted a certain way.

Reflect: The different ideas in this article helps me look at my the rest of the other articles I've gone through to help me look at peer review differently. It
brings different feel to my paper on how peer review is looked at. It gives a bias term that certain articles are not looked at for certain reasons. It helps my argument get by putting opposing statements in my articles to not just write about one form of peer review.

Owen Lloyd
Professor Culik
English 1190
07 January 2014
Search: google scholar
Search Term: peer review,scholarly,published
http://quod.lib.umich.edu/cgi/t/text/idx/j/jep/3336451.0008.103/--what-are-thealternatives-to-peer-review-quality-control?
rgn=main;view=fulltext

Summary: This article starts by talking about alternative peer review and how the internet has articles that are submitted on the internet and are inaccurate, biased, sloppy, bigoted, wrongly attributed, blasphemous, obscene, and wrong but there is also much that is of the highest quality,
often from obscure sources. It goes on to say as researchers and scholars it is their job to sort through the high quality and the bad. The article includes the different quality controls they use to sort through the articles.

Assess: This article will be useful to my paper by including the different ways of how papers reviewed and the different quality controls that can be used. This is written by a author who uses these tools everyday for work so knowing that mean that I can rely on his information. I do have other papers that list how they use different ways to use peer review but its good to have this article as it is being currently used. I would say it is reliable source its from it gives me more information to put towards my work then what I have learned from my other articles and the information that I previously known.

Reflect: There is a lot of information in this article that can help build my paper. The information that's given in this article to use peer review and sort through papers are current ways how papers looked through and chosen to be published. It gives different information from other articles that I have gone over which will help my argument of which peer review is the best to focus on. It has open my thoughts of other ways to do peer review and how to control on what information to put into my paper.
Summary: This article speaks on what the definition of peer review is. For example how peer review is used to select what submissions to approve for the publish to view and what effects it will have. Also ways of how they study questions, methods, and outcomes, they use to find the right results for the medical answers they need. The writer of the article also brings up how some of the people who's submissions where choose wanted their identity to be hidden and the effects that it would have on not seeing where the information came from if they don't have a person to give the credit too. They have different study's that that counter act the other study's and with this result peer review is a good way to find the wright answer but is mostly uncertain.

Assess: This article stands out to me because it gives that argument of yes there's different ways to do peer review and get the right answer but at the end of the day it is not a hundred percent accurate on getting you answer
that if you flip a coin sometimes it might not land on heads or tails but it will land in the middle and you won't get your answer. I think this will give a big turn to the rest of the information I have gathered it gives the kick that you may not always find the right answer even if you have hundreds to thousands of scientific professionals, or scholars trying to find the answer using peer review.

Reflect: This article will help put a debating argument in my paper against my the other articles that I have included. At first when I read into this article I felt it would just give the bases of what peer review is but the more that I read it gave me a good debating argument of how peer review works and how peer review does not always work. I has given me a different look on peer review until this point I never seen someone say peer review sometimes does not have an outcome.

Brittany Misiak
Professor Hugh Culik
English 1190-C1624
2-15-14
Annotated Bibliography #1

Search: Scholar google
Search Term: “peer review” “bias”
Summarize: This article is stating that everything can be flawed including peer review. Also that flawed research sometimes gets into literature. The reviewers can be bias, and a lot of people have concerns about the way things are peer reviewed. It expresses the problem that peer review fails to prevent the publication of flawed research. In a way it gives off the idea that it permits the publication of research is fraudulent. There are the articles examine the roles and responsibilities of authors and editors.

Assess: This article could be very useful if this is something that interest you. It is an important idea the in peer review can be bias because that can be a problem for thing to get published. This article wants to prove that peer review flawed and the reviewers are may have widely different opinions.

Reflect: Peer review has so many flaws, and the fact that it’s important and the biggest part of publishing. How is authors going to get better if the one thing they depend is flawed? It makes me think if peer review actually reliable or is there bigger problems behind it that no one knows about. The problem about peer review has to be changed for it to get better or improve. Also that reviewers are the heart of where the problems start and
how things are bias. The reviewers can have different opinions which create that bias problem. Therefore in this article really gets the idea out there that there could be a bigger problem in peer review.

Brittany Misiak
Professor Hugh Culik
English 1190-C1624
2-15-14

Annotated Bibliography #2

Search: Scholar google

Search term: problem with “peer review” *editing

Science and Engineering Ethics
1997, Volume 3, Issue 1, pp 63-84

Peer review for journals: Evidence on quality control, fairness, and innovation
J. Scott Armstrong


Summarize: This articles states that there is decision making in peer review. Peer review helps improve the quality of the work. Also peer review helps decide who should be rewarded, and it makes important
information be notified. Peer review is to decide either or not to publish a paper. The most successful work is found from peer review work and that it is very effective. There is evidence that peer review does help publishing and decision making on what gets published. Peer review is commonly believed to reduce the amount of errors in published work. Also for the reviewers that in the process of sending the work in to be peer review that it is rarely accepted the first submission.

Assess: This article can be really helpful to whatever in peer review interest you. The other sources I have found all been based on the idea of peer review, bias and the editing things behind it. It is a reliable source because what they are stating can be strongly true, but it depends on what you believe in about peer review.

Reflect: This article among with the others, will help me a lot on what I am focusing on. I believe that peer review has more problems than meets the eye but oddly on the same hand, peer review is really helpful. Peer review is the heart of what is going to be published or not. Peer review helps decide what is credible or not which relates to the idea of what we thought experts were.

Brittany Misiak
Professor Hugh Culik
English 1190-C1624
Annotated Bibliography #3

Search: Scholar google

Search term: “peer review” *Technology

Harnad, Stevan (1996) Implementing Peer Review on the Net:
Scientific Quality Control in Scholarly Electronic Journals. In, Peek,
R. and Newby, G. (eds.) UNSPECIFIED Scholarly Publishing: The Electronic
Frontier , MIT Press, 103-118.
http://eprints.soton.ac.uk/252900/1/harnad96.peer.review.html

Summarize: Electronic networks have made it possible for scholarly
periodical publishing to go from a trade model in which the author sells his
words through the mediation of the expensive and sometimes not stable
technology of paper. Is it trying to prove that the new way is better and
paper is the reason it is flawed? The paper way from the technology way is
still a helpful way of doing thing. The Net also offers the possibility of
implementing peer review more efficiently and equitably way. It makes it
seem like it is more of the reasonable way to do thing and the way it should
be done. Then the idea of "scholarly skywriting" is brought up through the
article. “Scholarly skywriting” needs to be constrained by peer review, but
it needs to be discussed. It explains that it will help scholars on the net to
communicate. Also it was talked about the difference between trade
publishing vs. scholarly publishing. How peer review is different but not in
a bad way with the electronic part. Also with the potential with the net and conditions of the net.

Assess: This article focuses on the technology part of peer review and how it is changing. As time is changing so is peer review, and is peer review just trying to play catch up with how the today world is. This technology change is really going to be helpful with peer review and what we are learning. The article can be useful to what you are focusing on about peer review.

Reflect: I think this article will help me with peer review. Peer review is always changing and because of that technology could be a reason for why things are becoming flawed. I am wondering how the editors or the experts feel about the technology change in peer review. If they like it or if they don’t want it changed. I think everything can be put to change but what if they are just used to what the way was.

Brittany Misiak
Professor Hugh Culik
English 1190-C1624
2-15-14

Annotated Bibliography #4

Search: Google
Search term: “Peer review” +quality
Measuring the Quality of Editorial Peer Review
Tom Jefferson, MD; Elizabeth Wager, MA; Frank Davidoff, MD


**Summarize:** With peer review there is important parts to it and measuring the quality of it. It explains about the methods. The way we identified the process of peer review and the studies about it. There is big decisions on submission of the paper, or even the acceptance. Then the result which help with the quality of the peer review process. The comment, analysis of the publish studies on editorial peer review reveals the diversity of study questions and end point. Conclusions helps show what it is aimed for and to evaluate the peer review.

**Assess:** This article is helpful because it explains the basics behind the peer review. The steps can explain to be people a better meaning of peer review. The goal is to make a clear article about what peer review is and to understand it.

**Reflect:** This is like one of the first article that I believe would help people understand peer review and start a great paper. Before people get deeper into the idea of peer review with the other things behind it. The simple concept has to be understood which this is a useful source for that. It will help myself with my paper because before I get into the bias part, gender
roles, or technology I have to understand and explain what peer review really is.

Brittany Misiak
Professor Hugh Culik
English 1190-C1624
2-15-14

Annotated Bibliography #5

Search: Scholar google

Search Term: “peer review” +bias

Peer review: a flawed process at the heart of science and journals
Richard Smith, Chief Executive, UnitedHealth Europe, E-mail:
richardswsmith@yahoo.co.uk
http://jrs.sagepub.com/content/99/4/178.short

Summarize: this articles talks about that peer review is the heart of all medical journals but it reflects on every article no matter what it is on. It points out a great point about peer review which is that it has to do with the application of a paper. It is corrected or judge by neither the author nor the person making a judgment on whether or not a grant should be given or a paper published. At one point it ask, who is the peer? And they brought up the term expert. The peer is thought to be someone looking or
knowing something in the same research or direct competitor. Peer reviews want raw data, repeating analyses, and checking the references. The problem with all this is that this article explains that there is a flawed process. It states the right way a paper is supposed to correct but in reality some peers is said to be “the paper looks all right to me”. All those problems is what starts the flawed in peer review and the sometimes laziness in it. Also it asked the question, “does peer review work at all?” and “what is peer review for?” This article really gets people thinking about peer review and the flawed parts of it.

Assess: This article is really interesting and I think it is a useful source for the topic on peer review. It will help understand the things behind peer review and the things that are wrong with it. This article makes it seem that everyone knows that there are things with peer review that is shady, but no one is saying anything. The problems are like the black elephant in the room.

Reflect: This article is the one out of the five that interested me the most. That the fact that something people trying to publishing idea and information that is new is mind blowing. It’s like the problems with peer review is staring them right in the face, and the experts are turning away from it as if there is nothing wrong with the processes. Than on the other hand if there isn’t any flaws why are people saying this?
Summary: This Article was written based on the experiments of peer review and how peer review is essentially problematic. In the article they do 19 different studies that really show peer review is just a term and that there is many different steps and practices within the peer review process. Each process deals with a different problem within itself. The experiment that was done in this article also shows that peer review is hard to study due to the many flaws that it has. The filtering and selection processes of peer review is untested. As though there is evidence that peer review does have a positive effect on submission, there are many holes within this process that are still unexplained.
**Assess:** While searching for this article I became extremely intrigued by the problems of peer review, and everything I seem to have clicked on were articles that experimented the processes of peer review. This article stood out to me not only because I am interested in the medical field I also got a fair amount of information on how peer review works and opened up my eyes to the flaws. It also showed me an opposing view that yes, peer review is helpful and that there really is no other way than peer review. To me this is extremely relevant to the topic because it gives me an insight on a different way to look at peer review (from a medical point of view), and also is shows positives and negatives of it.

**Reflect:** Having said above, the whole point of me researching this article is because it gives me a much different perspective and helps me bring out a bigger idea that maybe hasn’t been written about before, it gives me an abstract way to think about the term “peer review” and all the meanings and problems behind it. I feel all the different information that I can gather will definitely help myself with research and opening up a whole different issue that yet has been discovered. Articles like these will direct to me different topics they sited from.

______________________________

Julia Daniel

Professor Culik
Summary: This article is about how peer review is sometimes flawed, it can be flawed by poor editing from the peer reviewer or it can be done by false information that the write gave. It also states that the definition needs to be more defined, before peer review can be improved. There really is no way that you can teach or define the processes of peer review because they are all cognitive. Having said, when a reviewer is editing a piece of work they but a bias opinion into it and a horrible piece of work to them might be excellent to a discourse community that, that writer is writing towards.

Assess: I feel that this article gave me a good insight on what exactly is wrong with the peer review process and it briefly explains what the problems are. It sets me up to do further research on this subject by looking at their citations. I definitely will use their information that was given to me in this article.

Reflect: I feel that his piece is more opinionated than factual, which could cause a problem but the opinions are very relevant and seem to go through
the minds of many for know about peer review. The opinions in this paper helped me develop mine a little more clearly by answering some of the questions I have had. I would have like to see some research incorporated but as I already said it was very valid.

Mike Brown
Professor Culik
ENGLISH 1190-C1624
2/12/14


Search Engine: Google. Scholar “Problems With Peer Review”

Summary: This article starts off by talking about the different types of peer review. Next it talks about how peer review isn't a good thing because not everyone will agree on every critique. Also it talks about how in the peer review system there may be bias to well known friends, and people who you have not really talked to.
Assess: This article will be very helpful while writing this paper because it talks about a lot of the cons. And a lot of things that i just don't think many articles hit on. It will help me with all of my counter arguments and give me a different angle to look at this subject from.

Reflect: Seeing all of the counter arguments that i can use that came from this essay is really helpful, i have a lot of ideas that are already flowing that i need to get down on paper. This might be one of the most helpful articles that i have found.

__________________________

Mike Brown
Professor Culik
ENGLISH 1190-C1624
2/13/14


Search Engine: Google.Scholar

Summary: Peer review is the foundation of academic publication and a necessary step in the scrutiny of any scholarly work. Simply defined, peer
review is the attentive, unbiased assessment of any scholarly work that is submitted for formal scrutiny

**Assess:** This article talks about how using e-learning and online applications to do peer review can be good. But it also has its cons. Also, noting that most of the learning institutions in the world are starting to switch over and use all technology. So E-learning is the way to do peer review

**Reflect:** I really liked this because it brought up using technology to do peer review. Which I think is good because it is un-biased. It will not review nicer because it is friends with someone. Or grade a lot harder because it does not like that person. Definitely an article that will help me write my paper.

__________________________________

Mike Brown
Professor Culik
ENGLISH 1190-C1624
2/13/14

Mention peer review to any researcher and the chances are that he or she will soon start to grumble. Although the system by which research papers and grant applications are vetted is often described as science’s “gold standard,” it has always garnered mixed reviews from academics at its sharp end.

This is your basic pro's and cons's article. Although, it does talk heavily on the things that are good with peer review, than what is bad about it. But this is a mid range article, nothing too fancy. But it will be very helpful when writing my paper.

This article will be very helpful while writing my paper. It gives me a really good base to start at, and gives me great basic information and ideas. Its not going to make me go crazy and think out of the box, but it will definitaly help me think.

Julia Daniel
Professor Culik
English 1190-C1608
17 February 2014
Search: Scholar.google.com
Summary: This article was all about author satisfaction with the peer review processes. In the article it explains about the conducted research which happened to be “the annuals” sent out a survey to authors who had rejected papers and published papers by the peer review processes. The questions that were asked on this survey ranged from what they thought about the process if it worked well, or did not work well. Their personal opinions on the times and feeds backs of their writings being sent through peer review. The answers they had were on a scale of 1 for really good to 5 for really bad. The outcome of this surveyed showed that more authors who had more published articles thought even less of the process than authors who got denied in the peer review process. It also shows more people who had a so called “good “experience with peer review which simply is implying their work was published, answered the survey more than the people who were denied any kind of publication.

Assess: How I found this article was in the sources of the first article I read, I was intrigued by the topic the header stated so I google searched the authors cite “which is the article name” I instantly became engulfed into
the article. This game be a different insight not from a peer reviewer’s point of view but from an author who has gone through the peer review process. It really was directed towards to satisfaction or the unsatisfaction of authors who have gone through been review. It also helped me understand the kind of people who don’t like the process and the people who has a positive opinion about it. It stereotyped these authors but it definitely gave me a better understanding.

Reflect: As I found this article to give me a different point of view, it also helped me understand the type of people authors are. The downside to this article is that is briefly described what the true troubles were of peer review and what the authors thought of the process but it gave me TONS of factual information that I can use to further my research on peer review and the problems that follow it.

Julia Daniel
Professor Culik
English 1190-C1608
17 February 2014
Search: Scholar.google.com
Search Term: Peer Reviewers, credibility, quality, processes
Callaham, Michael L. "Reliability of Editors' Subjective Quality Ratings of Peer Reviews of Manuscripts." Journal of the American medical
Summary: This article was about the quality of the people who are doing the peer review for journals, this article suggest a simple grading scale 1 (bad) – 5 (great) on the quality of a peer reviewers work. The way they graded a peer reviewer is their response to what they were reading. Their personal insights if they were credible or not and also their thoughts on what should or shouldn’t be added. They article stresses the importance of getting rid of the poor peer reviewers and recognizing and keeping the ones who take the work seriously.

Assess: This article gave me tons of factual numbers and research which will make citing a breeze for my final paper. This topic on peer review I feel really isn’t answered, but is asked in the minds of others very frequently. I know I was wondering on how they choose who peer reviews and who doesn’t; and at this point in time they clearly just chose reviewers that they have normally chose whether they are good reviewers or not. Since most of the time whether an article gets published or not is truly based on the reviewer’s opinions and thoughts, we want to make sure the reviewers are truly cable of making that call. Not blowing off an article.

Reflect: As this is extremely important to the review process the credibility of peer reviewers, it also opens a different issue, if their actually giving an 100 percent effort into editing someone’s beloved publication that worked extremely hard on. Yes, we know that the peer review processes is flawed
but I believe that this article helps open different opinions as to who is truly credible.

Julia Daniel
Professor Culik
English 1190-C1608
17 February 2014
Search: Scholar.google.com
Search Term: Peer Reviewers, research, masking,

Summary: In this article, it explains the difference between masking the authors identity to reviewers, they did their own studied and it showed that it really did not make a difference. Now what did make a difference with masking or not masking identity was that the reviewers determined their reviews based upon the research level that the author had. Characteristics and other traits did not show any kind of difference in the review process. But with that said age is a characteristic and that seems to be a factor in research experience; but also research experience is associated with masking success.
Assess: this article really opened up a bigger picture, it really shows how there is so many factors that affect the peer review process, yes in this article it says that characteristics don’t affect the masking process of peer review but only the research experience does, but what effects research experience is age which is a characteristic. Showing me that there is so many aspects does that mean that the peer review process can be alter to a better way? Is it actually possible?

Reflect: I feel that this article gave me so many un-answer questions on the topic peer review. It opened my eyes to really think is it possible to make the process better, and if can be done. Or is it at the best it will ever be. It gave me little information but gave me tons of thoughts. Although it wasn’t completely directed to the importance of peer review it had background information that lead back to my main question.

Amy Marie Stirzinger
Professor Culik
English 1190-C1608
February 10, 2014
Search: scholar.google.com
Search Terms: credibility, peer review of literature, research, publication, expert
Summary: This article starts off by talking about how people should be able to believe a review or not. They also talk about how many experts come to different conclusions. Then The article lays out some guidelines to follow when you are looking at reviews. The first guideline is to have questions that will assess to the primary discussion. Second, is to look at “primary studies” which means to look at research reports that contain original information on which the review is based on. Third is to find that most published reviews have major scientific flaws. Then the article tells us that there is a need for improvement in peer-review literature. Then it talks about major points such as, “Were the questions and methods clearly stated?” Then they tell you to make a look at the review and make sure it makes a point at where it needs to be addressed. Then they state, “remember that fuzzy questions state to fuzzy answers so when we look at reviews to make sure they have clear statements.” They also tell us to remember that typically inferences is presented as a fact followed by one or more citations. In this case the reader has no basis upon which to judge the strength or validity of the inferences without reading the articles that are cited. Then we move on to another important questions, “Were comprehensive search methods used to locate relevant studies?” The article
then applies very good information on what to look for when you read. Then another question that is very important to look at is, “Were explicit methods used to determine which articles to include in the review?” and then it talks about that topic and how there may be common reviews on such a topic.

Assess: This reading on Guidelines of reading literature is very knowledgeable and helpful on some sort of standards. You have to think of reviews in a whole not just peer-review. I believe this source is useful because it does have good points. This sources seems to be somewhat reliable because it talks about what to look at when there is a review and how to know if the review is something truly to look at or not. This review is not really biased it just talks about key points to look at when it comes to reviews. The goal of this source is to help know what review is knowledgeable to look and what review is not.

Reflect: This article fits into my research very well because of how it talks about reviews and what key questions you should look at when you are reading a review. This source was helpful to me to understand and help question reviews and topics. This information can be reliable if you think about reviews as a whole. No matter if it’s a review about a restraints, doctor, or peer-review. Its good information to help understand the research or reading. It did change my thinking habit a little bit about this topic. But it also helped me understand what we are writing about. Because
when I first started this paper I had no clue what to write about and this helped me think outside of the box.

Amy Marie Stirzinger
Professor Culik
English 1190-C1608
February 10, 2014
Search: jstor
Search Terms: peer-review + credibility + validity

Summary: “Although people differ in their interpretations of the importance of disagreements among reviewers evaluating the same paper or proposal. Others will reject the reform, arguing that refer agreement-known as “reliability” when analyzing with statistics – has nothing to do with peer-review. In addition to noting generally poor reliability among referees, we find them more likely to agree about which grant proposals do not deserve support than about which proposals have scientific value.”

This article talks about a lot of reliability and what people do when they peer-review and the aftermath of peer-review. It also talks about how journals acceptance rates are higher and fewer people get in. It also talks
about manuscripts reviews and grant proposals. That also are key things to look at other than peer-review.

Assess: This article was alright. There was some information I might use for my paper but not a lot of talk. It stated a lot of stuff that seemed to not get to the point. It can be a useful source but I most likely wont use it. This article did not compare to my first source I found. My first source was really informational and helped me a lot understand the topic. Some of the info is reliable but not a lot of it. The goal of this source was to define peer-review, manuscripts, grant proposals.

Reflect: This source has some information if you read it but not a lot. I might use the parts like what I put at the beginning but that’s it. This shapes my agreement by understand that peer-review isn’t that great to use. And people are easily judged. Once you’ve summarized and assessed a source, you need to ask how it fits into your research. It didn’t really change my thinking process.

___________________________________

Amy Marie Stirzinger
Professor Culik
English 1190-C1608
February 10, 2014

Search: jstor
Search terms: peer-review + credibility + validity
Summary: A study of judgment of the quality and clinical care, made after retrospective analysis of hospital charts, in three clinical disciplines (obstetrics, surgery, pediatrics) revealed discrepancies, in intra-disciplinary judgments of the quality of clinical care, that cast doubt on the validity and the reliability of uncontrolled peer judgments of this quality. It was demonstrated that the degree of agreement between repeat judgments on the same cases by the same reviewers did not materially differ from the agreements seen in a different study involving serial judgments of the same kind made by different reviewers. It was show: (1) that individual judges consistently differed in the degree of harshness or permissiveness of their respective judgments; 2. That judges depended upon different aspects of clinical care to make final judgments of the quality of that care, and 3. That the number of independent (but professionally equally qualified) judges required to reach a stable judgment of care quality exceeded the number logistically available to meet the probable future demands of third-party payors. It was suggested that judgments of the quality of clinical care, derived from retrospective analyses of hospital charts, should be related to the compliance (or noncompliance) of the recorded care with pre-established sets of standards for that care.
Assess: I thought this sources is really useful because it talks about peoples judgments and how it affects certain things. Also how people judge and how they first think about things I think this source is really useful and it does compare as good as my other article. It really got my mind to think more clearly about the topic and what to write about. This information I think is reliable and good to reference in a paper. The goal of this source was to point out medical judges and how they judge and if certain things are reliable to trust and what’s not.

Reflect: Reflect: This article fits into my research well because it talks about how people judge things and it kind of refers to my first article with medical reviews. This source is very helpful and It shaped my argument to believe that peer-review isn’t a good thing. I can use this source in my paper by referencing it. This article made me more strongly believe more about the topic.

_____________________________________________

Amy Marie Stirzinger
Professor Culik
English 1190-C1608
February 10, 2014
Search: jstor
Search terms:
Summary: “Peer Review” the downfall of many papers and the heartbreaker of authors, is the most difficult component of publishing for researchers to accept. What is Peer Review? Peer review is the analysis of a paper by someone with sufficient knowledge of the subject to be able to make a judgment as to the merit of the paper. Why review?

Assess: I thought this article was useful as well. This article compares well with my others but it talks more about why we do review, what's good and bad about it, and ect. I thought this information was reliable and easy to understand. It made some very good points to the topic and the goal of the source was to help people understand why we do reviews and why is peer-review used.

Reflect: This article fits into my research because it talks about why we do reviews. Why is reviewing things important? Also why can peer-review be a bad things. This source was helpful for me and it shaped my agreement more to against peer-review. I can use this source in my paper easily because it fits perfectly on how peer-review can be bad and negative.

Mark Lorkowski
Professor Culik
ENGL-1190
2/16/14
Summary: The journal starts off to talk about how peer reviewing can be used it a bad way. It shows that some things that are peer reviewed aren’t really the most trusted things out there. The journal says that most articles should be rejected with people that do not have more than a high school education. This is because most of them have many flaws in their experiments, research and their knowledge. Also that many people making articles they say its easy to get published. After just a couple “credible” peer reviewers you can get the article published. Most of them tend to be not valid in their work.
Assess: This article stands out to me because it does tell you that there are not many trustable resources out there. There is always more ways to specify your research and to make your work better. This may not be the article I was looking for specifically but it opened me up to think that there are not many valid articles out there. It gives examples and points out flaws from other “authors” in the world. I may not be getting the most out of this article but I am learning and gaining insight on what peer review is really all about. I do believe it is useful because everyone will get a look as well in how peer review can have flaws.

Reflection: This journal will help benefit my research and me because it shows me authors do have a lot of work to do when it comes to peer review. Authors can always make their work better and get their peer reviews to do better as well. Together if they all do well, I think they can come out with a pretty credible article. But, it does have to be logical at the same time and have to be experts involved. This also helps me as I continue to research on this topic. I can use similar terms to find articles just like this one.

Mark Lorkowski
Professor Culik
ENGL-1190
Summary: This journal is about the peers reviewing author’s work. The reviewers that don’t know who the author do not really work or is proven to make a difference. It does not really make the quality of the article any better or improve it in any way. An article can only be as good as who the author is and who edits or peer reviews the article. Editors argue that peer review helps distinguish between good and bad papers and between good and bad research. This journal really questions if all articles that are published are really credible by who the editors (peer reviewers) are.
Assess: I do believe this is a useful source. It gives many examples in how peer review can be affected. It states that there can even be gender bias people and articles out there. This gives major help on determining on how peer review works. This article goes almost hand and hand with my other bibliographies. It shows and states that there is more and more of less quality articles out there in the world. It gives everyone else a hard time on really what to believe by all these articles and their peers.

Reflection: This fits into my research quite well actually. It built on my knowledge on how peer review is being looked at by editors and it is turning out to be not that credible. It helps my argument by giving me solutions on how peer review comes with an end product. This also gives me an insight on how scholars or experts are starting to look at peer review. Articles like this do change the way I think about peer review. It also gets me to question on if it’s really all that useful or if people do it just to think their work is “credible” for the world to use.

Mark Lorkowski
Professor Culik
ENGL-1190
2/16/14

**Summary:** This article introduces some different ways that the medical field uses peer review. They introduced two new types of methods that they are using on their doctors. It was said that the one way worked really well and is turning out quite useful to them. Having many doctors working in a particular area tend to get more accomplished in their field. Since there are several doctors in that specific area they all review each others work and it comes out better as if just one doctor were to be working alone.

**Assess:** This source is very useful to me. It introduced me to a new way on how other people in different areas of work use peer review. Peer review does not just have to be on one topic. It can branch off into more specific areas of a field. This one doesn’t really compare to my other sources. It
stands out. This article gave specific examples on new ways of peer review that is being used today. It is reliable not only because it’s from the government but that doctors use it as well.

**Reflection:** This source is very beneficial to my research. I keep on learning new ways on how peer review is dealt with in all aspects. It is starting to narrow down on what research is credible and what comes out of that research. Peer reviewing can be done in many ways, but what really matters is if it’s trustworthy. This shapes my argument even more because peer review can also be self-regulated and it gives the reader more to think about if peer reviewing is really needed.

_________________________________________
Mark Lorkowski
Professor Culik
ENGL-1190
2/16/14

Search: Google Scholar
Search Term(s): Peer Review, Reliable

Summary: On this article it is on how reliable peer reviewing really is. As is says in the article when reviewers edit work their judgment varies widely when doing another persons work. This article tested groups of people on the peer reviewing process. Editors were asked to not judge an article by the looks, gender, which made it, or even where it came from. It is all about the text, just the words in the article not who made it.

Assess: This article is a very useful source for my research. It gives yet another good example on how peers review is viewed. It tells reviewers to just edit articles based on the text and not where it originates. This compares with my articles very well. My knowledge of peer reviewing is growing. I learned a lot from this article just because it is kept simple and straight to the point. I would rule this article as reliable because it has research that was done and it has specific results that go with it. The goal is just to take peer reviewing as peer reviewing. No biases or anything just reading it for knowledge and to improve on the research done.
Reflection: This article was very beneficial to me and possibly some other classmates. It gives a good insight on what really peer review is about. No biases or anything. It shapes my argument that peer review can be useful if it’s looked at in this way. Peer review isn’t always negative and this is the reason why. There are actually people that want to make their work better and not just publishing articles or journals just to publish them. Yet again it has changed my views a little. Just because I believe that this article is credible with the research they have done.

Mark Lorkowski
Professor Culik
ENGL-1190
2/16/14

Search: Google Scholar
Search Term(s): Peer Review, Expertise, and Credible

**Summary:** The article starts off by talking about what peer review is. In scientific peer review at a minimum is to give judgments in promotion and tenure; to ensure the most important and meritorious research is funded. Meaning that peer review should always be top of the line and the most credible research out there. Also to keep on improving what they know about there research. Then it tells how peer review is really done. It gives good examples on the right way to peer review.

**Assess:** This is a very useful source for me. It gives me a detailed explanation on how peer review works and the process for it to get done. It takes a lot to get published and be a credible source. This article compares very well with my others because it goes even more in depth on how peer review works. It gives me a different angle on how it works for different places. The article is not biased at all it is totally objective and straight to the point.
Reflection: The points that are discussed in this article help me look into real life situations on how professionals create their work. It also allows me to link with the other articles and combine them to make one strong paper. This also adds on to my research, which will allow me to put into my paper. I now will have enough examples to make a credible claim. It didn’t change my view it just made the way I look at the topic of peer review in one way. This article helped me gain more knowledge to make my point stronger.

Nicole Vitale

Professor Culik

English-1190-C1624

2-15-14

Annotated Bibliography

Search: Scholar google

Search Term: Peer Review, Gender Roles,

Cote, Robert A. "The Role of Student Attitude towards Peer Review in Anonymous Electronic Peer Review in an EFL Writing Classroom." N.p.:
Summary: In certain studies peer review feedback is more helpful than professor feedback. Even though it is proven that peer review is more helpful students believe it does not benefit them, and often stay off task while editing a paper. Students blame their peers for not finding all the errors in their writing. Many believe the peer review process is biased because of friendships, gender, and many other common factors. To maximize the benefits of peer review, they had students sign into an online course in Spain. This studies goals was to find how students’ relationships effect a peer review study. Many of the students took questionnaires, and participated in peer review training. The interviews provided data on how the participants viewed the experience, the effects peer review had on their writing, insecurities about their English writing skills. Because of the peer review being electronically, students found it much more helpful in editing their writing.

Assess: This article is interesting to me because I never thought of peer review as something that can be altered depending on the person that is editing the piece of writing. It shows me that because of friendships and gender that a peer review can be taken in an informal manner. The information presented in this article is helpful because it helps to see all
sides of peer review. This article is very helpful because it shows how the most structured things can become biased. 

**Reflect:** This article is helpful because it shows how pieces of writing can become skewed because of the peoples that are editing it. This is a great example how external forces can effect ones writing. Because of friendships all of the errors may not be found and the writer may not have the piece of writing they greatly desire. Articles like this help me a lot because they can show the error on peer review on a face to face basis.

Nicole Vitale

Professor Culik

English-1190-C1624

2-15-14

Annotated Bibliography

**Search:** Scholar google

**Search Term:** Peer Review, Gender Roles, and workplace.

Marsh, Herbert W. "Gender differences in peer reviews of grant applications: A substantive-methodological synergy in support of the null

**Summary:** According to this article gender is not a significant reason for peer review to be considered as biased. This article stated that gender has no effects on the outcome of peer review. These findings show that researches are compared to people that have been chosen by a funding agency. From the research shown and from previous studies, there is strong evidence that there is no gender differences in peer review.

**Assess:** This article is extremely interesting to me. In the workplace gender plays a major role, considering women are paid 75 cents to every dollar that men make. Because of men being more dominant in the workplace I thought it would be the same in peer review. It is relieving to know that gender is not an issue in peer review.

**Reflect:** Because of the information in this article this is a great article to show how gender isn’t always a factor in roles. Because peer review is not effected by peer review it proves that gender isn’t always a factor is someone’s success. This research helps me better understand that peer review is not biased in the workplace.
Summary: This article is taking about how teacher review can help a student in many ways. It also talks about how the peer review process is very important in college writing and when the students write their essays.

Assess: This can help many people figure out what they need to do with their papers. Some people just read over their papers themselves, which is never good. A second pair of eye’s to help you is always effective.

Reflect: This article reminded me of what Hugh Culik does. He is a professor and reviews students papers and help them to become a better writer.
Search: Scholar google

Search Term: Peer Review, Credibility, and Editing.


Summary: In this article the peer review process for papers submitted into a movement are looked at by experts to insure the most accurate information is presented. In the article it states that the purpose of this systematic review was to describe the prevalence and content of guidelines developed to help peer reviewers when doing evaluations. The results showed that peer review guidelines are often used in special education with many referring to similar aspects of manuscripts. Because of the peer
review process strengths and errors are found in the manuscripts and the recommendations are used to create a stronger community of researchers. **Assess:** In this article I found that because of having manuscripts sent to experts the peer review process was used more efficiently. This makes me think back to our first paper we wrote in English 1190. What kind of experts are doing the peer reviews on manuscripts? Because of manuscripts being sent to experts the errors could be much less and the manuscripts could be a lot stronger.

**Reflect:** In the article I find that the information isn’t exactly clear about how experts are related in the peer review process. Yes they send manuscripts to experts because they have more knowledge than the average person but how is peer review and experts related? I wish the article was clearer or had more information on how experts are related to peer review.

Nicole Vitale

1

Professor Culik

English-1190-C1624

2-15-14

Annotated Bibliography #4

**Summary:** In this article the writers use videotaping and discourse analysis to study peoples dialogue and conduct during a preparation for an event. The research uses social analysis to reveal constructed facts by aligning professional visions of space, time, and agency. However, its subsequent failure to satisfy an unexpected scientific peer review demonstrates the importance of anticipating reception and use when developing such documents. This case study shows that planners can create and stabilize technical knowledge claims that project authority by showing a responsive face to many audiences.

**Assess:** In the article I found out that even in science fields they use the peer review process. The process helps demonstrate the importance when developing documents. This helps their claims have a better “back bone”.

---

**Search:** Scholar google

**Search Term:** Peer Review, Expertise, Discourse, Validity, and Credentials.
Without the peer review process many documents would be scattered and would have many errors in them.

Reflect: This article showed me that even in the science field peer review is used. Whether it was on an experiment or on scientific document the peer review process helped back up their claims and clarify the strong points in their studies. With the help of peer review many errors that could happen in an experiment are discovered.

Steve Tolomei
Professor Culik
English 1190
02/16/2014

1) Search: Scholarly Google
Terms: "Peer reviewed journal" + credibility + reliability
doi: 10.1109/ICDS.2009.28 02/16/2014
http://ieeexplore.ieee.org/stamp/stamp.jsp?
  tp=&arnumber=4782868&isnumber=4782834

Summary: This article describes the popularity of Wikipedia and how
accessible it is to virtually anyone. The downside is that it can be edited by viewers to display both information that is true, and false information so the academic integrity of the article cannot be trusted. In this generation of google people are abandoning the idea of having a reputable peer edited journal as their main source of information and using the first thing they see on google.

Assess: I picked this article because I use Wikipedia frequently to get a general idea of topics that I am unsure of.

Reflect: I think this article is very true of how the author says that Wikipedia is used as a popular search engine and that it provides information to the entire world wide web. The only port about this website is that it can be edited with information that can be both true and false.

2) Search Scholarly Google

Terms: “Peer reviewed Journal” + reliable + credibility


Summary: The article described an experiment on viewing the different levels of credibility. It dissects each level and describes each in detail so show how each affects credibility to make journals a credible and reliable source.
Assess: I picked this article because it was relevant to my age and social level by using college students as their test subjects.
Reflect: I never thought about the fact that there is qualitative scientific ways to measure credibility and reliability. So this is helpful to see that there is a scientific way to do something that you would just use your best guess with.

3) Search: Scholarly google
Terms: “Peer reviewed Journal” + reliable + credibility
Andrew J. Flanagin and Miriam J. Metzger. The role of site features, user attributes, and information verification behaviors on the perceived credibility of web-based information New Media & Society April 2007 9: 319-342, doi:10.1177/1461444807075015
Search Term: Peer Review Journal
Summary: This article took a different spin on credibility and how it can be divided and dissected. This article compared four different ways to measure credibility and reliability versus three from the previous article. The results were only a theory of development.
Assess: I chose this article because of how it was related to the separation and dividing of groups. It makes things clearer to see and easier to understand.
Reflect: I feel that because we all look at things a different way, that dividing and breaking things down makes information easier to digest and also easier to understand. People think differently and if we give them the option to pick a way that they understand information the best, they can make a judgment to whether it is reliable or not.

4) Search: Scholarly Google

Search Term: Peer Review Journal


Summary: This article reviews how perception and credibility are related. People see information in different ways. To believe them to be true is part of the whole challenge. The point of this research is to identify how people see credibility and what can influence them.

Assess: This article took another approach to how people perceive true information. Reliability and credibility are very big keys into winning someone’s opinion and I like how this article displayed that.

Reflect: I feel that this article relates two very important elements when it comes to information. I like to see that there are different studies being carried about this subject matter.
5) Search: Scholarly Google

Search Term: Peer Review Journal, Reliable

Eddy K. M. Chong, Using blogging to enhance the initiation of students into academic research, Computers & Education, v.55 n.2, p.798-807, September, 2010

Summary: This article reviews the link of teachers and students and how educators believe students get their information. They are worried about the credibility of the information that goes into students research projects. There was a survey conducted in this article as where.

Assess: I chose this article because I have also thought about the link of student research and how reliable some sites might be that give out information.

Reflect: There is a real truth behind this article because I was once aspiring to be a teacher. I find this article very relatable and I also have wondered about this same situation that has been brought up to in my experience in the teaching program.

------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Stephanie Giannola

Professor Culik

English 1190-

15 February 2014
Summary: The summery of this book starts off by talking about the peer review process and the reasons it is important for sciences. It’s described in four- stage process. (a) From the research, (b) to submission and (c) review of a manuscript by researchers in the same field, and (d) finally to the editor's decision. He also states its benefits researchers that what they reading is credible based on judgment and published bases is certain on the ones work. He views there no alternative to peer review. The quality of the work should be reviewed and improved before publishing. Also that only researchers in the same field can do this.

Assess: This article really stands out to me because he backs up all reasons why no other method besides peer review is possible. It makes you really think about the whole publication and research process. Though his information is a little repetitive, he still makes very good arguments about it. It open up my view how other methods could possible fail and how the
research/ information may not be as accurate without strictly sticking with peer review.

Reflect: The four-stages of peer review really pin point why peer review is so useful to researches. It makes sense why work should reviewed and then improved before publication. The ideas and points this author makes has very good arguments. He talks about doing other things besides peer review would be negative and how doing peer review is the only way.

Stephanie Giannola
Professor Culik
English 1190-
15 February 2014

Search Engine: Google.scholar.com
Search Term: allintitle: "Peer review"


Summary: The article starts off by stating different facts about peer review. The suggestion is the peer review should be broken down into two things. First, being that peer review should be as skilled as possible. Second, being that confirmation or even refutation of previously published data is an
important component of the scientific process. They also state that the days of anonymous peer review is should be and is over. The problem is with peer review there saying is how do you decided over controversial papers whatever the criticism is balanced with the deficiencies of the papers.

Assess: This journal really made me think. It pointed out all the negative feedback and qualities that peer reviewing has. A lot of the journals talk about good and the bad but this one mostly focuses on the negative. It open me up on how people can judge your paper without even reading it yet. They can automatically say it’s bad when its excellent and the opposite of that.

Reflect: I really strongly agree you get crisis on your work before it’s even reviewed. That’s a major problem with peer review. The days of anonymous peer review are very much over. The two suggestions of peer review are very true thought. One does need to be very skilled as much as possible. Also, other work and published data is very important.

Stephanie Giannola
Professor Culik
English 1190-
15 February 2014

Search Engine: Google.scholar.com

Summary: The journal starts off by stating the peer review means many different things to different people, yet that blinded peer review has long been the main thing of high quality scientific journals. Peer review has the classic concept of medical publishing but it’s making it confusing exactly what peer review represents. They state that the JBJS peer review processes is very rigorous and that’s before pre-publication. They say the editorials and reviewers role in validating data in the manuscript. If an article is published with readers that lack interest in the article there will be hard time pointing out the weakness. They also state the deficiencies in peer review. These include a delay in the time from submission to publication, various reviewer biases, and an inability to definitively validate the reported data without full access to the raw data on which the manuscript is based. They claim that peer review has lost its pin point and they are aiming to fix it.

Asses: I really like this article. It’s really grab my interest because its states and proves it’s the bases of scientific journals. They are saying the true meaning of peer review has lost its purpose. This is very true. They broke
down what the problem is and how they intend to fix it. They make very valid points and concerns about the problem

Reflect: The proof and background on peer review are stated in this article. It points all the classic concepts of scientific journals. It also states the problems with peer review, but they state the right way peer review should be done and there will be no problems. They claim that peer review has lost its pin point and they are aiming to fix it.

---------------------------------

Anthony Johnson
English 1190
Professor Culik

Summary
This article speaks of the power of social media being used as an interface to be access by anyone in the world. The author references the term "Web 2.0" multiple times. Web 2.0 is just a nickname for how the web really is now. The article addresses the problem of communication with health information being distributed around the world so simply. The fix they say is social media. Also the reporting of health improvements were the outcome of the patients.
Access
The article strikes a cord with me because of the simplicity of the concept and what they believe they think is the solution. The authors talk of promoting health information through just posting form patients of their results. Also this entire article seems like a promotion with all the testimonies an examples of the different doctors spoken throughout the article.

Reflect
I find this article baffling because of the simple concept of believing. This article seems to have a good message behind it. The ideas of social media being helpful an translate to other healthcare providers and specialists. This articles proves the message of believing is achieving.

Anthony Johnson
English 1190
Professor Culik
February 14, 2014

Works Cited
Summary
The article speaks about scientific communication through modern forms of media and technology. The article shows many graphs and statistics which seem a little bit mathematical than scientific. It also speaks on the production and life of TED which is (technology, entertainment, design) all of which are components to make the perfect interface for a scientific discussion. There are multiple mentions is TED talks on YouTube as a medium in which individuals can watch for free.

Access
This article stands out to me because it stands out yet it melds perfectly which the first previous article. Which both are chronological and cohesively ordered. The article shows a lot of the statistics and graphs showing to support the argument they are trying to make. It does it successfully which make the article legitimate and accessible.

Reflect
Both the previous and current annotated bib both cohesively and chronologically follow one another in an attempt to answer each question given to us. This article enlightenment me because of how powerful social media really is and how it makes everything much easier. Science is making a step forward socially thanks to the current and younger generation who made social media what it is today.

______________________________

Anthony Johnson
English 1190
Professor Culik
February 14, 2014

Works Cited


Summary

This article speaks about the absense or traditional knowledge processes because of the developments in science. What the author is trying to convey is that the range and complex ivory of tools used to interact with knowledge and insight are now dead and gone. The motivation is gone by the accessibility of the tools we have now. It is like the death of the expertise in a way.
Access
The author questions a lot of arguments used in support of using social media as a vessel for accessing and using knowledge. Also the author differentiates the business aspect from the scientific aspect. But the relevance of this is futile. The emergence of technology has killed the old methods of accessing knowledge.

Reflect
This third article serves as the rebuttal for the first two annotated bibs. It is kind of like the other argument used for another side of an opinion. Also to give a different outlook. I am taken aback with realization by how much I never thought or considered to think of the discrepancies of using social media with science advances. Much less using the internet.

Anthony Johnson
English 1190
Professor Culik
February 15, 2014

Works Cited
**Summary**

To determine the reputation of an author who makes online content. Some content contains multiple links of online content which is connected through an ongoing maze or spiderweb. It is hard to distinguish what has or hasn't been copied or pasted. Also, many authors are anonymous or made up so it would be extremely difficult to distinguish who had credentials or not.

**Access**

This article is extensive in information on how patent and the rules of patenting and plagiarism. As I was reading this, I got a sense of bold attic sadness because I felt like I was in schools again learning how to write a paper and cite my information right. It is very clear and makes sure the reader knows all of what to do and what consequences come with it. The information is a lot though it could have been shortened.

**Reflect**

Each to the articles I have written about each contain a specific sphere of information all connecting to a harmonious topic. Authors of media and
especially online material should really look into what patenting really is. Failure to do so can result in jail or otherwise.

Frisko Ndoja
Professor Hughlik
English 1190- c1624
2/12/14

http://advan.physiology.org/content/31/2/145.full.pdf+html
Search Engine: scholar.google.com
Search terms: "peer review" + "validity" + "publication" + "credibility"

Summary: This article traces the history of peer review of scientific publications, plotting the development of the process from its inception to its present-day application. We discuss the merits of peer review and its weaknesses, both perceived and real, as well as the practicalities of several major proposed changes to the system. It is our hope that readers will gain a better appreciation of the complexities of the process and, when serving as reviewers themselves, will do so in a manner that will enhance the utility of the exercise. We also propose the development of an international on-line training program for accreditation of potential referees.
**Assess:** This article is very interesting because it covers all aspects of peer review. It shows the evolution of peer review and how it came to be. These authors are from the departments of Physiology and Biophysics, Nutrition and Vision Sciences from the University of Alabama. As far as the paper goes they go straight to the point with each one of these topics, which allows you to digest the most important information. Mentioning how importance of peer review and how without it there would be no credibility. Saying that there will be a lack of opportunity for other experts to bring up criticism before publication. Also mentioning the changes of peer review and how it has evolved. Talking about successful blinding to avoid being bias; blinding is where the authors name and information is erased from the paper so that the people reviewing will not know who wrote them. What makes this paper unique is that they bring up their own counter argument saying how you can’t avoid bias because they will have different methodologies. Bring up an interesting thesis about the future of peer review. They stated how there is already companies like Wikipedia that is an online encyclopedia that allows individuals to submit and edit information on any topic of their choosing.

**Reflect:** This article is very well wrote it has several authors which I like because they can peer review one another while writing the paper. They all bring their own aspects of peer review and put it into one article. They mentioned how in Wikipedia anyone with internet can change the information that is written, this is because there’s so many things to write
about. This losing its credibility but Wikipedia does a good job of have a low percentage of errors. There references also seem to be other information by credible universities. Although this paper was written in 2006 it is still applicable to the world today.

Frisko Ndoja
Professor Hughlik
English 1190- c1624
2/12/14


[http://swr.oxfordjournals.org/content/35/1/11.full.pdf+html](http://swr.oxfordjournals.org/content/35/1/11.full.pdf+html)

Search Engine: Schoolar.Google.com
Search terms: "peer review" + article+ community+credibility +"publication"

**Summary:** This study was conducted to describe strategies used by social work researchers to enhance the rigor of their qualitative work. A template was developed and used to review a random
sample of 100 articles drawn from social work journals listed in the 2005
Journal Citation Reports: Science and Social Sciences Edition. Results suggest that the most
commonly applied
strategies were use of a sampling rationale (67%), analyst triangulation
(59%), and mention of
methodological limitations (56%); the least common were negative or
deviant case analysis (8%),
external audit (7%), and specification of ontology (6%). Of eight key
criteria, researchers used
an average of 2.0 (SD = 1.5); however, the number used increased
significantly between 2003
and 2008. The authors suggest that for this trend to continue, social work
educators, journal
editors, and researchers must reinforce the judicious application of
strategies for enhancing
the rigor of qualitative work.

Assess: This paper is written by 2 professors out of the college of social
studies in Utah. The third author is a research assistant at the college of
social studies and community development. In this article is that the
authors make their own experiment so you know that the numbers they
come up with are true. They take a group of people from all different types
of backgrounds, and they categorize them by the way that they review a published article. The authors also created a graph allowing to visualize the increased use of key strategies over the years. This allows you to see how techniques have changed over the years, and which ones are the best to use.

**Reflect:** This article is very helpful it seems that the authors know what they’re doing, and there work seems credible. The fact that they conducted their own experiment is great because it gives us a lot of facts about peer reviewing. The only problem with this article is that it is a little dated but the information can still be considered dependable.