

Bias in peer review

Journal of the Association for Information Science and Techno
64, 2-17

DOI: [10.1002/asi.22784](https://doi.org/10.1002/asi.22784)

Citation Report

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
1	Journal acceptance rates: A cross-disciplinary analysis of variability and relationships with journal measures. <i>Journal of Informetrics</i> , 2013, 7, 897-906.	1.4	75
2	Writing and reading peer reviews. <i>Qualitative Social Work</i> , 2013, 12, 715-721.	0.9	3
3	THE LIMITED EFFECTIVENESS OF PRESTIGE AS AN INTERVENTION ON THE HEALTH OF MEDICAL JOURNAL PUBLICATIONS. <i>Epistēmē</i> , 2013, 10, 387-402.	0.6	4
4	Looking Across and Looking Beyond the Knowledge Frontier: Intellectual Distance and Resource Allocation in Science. <i>SSRN Electronic Journal</i> , 2014, , .	0.4	6
5	From the Editors: Lessons Learned From Dance's Cross-Training as a Tool for Moving Forward in Our Discipline. <i>Academy of Management Learning and Education</i> , 2014, 13, 151-153.	1.6	4
6	The four pillars of scholarly publishing: The future and a foundation. <i>Ideas in Ecology and Evolution</i> , 0, 7, .	0.1	6
7	Open, single-blind, double-blind: which peer review process do you prefer?. <i>BMC Pharmacology & Toxicology</i> , 2014, 15, 55.	1.0	28
8	The Peer-Review Process. <i>Perspectives in Psychiatric Care</i> , 2014, 50, 77-78.	0.9	4
9	Understanding shortages of sufficient health care in rural areas. <i>Health Policy</i> , 2014, 118, 201-214.	1.4	175
10	Radiation therapist peer review: raising the bar on quality and safety in radiation oncology. <i>Journal of Radiotherapy in Practice</i> , 2014, 13, 484-489.	0.2	3
11	Evaluating altmetrics. <i>Scientometrics</i> , 2014, 98, 1131-1143.	1.6	192
12	A web application for aggregating conflicting reviewers' preferences. <i>Scientometrics</i> , 2014, 99, 523-539.	1.6	1
14	Translational paradigms in pharmacology and drug discovery. <i>Biochemical Pharmacology</i> , 2014, 87, 189-210.	2.0	31
15	Advancing Kinesiology Through Improved Peer Review. <i>Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport</i> , 2014, 85, 127-135.	0.8	20
16	Hospital Positioning and Integrated Hospital Marketing Communications: State-of-the-Art Review, Conceptual Framework, and Research Agenda. <i>Journal of Nonprofit and Public Sector Marketing</i> , 2014, 26, 1-34.	0.9	28
17	The reviewer in the mirror: examining gendered and ethnicized notions of reciprocity in peer review. <i>Scientometrics</i> , 2014, 101, 717-735.	1.6	22
18	What is a Publishable Article?. <i>Applied Biosafety</i> , 2014, 19, 116-117.	0.2	0
19	Commensuration Bias in Peer Review. <i>Philosophy of Science</i> , 2015, 82, 1272-1283.	0.5	57

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
20	Is three better than one? simulating the effect of reviewer selection and behavior on the quality and efficiency of peer review. , 2015, , .		8
21	Tres siglos despu�s. . . �Es vigente el arbitraje por pares en las publicaciones cient�ficas?. Investigaci�n En Educaci�n M�dica, 2015, 4, 236-241.	0.0	1
22	Does Unblinding Make One King in the Land of the Blind(Ed)?. Proceedings of Singapore Healthcare, 2015, 24, 69-71.	0.2	0
23	Imperfect referees: Reducing the impact of multiple biases in peer review. Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology, 2015, 66, 2340-2356.	1.5	6
24	Emerging new methods of peer review in scholarly journals. Learned Publishing, 2015, 28, 85-91.	0.8	20
25	Bias and effort in peer review. Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology, 2015, 66, 2020-2030.	1.5	14
26	Moving to the Double-Blind Review System. Journal of Intelligence, 2015, 3, 158-159.	1.3	0
27	How peer-review constrains cognition: on the frontline in the knowledge sector. Frontiers in Psychology, 2015, 6, 1706.	1.1	18
28	The research impact of school psychology faculty. Journal of School Psychology, 2015, 53, 231-241.	1.5	9
29	Testing for the fairness and predictive validity of research funding decisions: A multilevel multiple imputation for missing data approach using ex�ante and ex�post peer evaluation data from the Austrian science fund. Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology, 2015, 66, 2321-2339.	1.5	15
30	The Editorial Review Process. Journal of Micro/ Nanolithography, MEMS, and MOEMS, 2015, 14, 030101.	1.0	7
31	Data journals: A survey. Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology, 2015, 66, 1747-1762.	1.5	87
32	Adverse selection of reviewers. Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology, 2015, 66, 1252-1262.	1.5	10
33	Societal impact evaluation: Exploring evaluator perceptions of the characterization of impact under the REF2014: Table 1.. Research Evaluation, 2015, 24, 229-241.	1.3	77
34	Industry Disclosures. Journal of the American College of Cardiology, 2015, 65, 2457-2458.	1.2	2
35	Peer Review of Datasets: When, Why, and How. Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society, 2015, 96, 191-201.	1.7	33
36	Open Peer Review: Fast Forward for a New Science. Advances in Librarianship, 2015, , 115-141.	0.1	4
37	The principal�agent problem in peer review. Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology, 2015, 66, 297-308.	1.5	15

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
38	Use of politeness strategies in signed open peer review. <i>Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology</i> , 2015, 66, 1048-1064.	1.5	9
39	Science as a Social Enterprise. , 2015, , 291-336.		0
40	Retracting Inconclusive Research: Lessons from the SÃ©ralini GM Maize Feeding Study. <i>Journal of Agricultural and Environmental Ethics</i> , 2015, 28, 621-633.	0.9	15
41	From Manuscript Evaluation to Article Valuation: The Changing Technologies of Journal Peer Review. <i>Human Studies</i> , 2015, 38, 57-79.	0.7	58
42	The authorâ€™editor game. <i>Scientometrics</i> , 2015, 104, 361-380.	1.6	27
43	Reviewer recommendations and editorsâ€™ decisions for a conservation journal: Is it just a crapshoot? And do Chinese authors get a fair shot?. <i>Biological Conservation</i> , 2015, 186, 22-27.	1.9	24
44	Comparison of self-citation by peer reviewers in a journal with single-blind peer review versus a journal with open peer review. <i>Journal of Psychosomatic Research</i> , 2015, 79, 561-565.	1.2	10
45	Measuring the effectiveness of scientific gatekeeping. <i>Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America</i> , 2015, 112, 360-365.	3.3	205
46	Scientific Reproducibility, Human Error, and Public Policy. <i>BioScience</i> , 2015, 65, 5-6.	2.2	17
47	Who publishes in â€œpredatoryâ€ journals?. <i>Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology</i> , 2015, 66, 1406-1417.	1.5	229
49	Variables Affecting Evaluation and Publication of Oncology Case Reports: A Systematic Analysis. <i>International Journal of Biological Markers</i> , 2016, 31, 456-460.	0.7	1
50	Blind Peer Review by Academic Journals. , 2016, , 75-95.		5
51	Knowledge Production in Two Types of Medical PhD Routesâ€™Whatâ€™s to Gain?. <i>Publications</i> , 2016, 4, 14.	1.9	3
52	Bias in Research Grant Evaluation Has Dire Consequences for Small Universities. <i>PLoS ONE</i> , 2016, 11, e0155876.	1.1	44
53	Ex ante evaluation of interdisciplinary research projects: A literature review. <i>Social Science Information</i> , 2016, 55, 568-588.	1.1	4
55	Do Peer Reviews Predict Impact? Evidence from the <i>American Sociological Review</i> , 1978 to 1982. <i>Socius</i> , 2016, 2, 237802311664027.	1.1	4
56	Not all international collaboration is beneficial: The <i>Mendeley</i> readership and citation impact of biochemical research collaboration. <i>Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology</i> , 2016, 67, 1849-1857.	1.5	51
57	What motivates people to review articles? The case of the humanâ€™computer interaction community. <i>Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology</i> , 2016, 67, 1358-1371.	1.5	7

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
58	The world's contribution to the field of urology in 2015: A bibliometric study. Arab Journal of Urology Arab Association of Urology, 2016, 14, 241-247.	0.7	4
59	Editorial behaviors in peer review. SpringerPlus, 2016, 5, 903.	1.2	16
60	Gender differences in patterns of authorship do not affect peer review outcomes at an ecology journal. Functional Ecology, 2016, 30, 126-139.	1.7	50
61	Editor and reviewer gender influence the peer review process but not peer review outcomes at an ecology journal. Functional Ecology, 2016, 30, 140-153.	1.7	86
62	Peer review in megajournals compared with traditional scholarly journals: Does it make a difference?. Learned Publishing, 2016, 29, 9-12.	0.8	42
63	Alternative Policies for Collaborative Publishing in Natural Resource Journals. Society and Natural Resources, 2016, 29, 1375-1388.	0.9	3
64	Is there a gender difference in scientific collaboration? A scientometric examination of co-authorships among industrial/organizational psychologists. Scientometrics, 2016, 108, 113-141.	1.6	34
65	Measuring the match between evaluators and evaluatees: cognitive distances between panel members and research groups at the journal level. Scientometrics, 2016, 109, 1639-1663.	1.6	4
66	Does "Decision Fatigue" Impact Manuscript Acceptance? An Analysis of Editorial Decisions by the American Journal of Gastroenterology. American Journal of Gastroenterology, 2016, 111, 1511-1512.	0.2	4
67	Web Indicators for Research Evaluation: A Practical Guide. Synthesis Lectures on Information Concepts, Retrieval, and Services, 2016, 8, i-155.	0.6	11
69	Peer review and the publication process. Nursing Open, 2016, 3, 193-202.	1.1	76
70	Improving the Peer review process: Capturing more information and enabling high-risk/high-return research. Research Policy, 2016, 45, 1936-1938.	3.3	18
71	Authors and reviewers who suffer from confirmatory bias. Scientometrics, 2016, 109, 1377-1395.	1.6	11
72	Scientific Eminence. Perspectives on Psychological Science, 2016, 11, 899-904.	5.2	54
73	Innovation Experiments: Researching Technical Advance, Knowledge Production, and the Design of Supporting Institutions. Innovation Policy and the Economy, 2016, 16, 135-167.	6.1	16
74	Can the behavioral sciences self-correct? A social epistemic study. Studies in History and Philosophy of Science Part A, 2016, 60, 55-69.	0.6	30
75	Why Submit Your Next Paper to the "Japanese Journal of Personality"? Japanese Journal of Personality, 2016, 25, 183-190.	0.0	1
76	Reforms in Academic Publishing: Should Behavioral Disorders and Special Education Journals Embrace Them?. Behavioral Disorders, 2016, 41, 161-172.	0.8	8

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
78	â€œStanding on the shoulders of giantsâ€™: diversity and scholarship in Intelligence Studies. Intelligence and National Security, 2016, 31, 1040-1054.	0.3	24
79	Frequency and Type of Conflicts of Interest in the Peer Review of Basic Biomedical Research Funding Applications: Self-Reporting Versus Manual Detection. Science and Engineering Ethics, 2016, 22, 189-197.	1.7	5
80	A statistical approach to calibrating the scores of biased reviewers of scientific papers. Metrika, 2016, 79, 37-57.	0.5	2
81	Why the refereesâ€™ reports I receive as an editor are so much better than the reports I receive as an author?. Scientometrics, 2016, 106, 967-986.	1.6	7
82	Looking Across and Looking Beyond the Knowledge Frontier: Intellectual Distance, Novelty, and Resource Allocation in Science. Management Science, 2016, 62, 2765-2783.	2.4	275
83	Estimating the Difference Between Published and Unpublished Effect Sizes. Review of Educational Research, 2016, 86, 207-236.	4.3	162
84	The white cube in the black box: assessing artistic research quality in multidisciplinary academic panels. Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education, 2016, 41, 1223-1236.	3.9	8
85	Coping with the Conflict-of-Interest Pandemic by Listening to and Doubting Everyone, Including Yourself. Science and Engineering Ethics, 2016, 22, 591-596.	1.7	9
86	Evolutionary games between authors and their editors. Applied Mathematics and Computation, 2016, 273, 645-655.	1.4	5
87	Tourism research quality: Reviewing and assessing interdisciplinarity. Tourism Management, 2016, 52, 586-592.	5.8	35
88	Evaluating the Pros and Cons of Different Peer Review Policies via Simulation. Science and Engineering Ethics, 2016, 22, 1073-1094.	1.7	4
89	Frame Search and Re-search: How Quantitative Sociological Articles Change During Peer Review. American Sociologist, The, 2016, 47, 264-288.	0.2	15
90	Ensuring the Quality, Fairness, and Integrity of Journal Peer Review: A Possible Role of Editors. Science and Engineering Ethics, 2016, 22, 169-188.	1.7	89
91	The Social and Psychological Costs of Peer Review. Journal of Management Inquiry, 2016, 25, 11-26.	2.5	36
92	Measuring metrics â€œa 40â€™ year longitudinal crossâ€™ validation of citations, downloads, and peer review in astrophysics. Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology, 2017, 68, 695-708.	1.5	18
93	Student peer review: enhancing formative feedback with a rebuttal. Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education, 2017, 42, 801-811.	3.9	33
94	Authorâ€™s suggested reviewers: gender differences and influences on the peer review process at an ecology journal. Functional Ecology, 2017, 31, 270-280.	1.7	30
95	Dimensions of trust in scholarly communication: Problematizing peer review in the aftermath of John Bohannon's â€œStingâ€™ in science. Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology, 2017, 68, 450-467.	1.5	12

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
96	Understanding and supporting anonymity policies in peer review. <i>Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology</i> , 2017, 68, 957-971.	1.5	9
97	A Social Epistemological Inquiry into Biases in Journal Peer Review. <i>Perspectives on Science</i> , 2017, 25, 124-148.	0.3	9
98	Preserving the Quality of Scientific Research: Peer Review of Research Articles. <i>Fascinating Life Sciences</i> , 2017, , 73-99.	0.5	10
99	On the Nature and Role of Peer Review in Mathematics. <i>Accountability in Research</i> , 2017, 24, 177-192.	1.6	21
100	Is there a first mover advantage in science? Pioneering behavior and scientific production in nanotechnology. <i>Research Policy</i> , 2017, 46, 522-533.	3.3	25
101	Evaluation, ranking and selection of R&D projects by multiple experts: an evidential reasoning rule based approach. <i>Scientometrics</i> , 2017, 111, 1501-1519.	1.6	18
102	On ideals of objectivity, judgments, and bias in medical research – A comment on Stegenga. <i>Studies in History and Philosophy of Science Part C: Studies in History and Philosophy of Biological and Biomedical Sciences</i> , 2017, 62, 35-41.	0.8	12
103	Peer Review: From “Sacred Ideals” to “Profane Realities”. <i>Higher Education</i> , 2017, , 485-527.	0.9	10
104	The review process in tourism academia: An elaboration of reviewers' extrinsic and intrinsic motivations. <i>Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management</i> , 2017, 32, 1-11.	3.5	6
105	Why Not Open the Black Box of Journal Editing in Philosophy? Make Peer Reviews of Published Papers Available. <i>Metaphilosophy</i> , 2017, 48, 245-257.	0.2	2
106	Threats to the Survival of the Author-Pays-Journal to Publish Model. <i>Publishing Research Quarterly</i> , 2017, 33, 64-70.	0.4	15
107	Efficacy of Double-Blind Peer Review in an Imaging Subspecialty Journal. <i>American Journal of Neuroradiology</i> , 2017, 38, 230-235.	1.2	23
108	Scholarly use of social media and altmetrics: A review of the literature. <i>Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology</i> , 2017, 68, 2037-2062.	1.5	335
109	Article-level assessment of influence and translation in biomedical research. <i>Molecular Biology of the Cell</i> , 2017, 28, 1401-1408.	0.9	23
110	Peer review in forensic science. <i>Forensic Science International</i> , 2017, 277, 66-76.	1.3	27
111	Evaluation for the allocation of university research project funding: Can rules improve the peer review?. <i>Research Evaluation</i> , 2017, 26, 190-198.	1.3	21
112	The effect of the “very important paper” (VIP) designation in <i>Angewandte Chemie International Edition</i> on citation impact: A propensity score matching analysis. <i>Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology</i> , 2017, 68, 2139-2153.	1.5	9
113	Peer Review in Academic Settings. , 2017, , 1-29.		3

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
114	How complex international partnerships shape domestic research clusters: Difference-in-difference network formation and research re-orientation in the MIT Portugal Program. <i>Research Policy</i> , 2017, 46, 557-572.	3.3	19
115	Berufungsverfahren als Turniere: Berufungschancen von Wissenschaftlerinnen und Wissenschaftlern. <i>Zeitschrift Fur Soziologie</i> , 2017, 46, 283-302.	0.4	12
116	Inter-rater reliability and validity of peer reviews in an interdisciplinary field. <i>Scientometrics</i> , 2017, 113, 1059-1092.	1.6	21
117	Language and socioeconomics predict geographic variation in peer review outcomes at an ecology journal. <i>Scientometrics</i> , 2017, 113, 1113-1127.	1.6	12
118	Peer Review. <i>Journal for Nurses in Professional Development</i> , 2017, 33, 102-104.	0.1	9
119	Social behavioural epistemology and the scientific community. <i>Journal of Genetics</i> , 2017, 96, 525-533.	0.4	3
121	Influence of Reviewer Interaction Network on Long-Term Citations: A Case Study of the Scientific Peer-Review System of the <i>Journal of High Energy Physics</i> . , 2017, , .		6
122	Prediction Markets for Science: Is the Cure Worse than the Disease?. <i>Social Epistemology</i> , 2017, 31, 451-467.	0.7	2
123	Peer review: The experience and views of early career researchers. <i>Learned Publishing</i> , 2017, 30, 269-277.	0.8	47
124	In Reply to the Letter to the Editor "Enhancing Ethics in Peer Review Process" <i>World Neurosurgery</i> , 2017, 108, 977.	0.7	0
125	Scientists's Conceptions of Good Research Practice. <i>Perspectives on Science</i> , 2017, 25, 766-791.	0.3	11
126	Does single blind peer review hinder newcomers?. <i>Scientometrics</i> , 2017, 113, 567-585.	1.6	44
127	Peer Review: A System under Stress. <i>BioScience</i> , 2017, 67, 407-410.	2.2	29
128	Who, Me? An Inductive Study of Novice Experts in the Context of How Editors Come to Understand Theoretical Contribution. <i>Academy of Management Perspectives</i> , 2017, 31, 4-27.	4.3	30
129	Attitudes of referees in a multidisciplinary journal: An empirical analysis. <i>Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology</i> , 2017, 68, 1763-1771.	1.5	36
130	Impact of Alumni Connections on Peer Review Ratings and Selection Success Rate in National Research. <i>Science Technology and Human Values</i> , 2017, 42, 116-143.	1.7	10
131	A Mixed Method Approach for Identifying Emerging Fields and Building Collaborative Teams: Leveraging Network Ethnography to Design Experimental Interventions. <i>Conference Proceedings Ethnographic Praxis in Industry Conference</i> , 2017, 2017, 177-196.	0.1	1
132	Respondent disengagement from a peer assessment instrument measuring Collaboration Viability. <i>Australasian Journal of Engineering Education</i> , 2017, 22, 95-106.	0.2	1

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
133	Online peer marking with aggregation functions. , 2017, , .		4
134	Peer review: A good but flawed system?. Journal of Child Health Care, 2017, 21, 233-235.	0.7	2
135	Can editors save peer review from peer reviewers?. PLoS ONE, 2017, 12, e0186111.	1.1	42
136	â€œAre you siding with a personality or the grant proposal?â€™: observations on how peer review panels function. Research Integrity and Peer Review, 2017, 2, 19.	2.2	18
137	Explicit Bias Toward High-Income-Country Research: A Randomized, Blinded, Crossover Experiment Of English Clinicians. Health Affairs, 2017, 36, 1997-2004.	2.5	76
138	Quantifying the Distribution of Editorial Power and Manuscript Decision Bias at the Mega-Journal PLOS ONE. SSRN Electronic Journal, 0, , .	0.4	0
139	Potential implementation of subject areas in Malaysia's research assessment Co-word analysis study. , 2017, , .		0
140	Is Europe ready for integrated multi-trophic aquaculture? A survey on the perspectives of European farmers and scientists with IMTA experience. Aquaculture, 2018, 490, 136-148.	1.7	40
141	Anatomizing and extrapolating from â€œDo Not Publishâ€ as oppression, silencing, and denial. Critical Inquiry in Language Studies, 2018, 15, 258-281.	1.2	13
142	Reviewing University Community Gardens for Sustainability: taking stock, comparisons with urban community gardens and mapping research opportunities. Local Environment, 2018, 23, 652-671.	1.1	14
143	Risk evaluation in peer review of grant applications. Environment Systems and Decisions, 2018, 38, 216-229.	1.9	22
144	The Social Structure of Consecration in Cultural Fields: The Influence of Status and Social Distance in Audienceâ€™ Candidate Evaluative Processes. Research in the Sociology of Organizations, 2018, , 129-157.	0.5	5
145	On the money value of peer review. Scientometrics, 2018, 115, 613-620.	1.6	11
146	To what is the review process relevant?. European Business Review, 2018, 30, 145-156.	1.9	7
147	Reviewersâ€™ Perceptions of the Peer Review Process in Journalism and Mass Communication. Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly, 2018, 95, 278-299.	1.4	9
148	What influences the regional diversity of reviewers: A study of medical and agricultural/biological sciences journals. Learned Publishing, 2018, 31, 189-197.	0.8	9
149	â€œDo it yourselfâ€™ scholarship: from punk rock to qualitative research. International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 2018, 31, 312-327.	0.8	0
150	THE ROYAL SOCIETY AND THE PREHISTORY OF PEER REVIEW, 1665â€™1965. Historical Journal, 2018, 61, 863-889.	0.2	61

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
151	Publication patterns in the social sciences and humanities: evidence from eight European countries. <i>Scientometrics</i> , 2018, 116, 463-486.	1.6	131
152	Escape From Abilene: The Developmental Opportunity of the Review Process. <i>Journal of Management Inquiry</i> , 2018, 27, 140-143.	2.5	2
153	A Review of SAFMEDS: Evidence for Procedures, Outcomes and Directions for Future Research. <i>Perspectives on Behavior Science</i> , 2018, 41, 283-301.	1.1	16
154	Embedding external referencing of standards into higher education: collaborative relationships are the key. <i>Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education</i> , 2018, 43, 45-57.	3.9	5
155	Should Authors be Requested to Suggest Peer Reviewers?. <i>Science and Engineering Ethics</i> , 2018, 24, 275-285.	1.7	16
156	When journal editors play favorites. <i>Philosophical Studies</i> , 2018, 175, 831-858.	0.5	6
157	Drivers of citations: An analysis of publications in "accounting journals. <i>Critical Perspectives on Accounting</i> , 2018, 51, 24-46.	2.7	58
158	Hidden connections: Network effects on editorial decisions in four computer science journals. <i>Journal of Informetrics</i> , 2018, 12, 101-112.	1.4	35
159	"Let the community decide" The vision and reality of soundness-only peer review in open-access mega-journals. <i>Journal of Documentation</i> , 2018, 74, 137-161.	0.9	31
160	Another Grand Challenge: Diversity in Environmental Engineering. <i>Environmental Engineering Science</i> , 2018, 35, 568-572.	0.8	8
161	Academics' attitudes towards peer review in scholarly journals and the effect of role and discipline. <i>Journal of Information Science</i> , 2018, 44, 644-657.	2.0	14
162	External Tests of Peer Review Validity Via Impact Measures. <i>Frontiers in Research Metrics and Analytics</i> , 2018, 3, .	0.9	2
163	Peer Review of Scholarly Work. <i>Advances in Neonatal Care</i> , 2018, 18, 423-424.	0.5	1
164	Editors' perspectives on the peer-review process in biomedical journals: protocol for a qualitative study. <i>BMJ Open</i> , 2018, 8, e020568.	0.8	15
165	Developing sustainable Open Science solutions in the frame of EU funded research. , 2018, , .		0
166	Evaluation of Research(ers) and its Threat to Epistemic Pluralisms. <i>European Journal of Analytic Philosophy</i> , 2018, 13, 55-78.	0.8	4
167	Caring for Esteem and Intellectual Reputation: Some Epistemic Benefits and Harms. <i>Royal Institute of Philosophy Supplement</i> , 2018, 84, 47-67.	0.1	5
168	Academic Misconduct, Misrepresentation and Gaming: A Reassessment. <i>SSRN Electronic Journal</i> , 2018, , .	0.4	2

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
169	Are non-monetary rewards effective in attracting peer reviewers? A natural experiment. <i>Scientometrics</i> , 2018, 117, 1587-1609.	1.6	29
170	Using Best Available Science Information: Determining Best and Available. <i>Journal of Forestry</i> , 2018, 116, 473-480.	0.5	25
171	Editorial: Editorial Practice at the International Journal of Primatology: the Roles of Gender and Country of Affiliation in Participation in Scientific Publication. <i>International Journal of Primatology</i> , 2018, 39, 969-986.	0.9	11
172	Gender differences in authorships are not associated with publication bias in an evolutionary journal. <i>PLoS ONE</i> , 2018, 13, e0201725.	1.1	33
173	Scientific Autonomy, Public Accountability, and the Rise of "Peer Review" in the Cold War United States. <i>Isis</i> , 2018, 109, 538-558.	0.1	88
174	The state of the art in peer review. <i>FEMS Microbiology Letters</i> , 2018, 365, .	0.7	77
175	Peer review of health research funding proposals: A systematic map and systematic review of innovations for effectiveness and efficiency. <i>PLoS ONE</i> , 2018, 13, e0196914.	1.1	25
176	Identifying items for moderation in a peer assessment framework. <i>Knowledge-Based Systems</i> , 2018, 162, 211-219.	4.0	5
177	Reporting Results. , 2018, , 145-196.		0
178	Addressing Reproducibility: Peer Review, Impact Factors, Checklists, Guidelines, and Reproducibility Initiatives. , 2018, , 197-306.		4
179	Nullis in Verba: Advancing Research through Transparency and Openness. <i>International Information and Library Review</i> , 2018, 50, 157-162.	0.8	1
180	Comments on Single-Blind Reviewing from the Editorial Staff. <i>Political Analysis</i> , 2018, 26, 255-257.	2.8	0
181	Editorial decisions with informed and uninformed reviewers. <i>Scientometrics</i> , 2018, 117, 25-43.	1.6	2
182	The sociology of scientific validity: How professional networks shape judgement in peer review. <i>Research Policy</i> , 2018, 47, 1825-1841.	3.3	56
183	Providing meaningful information: Part B "Bibliometric analysis. , 2018, , 33-47.		13
184	Scientific Research Funding Criteria: An Empirical Study of Peer Review and Scientometrics. <i>Studies in Systems, Decision and Control</i> , 2018, , 277-292.	0.8	1
185	Teaching students critical appraisal of scientific literature using checklists. , 2018, , .		1
186	Authors and editors assort on gender and geography in high-rank ecological publications. <i>PLoS ONE</i> , 2018, 13, e0192481.	1.1	13

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
187	A systematic literature review to evaluate the tools and methods used to measure rein tension. Journal of Veterinary Behavior: Clinical Applications and Research, 2019, 29, 77-87.	0.5	14
188	New Data on the Linguistic Diversity of Authorship in Philosophy Journals. Erkenntnis, 2019, 84, 953-974.	0.6	10
189	Reviewers' Feedback on Second-Language Writers' Submissions to Academic Journals. , 2019, , 226-244.		2
190	Widening understanding of low embodied impact buildings: Results and recommendations from 80 multi-national quantitative and qualitative case studies. Journal of Cleaner Production, 2019, 235, 378-393.	4.6	53
191	Criticism and Judgment: A Critical Look at Scientific Peer Review. American Journal of Critical Care, 2019, 28, 242-245.	0.8	8
192	Widespread Biases in Ecological and Evolutionary Studies. BioScience, 2019, 69, 631-640.	2.2	40
193	Peer-Review and Academic Archaeology: Quality, Epistemology and Science Policies. Archaeologies, 2019, 15, 227-253.	0.3	2
194	â€œI don't see genderâ€ Conceptualizing a gendered system of academic publishing. Social Science and Medicine, 2019, 235, 112388.	1.8	27
195	Is the soundness-only quality control policy of open access mega journals linked to a higher rate of published errors?. Scientometrics, 2019, 120, 917-923.	1.6	8
196	An evolutionary explanation of assassins and zealots in peer review. Scientometrics, 2019, 120, 1373-1385.	1.6	4
197	A scoping review on the roles and tasks of peer reviewers in the manuscript review process in biomedical journals. BMC Medicine, 2019, 17, 118.	2.3	48
198	Lutz Bornmann: Recipient of the 2019 Derek John de Solla Price Medal. Scientometrics, 2019, 121, 1235-1238.	1.6	2
199	European Research Council: excellence and leadership over time from a gender perspective. Research Evaluation, 2019, 28, 370-382.	1.3	14
200	The optimal amount of information to provide in an academic manuscript. Scientometrics, 2019, 121, 1685-1705.	1.6	5
201	Cognitive Bias in the Peer Review Process. Data Base for Advances in Information Systems, 2019, 50, 52-70.	1.1	5
202	A scoping review of simulation models of peer review. Scientometrics, 2019, 121, 555-594.	1.6	18
203	An instrument for quality assurance in work capacity evaluation: development, evaluation, and inter-rater reliability. BMC Health Services Research, 2019, 19, 556.	0.9	2
204	Inter-ranking reputational effects: an analysis of the Academic Ranking of World Universities (ARWU) and the Times Higher Education World University Rankings (THE) reputational relationship. Scientometrics, 2019, 121, 897-915.	1.6	25

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
205	Editorial: Science Needs an Inclusive and Transparent Publication Process—How Integrative and Comparative Biology Works Toward This Aim. <i>Integrative and Comparative Biology</i> , 2019, 59, 1445-1450.	0.9	4
206	Double-blind peer review—An experiment. <i>Functional Ecology</i> , 2019, 33, 4-6.	1.7	8
207	Identifying emerging scholars: seeing through the crystal ball of scholarship selection committees. <i>Scientometrics</i> , 2019, 120, 39-56.	1.6	1
208	Peer review assessment of originality in tourism journals: critical perspective of key gatekeepers. <i>Annals of Tourism Research</i> , 2019, 77, 1-11.	3.7	17
209	Publish-and-Flourish: Using Blockchain Platform to Enable Cooperative Scholarly Communication. <i>Publications</i> , 2019, 7, 33.	1.9	6
210	The rhetorical structure of science? A multidisciplinary analysis of article headings. <i>Journal of Informetrics</i> , 2019, 13, 555-563.	1.4	11
211	Gender differences in peer review outcomes and manuscript impact at six journals of ecology and evolution. <i>Ecology and Evolution</i> , 2019, 9, 3599-3619.	0.8	112
212	Citations, Citation Indicators, and Research Quality: An Overview of Basic Concepts and Theories. <i>SAGE Open</i> , 2019, 9, 215824401982957.	0.8	456
213	Explainable Machine Learning for Chatbots. , 2019, , 53-83.		2
214	Diversity in Visualization. <i>Synthesis Lectures on Visualization</i> , 2019, 6, 1-127.	0.1	1
215	Overview of trends in global epigenetic research (2009—2017). <i>Scientometrics</i> , 2019, 119, 1545-1574.	1.6	5
216	Peer Review Bias: A Critical Review. <i>Mayo Clinic Proceedings</i> , 2019, 94, 670-676.	1.4	86
217	Double-blind reviewing and gender biases at EvoLang conferences: An update. <i>Journal of Language Evolution</i> , 0, , .	2.2	2
218	Examining scientific writing styles from the perspective of linguistic complexity. <i>Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology</i> , 2019, 70, 462-475.	1.5	20
219	Use of Checklists in Reviews of Health Economic Evaluations, 2010 to 2018. <i>Value in Health</i> , 2019, 22, 377-382.	0.1	57
220	Academic misconduct, misrepresentation and gaming: A reassessment. <i>Research Policy</i> , 2019, 48, 401-413.	3.3	55
221	The Power of Peer Review on Transdisciplinary Discovery. <i>Science Technology and Human Values</i> , 2019, 44, 1020-1047.	1.7	5
222	Beyond Data Collection: Ethical Issues in Minority Research. <i>Ethics and Behavior</i> , 2019, 29, 531-546.	1.3	5

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
223	Research and Design on Cognitive Computing Framework for Predicting Judicial Decisions. <i>Journal of Signal Processing Systems</i> , 2019, 91, 1159-1167.	1.4	21
224	The ability of different peer review procedures to flag problematic publications. <i>Scientometrics</i> , 2019, 118, 339-373.	1.6	37
225	Peer review in the development of academic articles: Experiences of Finnish authors in the educational sciences. <i>Learned Publishing</i> , 2019, 32, 137-146.	0.8	7
226	Unconceived alternatives and conservatism in science: the impact of professionalization, peer-review, and Big Science. <i>Synthese</i> , 2019, 196, 3915-3932.	0.6	38
227	The Game Between a Biased Reviewer and His Editor. <i>Science and Engineering Ethics</i> , 2019, 25, 265-283.	1.7	11
228	A plea for minimally biased naturalistic philosophy. <i>Synthese</i> , 2019, 196, 3841-3867.	0.6	3
229	Publishing and perishing? Publishing patterns of information science academics in Kenya. <i>Information Development</i> , 2020, 36, 5-15.	1.4	14
230	The meaning-making of educational proficiency in academic hiring: a blind spot in the black box. <i>Teaching in Higher Education</i> , 2020, 25, 541-559.	1.7	8
231	What Do Editors Maximize? Evidence from Four Economics Journals. <i>Review of Economics and Statistics</i> , 2020, 102, 195-217.	2.3	64
232	On the effectiveness of the scientific peer-review system: a case study of the <i>Journal of High Energy Physics</i> . <i>International Journal on Digital Libraries</i> , 2020, 21, 93-107.	1.1	2
233	Is Peer Review a Good Idea?. <i>British Journal for the Philosophy of Science</i> , 2021, 72, 635-663.	1.4	53
234	Journal Peer Review and Editorial Evaluation: Cautious Innovator or Sleepy Giant?. <i>Minerva</i> , 2020, 58, 139-161.	1.4	20
235	Managing the Growth of Peer Review at the Royal Society Journals, 1865-1965. <i>Science Technology and Human Values</i> , 2020, 45, 405-429.	1.7	21
236	A systematic review and meta-analysis of the evidence for unaware fear conditioning. <i>Neuroscience and Biobehavioral Reviews</i> , 2020, 108, 254-268.	2.9	42
237	Early career researchers and their authorship and peer review beliefs and practices: An international study. <i>Learned Publishing</i> , 2020, 33, 142-152.	0.8	26
239	Females Are First Authors, Sole Authors, and Reviewers of Entomology Publications Significantly Less Often Than Males. <i>Annals of the Entomological Society of America</i> , 2020, 113, 193-201.	1.3	10
240	Challenges and performance metrics for security operations center analysts: a systematic review. <i>Journal of Cyber Security Technology</i> , 2020, 4, 125-152.	1.8	37
241	Determinants of quality of research environment: An assessment of the environment submissions in the UK's Research Excellence Framework in 2014. <i>Research Evaluation</i> , 2020, 29, 231-244.	1.3	9

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
242	Analyzing the impact of reputational bias on global university rankings based on objective research performance data: the case of the Shanghai Ranking (ARWU). <i>Scientometrics</i> , 2020, 125, 2199-2227.	1.6	12
243	Open up: a survey on open and non-anonymized peer reviewing. <i>Research Integrity and Peer Review</i> , 2020, 5, 8.	2.2	15
244	Why do doctors work in rural areas in high-income countries? A qualitative systematic review of recruitment and retention. <i>Australian Journal of Rural Health</i> , 2020, 28, 543-554.	0.7	13
245	Does open peer review improve citation count? Evidence from a propensity score matching analysis of PeerJ. <i>Scientometrics</i> , 2020, 125, 607-623.	1.6	22
246	Conflating scholarly and science communication practices: the production of open letters on climate change. <i>Journal of Documentation</i> , 2020, 76, 1359-1375.	0.9	4
247	Journal editors' perspectives on the communication practices in biomedical journals: a qualitative study. <i>BMJ Open</i> , 2020, 10, e035600.	0.8	3
248	Estimating the deep replicability of scientific findings using human and artificial intelligence. <i>Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America</i> , 2020, 117, 10762-10768.	3.3	44
249	What Motivates Health Communication's Peer Reviewers to Review? A Survey of Our Scholarly Community. <i>Health Communication</i> , 2020, 35, 1056-1060.	1.8	3
250	What feedback do reviewers give when reviewing qualitative manuscripts? A focused mapping review and synthesis. <i>BMC Medical Research Methodology</i> , 2020, 20, 122.	1.4	15
251	Locating unregistered and unreported data for use in a social science systematic review and meta-analysis. <i>Systematic Reviews</i> , 2020, 9, 116.	2.5	8
252	The discoveries of citizens running around. <i>Climate Risk Management</i> , 2020, 28, 100225.	1.6	6
253	Intermediacy of publications. <i>Royal Society Open Science</i> , 2020, 7, 190207.	1.1	9
254	Gender bias in patenting process. <i>Journal of Informetrics</i> , 2020, 14, 101046.	1.4	3
255	Open peer review: promoting transparency in open science. <i>Scientometrics</i> , 2020, 125, 1033-1051.	1.6	61
256	Doctoral students' engagement with journal reviewers' feedback on academic writing. <i>Studies in Continuing Education</i> , 2022, 44, 87-104.	1.2	8
257	Ordinary Claims Require Ordinary Evidence: A Lack of Direct Support for Equalitarian Bias in the Social Sciences. <i>Psychological Inquiry</i> , 2020, 31, 42-47.	0.4	1
258	Breaking Groupthink: Why Scientific Identity and Norms Mitigate Ideological Epistemology. <i>Psychological Inquiry</i> , 2020, 31, 66-72.	0.4	10
259	High-income countries remain overrepresented in highly ranked public health journals: a descriptive analysis of research settings and authorship affiliations. <i>Critical Public Health</i> , 2021, 31, 487-493.	1.4	14

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
260	LoTToR: An Algorithm for Missing-Wedge Correction of the Low-Tilt Tomographic 3D Reconstruction of a Single-Molecule Structure. <i>Scientific Reports</i> , 2020, 10, 10489.	1.6	26
261	Scientific self-correction: the Bayesian way. <i>Synthese</i> , 2021, 198, 5803-5823.	0.6	6
262	Pride and prejudice – What can we learn from peer review?. <i>Medical Teacher</i> , 2020, 42, 1012-1018.	1.0	16
263	Double-blind peer review of manuscripts: opportunities, challenges, and way forward. <i>Physical Therapy Reviews</i> , 2020, 25, 1-6.	0.3	5
264	Evaluation Information Fusion of Scientific Research Project Based on Evidential Reasoning Approach Under Two-Dimensional Frames of Discernment. <i>IEEE Access</i> , 2020, 8, 8087-8100.	2.6	7
265	The good, the bad and the rude peer-review. <i>International Orthopaedics</i> , 2020, 44, 413-415.	0.9	51
266	Confirmatory bias in peer review. <i>Scientometrics</i> , 2020, 123, 517-533.	1.6	16
267	The limitations to our understanding of peer review. <i>Research Integrity and Peer Review</i> , 2020, 5, 6.	2.2	121
268	A new Approach to data access and research transparency (DART). <i>Journal of International Business Studies</i> , 2020, 51, 887-905.	4.6	34
269	What Can Journals Do to Increase the Reliability of Scientific Research?. <i>Practical Radiation Oncology</i> , 2020, 10, 139-140.	1.1	0
270	Civil disobedience in scientific authorship: Resistance and insubordination in science. <i>Accountability in Research</i> , 2020, 27, 347-371.	1.6	22
271	Commercial interests, agenda setting, and the epistemic trustworthiness of nutrition science. <i>Synthese</i> , 2021, 198, 2629-2646.	0.6	6
272	The ethics of scientific recommender systems. <i>Scientometrics</i> , 2021, 126, 1841-1848.	1.6	8
273	On being reviewed: from ghosts that haunt in isolation toward connection and unexpected agency. <i>Higher Education Research and Development</i> , 2021, 40, 917-931.	1.9	1
274	The cichlid – Cichlidogyrus network: a blueprint for a model system of parasite evolution. <i>Hydrobiologia</i> , 2021, 848, 3847-3863.	1.0	18
275	Gender Gaps in the Evaluation of Research: Evidence from Submissions to Economics Conferences*. <i>Oxford Bulletin of Economics and Statistics</i> , 2021, 83, 590-618.	0.9	16
276	Practicing care in a global pandemic. <i>Landscape Research</i> , 2021, 46, 1-7.	0.7	4
277	A retrospective analysis of the peer review of more than 75,000 Marie Curie proposals between 2007 and 2018. <i>ELife</i> , 2021, 10, .	2.8	18

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
278	Textual analysis of artificial intelligence manuscripts reveals features associated with peer review outcome. <i>Quantitative Science Studies</i> , 2021, 2, 662-677.	1.6	10
279	Peer review and gender bias: A study on 145 scholarly journals. <i>Science Advances</i> , 2021, 7, .	4.7	90
280	Buyer-Seller Social Interaction and Sales Activity in Online P2P Markets for Used Goods. <i>SSRN Electronic Journal</i> , 0, , .	0.4	0
281	AI-assisted peer review. <i>Humanities and Social Sciences Communications</i> , 2021, 8, .	1.3	69
282	Is Novel Research Worth Doing? Evidence from Journal Peer Review. <i>SSRN Electronic Journal</i> , 0, , .	0.4	2
283	Do peers share the same criteria for assessing grant applications?. <i>Research Evaluation</i> , 2022, 31, 104-117.	1.3	7
284	Building a Data-Driven Model of Peer Review: The Case of Science Foundation Ireland. <i>Springer Proceedings in Complexity</i> , 2021, , 223-227.	0.2	0
286	Legal Origin and the Unequal Treatment of Scientific Articles. <i>SSRN Electronic Journal</i> , 0, , .	0.4	0
287	Rates of Change. , 2021, , 18-52.		0
288	The Quality is Mightier than the Duration: High Quality of Peer Review Makes Journal Attractive. <i>Ningen Kogaku = the Japanese Journal of Ergonomics</i> , 2021, 57, 1-3.	0.0	1
289	Social Network <i>Positions</i>, Peer Effects, and Evaluation Updating: An Experimental Test in the Entrepreneurial Context. <i>Organization Science</i> , 2021, 32, 1174-1192.	3.0	7
290	A bi-directional adversarial explainability for decision support. <i>Human-Intelligent Systems Integration</i> , 2021, 3, 1-14.	1.2	7
291	An exploration of referees'™ comments published in open peer review journals: The characteristics of review language and the association between review scrutiny and citations. <i>Research Evaluation</i> , 2021, 30, 314-322.	1.3	11
292	Open Research Data and Open Peer Review: Perceptions of a Medical and Health Sciences Community in Greece. <i>Publications</i> , 2021, 9, 14.	1.9	6
293	Citations versus expert opinions: citation analysis of featured reviews of the American Mathematical Society. <i>Scientometrics</i> , 2021, 126, 3853-3870.	1.6	1
294	New Media for Science: Key Features of Platforms with Open Peer Review. <i>Theoretical and Practical Issues of Journalism</i> , 2021, 10, 22-38.	0.2	2
295	Implications of the open science era for educational psychology research syntheses. <i>Educational Psychologist</i> , 2021, 56, 142-160.	4.7	18
296	On the relationship between interdisciplinarity and impact: Distinct effects on academic and broader impact. <i>Research Evaluation</i> , 2021, 30, 256-268.	1.3	24

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
297	Problematizing Peer Review: Academic Librariansâ€™ Pedagogical Approaches to Peer Review. <i>Journal of Librarianship and Scholarly Communication</i> , 2021, 9, .	0.3	1
298	Grant Review Feedback: Appropriateness and Usefulness. <i>Science and Engineering Ethics</i> , 2021, 27, 18.	1.7	6
299	Peer reviewing in the contemporary academic communications. <i>Science Management Theory and Practice</i> , 2021, 3, 35-54.	0.2	5
301	Open Science and Special Education Research. <i>Advances in Learning and Behavioral Disabilities</i> , 2021, , 61-74.	0.3	1
302	How Cognitive Biases Can Undermine Program Scale-Up Decisions. , 2021, , 41-57.		4
303	Does reviewing experience reduce disagreement in proposals evaluation? Insights from Marie Skłodowska-Curie and COST Actions. <i>Research Evaluation</i> , 2021, 30, 349-360.	1.3	11
304	Reimagining the peer-review system for translational health science journals. <i>Clinical and Translational Science</i> , 2021, 14, 1210-1221.	1.5	16
305	Critical essay: Blinding faith â€“ Paradoxes and pathologies of opacity in peer review. <i>Human Relations</i> , 2022, 75, 1741-1769.	3.8	6
306	Casefinder: A Non-Law Students Smartphone App for Legal Writing. , 2021, , .		0
307	A scoping review on biomedical journal peer review guides for reviewers. <i>PLoS ONE</i> , 2021, 16, e0251440.	1.1	21
308	Shedding light on neuroscience: Two decades of functional near-infrared spectroscopy applications and advances from a bibliometric perspective. <i>Journal of Neuroimaging</i> , 2021, 31, 641-655.	1.0	7
309	Disagreement and Agonistic Chance in Peer Review. <i>Science Technology and Human Values</i> , 2022, 47, 1302-1333.	1.7	8
310	Stop blaming external factors: A historical-sociological argument. <i>Social Science Information</i> , 2021, 60, 329-337.	1.1	5
311	Towards a More Structured Peer Review Process with Empirical Standards. , 2021, , .		2
312	Re-discovering Archaeological Discoveries. Experiments with reproducing archaeological survey analysis. <i>Internet Archaeology</i> , 0, , .	0.0	1
314	Gender bias in academia: A lifetime problem that needs solutions. <i>Neuron</i> , 2021, 109, 2047-2074.	3.8	106
315	The Cultivation of Social Work Knowledge: Toward a More Robust System of Peer Review. <i>Families in Society</i> , 2021, 102, 556-568.	0.6	5
316	How Gendered Is the Peer-Review Process? A Mixed-Design Analysis of Reviewer Feedback. <i>PS - Political Science and Politics</i> , 2022, 55, 135-141.	0.3	4

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
317	How to get published in Palynology (or any other journal). Palynology, 0, , 1-12.	0.7	0
318	Integrating Qualitative Methods and Open Science: Five Principles for More Trustworthy Research*. Journal of Communication, 0, , .	2.1	6
320	What should be rewarded? Gender and evaluation criteria for tenure and promotion. Journal of Informetrics, 2021, 15, 101196.	1.4	9
321	Suborning science for profit: Monsanto, glyphosate, and private science research misconduct. Research Policy, 2021, 50, 104290.	3.3	14
322	Addressing Racial Disparities in NIH Funding. Journal of Science Policy & Governance, 2021, 18, .	0.1	3
323	Analyzing sentiments in peer review reports: Evidence from two science funding agencies. Quantitative Science Studies, 2021, 2, 1271-1295.	1.6	11
324	A model of the editorial process in academic journals. Research Policy, 2021, 50, 104339.	3.3	8
325	Toward Unveiling How SAFe Framework Supports Agile in Global Software Development. IEEE Access, 2021, 9, 109671-109692.	2.6	13
326	Scholarly Publishing and Scientific Reproducibility. Laboratory Animal Science and Medicine, 2021, , 185-211.	0.1	1
330	Peer Review and Citation Data in Predicting University Rankings, a Large-Scale Analysis. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, 2018, , 195-207.	1.0	8
331	Bias and Groupthink in Science's Peer-Review System. , 2020, , 99-113.		11
332	Impact for whom? Mapping the users of public research with lexicon-based text mining. Scientometrics, 2021, 126, 1745-1774.	1.6	8
335	English as the lingua franca of academic publishing in Tunisia. World Englishes, 2021, 40, 245-258.	0.7	5
336	Judicious Use of Bibliometrics to Supplement Peer Evaluations of Research in Kinesiology. Kinesiology Review, 2019, 8, 100-109.	0.4	5
337	What do we know about grant peer review in the health sciences?. F1000Research, 2017, 6, 1335.	0.8	48
338	What do we know about grant peer review in the health sciences?. F1000Research, 2017, 6, 1335.	0.8	56
339	A multi-disciplinary perspective on emergent and future innovations in peer review. F1000Research, 2017, 6, 1151.	0.8	62
340	A multi-disciplinary perspective on emergent and future innovations in peer review. F1000Research, 0, 6, 1151.	0.8	14

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
341	A multi-disciplinary perspective on emergent and future innovations in peer review. F1000Research, 2017, 6, 1151.	0.8	134
342	Ten considerations for open peer review. F1000Research, 2018, 7, 969.	0.8	33
343	Preprints and Scholarly Communication: An Exploratory Qualitative Study of Adoption, Practices, Drivers and Barriers. F1000Research, 2019, 8, 971.	0.8	39
344	Bias in peer review: a case study. F1000Research, 2015, 4, 21.	0.8	12
345	Personal attributes of authors and reviewers, social bias and the outcomes of peer review: a case study. F1000Research, 2015, 4, 21.	0.8	29
346	A persistent lack of international representation on editorial boards in environmental biology. PLoS Biology, 2017, 15, e2002760.	2.6	60
347	The Quality of Methods Reporting in Parasitology Experiments. PLoS ONE, 2014, 9, e101131.	1.1	12
348	Menage a Quoi? Optimal Number of Peer Reviewers. PLoS ONE, 2015, 10, e0120838.	1.1	29
349	The Influence of Peer Reviewer Expertise on the Evaluation of Research Funding Applications. PLoS ONE, 2016, 11, e0165147.	1.1	47
350	The perceived feasibility of methods to reduce publication bias. PLoS ONE, 2017, 12, e0186472.	1.1	34
351	Fragments of peer review: A quantitative analysis of the literature (1969-2015). PLoS ONE, 2018, 13, e0193148.	1.1	27
352	Decision-making approaches used by UK and international health funding organisations for allocating research funds: A survey of current practice. PLoS ONE, 2020, 15, e0239757.	1.1	7
353	Laughter through tears: Unprofessional review comments as humor on the ShitMyReviewersSay Twitter account. Intercultural Pragmatics, 2020, 17, 513-544.	0.7	6
354	Peer Observation and Evaluation Tool (POET): A Formative Peer Review Supporting Scholarly Teaching. Open Journal of Occupational Therapy, 2016, 4, .	0.2	7
355	Characteristics of a Megajournal: A Bibliometric Case Study. Journal of Information Science Theory and Practice, 2015, 3, 16-30.	0.5	9
356	Ladies, Gentlemen, and Scientific Publication at the Royal Society, 1945â€“1990. Open Library of Humanities, 2018, 4, .	0.1	5
357	Open Peer Review in Scientific Publishing: A Web Mining Study of <i>Peer</i> Authors and Reviewers. Journal of Data and Information Science, 2017, 1, 60-80.	0.5	10
358	A Model of the Editorial Process in Scientific Journals. SSRN Electronic Journal, 0, , .	0.4	1

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
359	A Novel Experimental Test of Social Network Opportunity and Structure in Entrepreneurial Pitch Evaluation Updating. SSRN Electronic Journal, 0, , .	0.4	2
360	Gender Gaps in the Evaluation of Research: Evidence from Submissions to Economics Conferences. SSRN Electronic Journal, 0, , .	0.4	10
361	â€œThe authors have wasted their time...â€• Genre features and language of anonymous peer reviews. Topics in Linguistics, 2019, 20, 67-89.	0.3	3
362	Bibliometrically Disciplined Peer Review: on Using Indicators in Research Evaluation. Scholarly Assessment Reports, 2020, 2, .	1.8	5
364	Scholarly reputation building in the digital age: an activity-specific approach. Review article. Profesional De La Informacion, 2019, 28, .	2.7	22
365	Who stands to win from double-blind peer review?. Advances in Regenerative Biology, 2015, 2, 26879.	0.2	5
366	Diverse Group Formation based on Multiple Demographic Features. , 2020, , .		2
367	The Shifting Genres of Scholarly Multimedia: Webtexts As Innovation. Journal of Media Innovations, 2016, 3, 52-71.	0.5	6
368	A System Dynamics Analysis of National R&D Performance Measurement System in Korea. Industrial Engineering and Management Systems, 2018, 17, 833-839.	0.3	3
371	Gender bias in scholarly peer review. ELife, 2017, 6, .	2.8	236
372	Large-scale language analysis of peer review reports. ELife, 2020, 9, .	2.8	19
373	International authorship and collaboration across bioRxiv preprints. ELife, 2020, 9, .	2.8	17
374	Unprofessional peer reviews disproportionately harm underrepresented groups in STEM. PeerJ, 2019, 7, e8247.	0.9	91
375	Ten strategies for avoiding and overcoming authorship conflicts in academic publishing. Facets, 2021, 6, 1753-1770.	1.1	7
376	Peer Review Aggregation utilizing blockchain technology. , 2021, , .		1
377	The change of disciplinary practices as an effect of peer review in re-accreditation: the case of humanities in Croatia. Quality in Higher Education, 0, , 1-15.	0.6	1
378	Speeding up to keep up: exploring the use of AI in the research process. AI and Society, 2022, 37, 1439-1457.	3.1	22
380	The Impact of Negotiation as a Social Practice on EFL Writing Peer Assessment Sessions. Theory and Practice in Language Studies, 2021, 11, 1334-1341.	0.1	3

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
381	A Case Study for the Interrater Reliability of Journal Referees. <i>Research on Social Work Practice</i> , 2022, 32, 238-244.	1.1	2
382	The data paper as a sociolinguistic epistemic object: A content analysis on the rhetorical moves used in data paper abstracts. <i>Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology</i> , 2022, 73, 834-846.	1.5	7
383	Does double-blind peer review reduce bias? Evidence from a top computer science conference. <i>Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology</i> , 2022, 73, 811-819.	1.5	9
384	When Cognitive Proximity Leads to Higher Evaluation Decision Quality: A Study of Public Funding Allocation. <i>Frontiers in Psychology</i> , 2021, 12, 697989.	1.1	0
385	Representation of women in HPC conferences. , 2021, , .		4
386	Frame Search and Re-Search: How Quantitative Sociological Articles Change During Peer Review. <i>SSRN Electronic Journal</i> , 0, , .	0.4	0
387	La valutazione dei pari nelle scienze sociali e politiche. la lezione della VQR 2004-2010. <i>Sociologia E Politiche Sociali</i> , 2015, , 44-72.	0.1	3
388	Our Current NIH Funding Dilemma: Reform Our Process Or Remain In The Bog?. <i>Journal of Biomolecular Research & Therapeutics</i> , 2016, 05, .	0.2	0
389	Scientific Publication during PhD Candidature: Preclinical versus Clinical Research. <i>Romanian Journal of Laboratory Medicine</i> , 2016, 24, 232-236.	0.1	0
390	Quality Factor: A new Bibliometric Measure for Assessing the Quality of Faculty Research Performance. <i>Han-guk Doseogwan-jeongbo Hakoeji</i> , 2016, 47, 287-304.	0.0	0
391	Learning to Do Peer Review. , 2017, , 145-156.		0
392	Forms of articulating epistemic Critique. <i>Science and Technology Studies</i> , 0, , 40.	0.6	0
393	L'auto-valutazione della produzione di una comunità scientifica: una proposta metodologica. <i>Riv Rassegna Italiana Di Valutazione</i> , 2017, , 112-131.	0.1	1
394	SROI in the Context of Policy and Governance Developments. , 2017, , 71-92.		0
395	Peer Review, Higher Education. , 2017, , 1-3.		0
397	Considerazioni metodologiche sulla Vqr 2011-2014 e possibili sviluppi della valutazione. <i>Sociologia E Ricerca Sociale</i> , 2017, , 89-116.	0.1	0
398	Implicit Bias and Reform Efforts in Philosophy. <i>Philosophical Topics</i> , 2018, 46, 71-102.	0.2	2
399	Risking Groupthink in Impact Assessment. , 2018, , 159-197.		1

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
401	A Two-Stage Mechanism for Ordinal Peer Assessment. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, 2018, , 176-188.	1.0	0
402	Epistemic communities and their influence in international politics: updating of the concept. Janus Net, 2018, 2, 1-15.	0.1	1
403	Impact from the Evaluatorsâ€™ Eye. , 2018, , 1-19.		0
405	Per i Big Data nella ricerca valutativa: una proposta operativa per la gestione del matching prodotto-revisore nella VQR. RIV Rassegna Italiana Di Valutazione, 2018, , 103-119.	0.1	1
407	Readership Data and Research Impact. Springer Handbooks, 2019, , 761-779.	0.3	3
409	An Investigation of Social-Behavioral Phenomena in the Peer-Review Processes of Scientific Foundations. Communications in Computer and Information Science, 2019, , 68-81.	0.4	0
410	Hype or Real Threat: The Extent of Predatory Journals in Student Bibliographies. Partnership: the Canadian Journal of Library and Information Practice and Research, 2019, 14, .	0.1	4
411	Halo Effect in Peer Review: Exploring the Possibility of Bias Associated with the Feeling of Belonging to a Group. Perspectivas Em Ciencia Da Informacao, 2019, 24, 96-132.	0.1	0
412	Protean Uses of Trust: A Curious Case of Science Hoaxes. Nauki O Wychowaniu Studia Interdyscyplinarne, 2019, 9, 216-230.	0.0	0
413	WielokulturowoÅ– a nauka. Politeja, 2020, 16, 5-18.	0.0	0
414	ChapterÅ–6. Continuity and change. Pragmatics and Beyond New Series, 2019, , 107-129.	0.3	0
415	Managing Customer Relations in an Explainable Way. Human-computer Interaction Series, 2020, , 309-377.	0.4	0
416	Criteria for assessing grant applications: a systematic review. Palgrave Communications, 2020, 6, .	4.7	16
418	Replicability Crisis and Scientific Reforms: Overlooked Issues and Unmet Challenges. International Studies in the Philosophy of Science, 2020, 33, 135-151.	0.2	6
419	MaSRChain: A Trusted Manuscript Submission and Review System Based on Blockchain. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, 2020, , 18-26.	1.0	1
420	Authorship in top-ranked mathematical and physical journals: Role of gender on self-perceptions and bibliographic evidence. Quantitative Science Studies, 2020, 1, 1468-1492.	1.6	4
421	Ethical Theories in Research Evaluation: An Exploratory Approach. Scholarly Assessment Reports, 2020, 2, .	1.8	4
422	Peer Review, Higher Education. , 2020, , 2210-2213.		0

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
424	Do Governments Fund the Best Entrepreneurial Ventures? The Case of the Small Business Innovation Research Program. <i>Academy of Management Discoveries</i> , 2022, 8, 103-138.	1.7	5
425	A survey of accepted authors in computer systems conferences. <i>PeerJ Computer Science</i> , 2020, 6, e299.	2.7	4
427	Reviewer training for improving grant and journal peer review. <i>The Cochrane Library</i> , 0, , .	1.5	2
428	Transparency in peer review: Exploring the content and tone of reviewers' confidential comments to editors. <i>PLoS ONE</i> , 2021, 16, e0260558.	1.1	6
429	Evaluation of scientific research projects on the basis of evidential reasoning approach under the perspective of expert reliability. <i>Scientometrics</i> , 2022, 127, 275-298.	1.6	3
430	Who are we? Highlighting Nuances in Asian American Experiences in Ecology and Evolutionary Biology. <i>Bulletin of the Ecological Society of America</i> , 2022, 103, e01939.	0.2	8
431	Trustworthiness of Science in Debate: Challenges, Responses, and Implications. <i>Science and Education</i> , 2022, 31, 1181-1208.	1.7	3
432	Incorrect method for calculation of grey water footprint in several articles. <i>Science of the Total Environment</i> , 2021, , 152048.	3.9	1
433	Investigación y producción de conocimiento en educación matemática: una cuestión de mercado, poder y estética. , 2021, 1, .		0
434	Revealing Reviewers' Identities as Part of Open Peer Review and Analysis of the Review Reports. <i>SSRN Electronic Journal</i> , 0, , .	0.4	0
435	An Overview of Post-Publication Peer Review. <i>Scholarly Assessment Reports</i> , 2021, 3, .	1.8	7
436	Peer Advocacy: Expressions of Loyalty in Peer Review. , 2022, , 203-222.		1
437	Peer Review in Academia. , 2022, , 3-36.		4
438	Post publication peer review in Iranian biomedical journals. <i>Galen</i> , 2015, 4, .	0.6	2
441	Research integrity during the COVID-19 pandemic: Perspectives of health science researchers at an Academic Health Science Center. <i>Accountability in Research</i> , 2023, 30, 471-492.	1.6	6
442	Structural causes of citation gaps. <i>Philosophical Studies</i> , 0, , 1.	0.5	4
443	Promoting inclusivity in health professions education publishing. <i>Medical Education</i> , 2022, 56, 252-256.	1.1	16
444	Publishing your scholarship: a survey of pearls from top reviewers. <i>Medical Education Online</i> , 2022, 27, 2016561.	1.1	5

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
445	Peer review analyze: A novel benchmark resource for computational analysis of peer reviews. PLoS ONE, 2022, 17, e0259238.	1.1	18
446	What Has the Pandemic Revealed about the Shortcomings of Modern Epidemiology? What Can We Fix or Do Better?. American Journal of Epidemiology, 2022, 191, 980-986.	1.6	3
447	Designing grant-review panels for better funding decisions: Lessons from an empirically calibrated simulation model. Research Policy, 2022, 51, 104467.	3.3	4
448	Choosing Reviewers: Predictors of Undergraduate Manuscript Evaluations. PS - Political Science and Politics, 0, , 1-5.	0.3	0
449	Academic Journal Publishing: A Pathway to Global Health Leadership. , 2022, , 63-79.		0
450	Refinement: Measuring informativeness of ratings in the absence of a gold standard. British Journal of Mathematical and Statistical Psychology, 2022, 75, 593-615.	1.0	1
451	Dissemination, Publication, and Impact of Finance Research: When Novelty Meets Conventionality. Review of Finance, 2023, 27, 79-141.	3.2	4
452	Journal and disciplinary variations in academic open peer review anonymity, outcomes, and length. Journal of Librarianship and Information Science, 2023, 55, 299-312.	1.6	6
453	Peer reviewers' dilemmas: a qualitative exploration of decisional conflict in the evaluation of grant applications in the medical humanities and social sciences. Humanities and Social Sciences Communications, 2022, 9, .	1.3	3
454	Pork Barrel or Barrel of Gold? Examining the performance implications of earmarking in public R&D grants. Research Policy, 2022, , 104514.	3.3	0
455	Underrepresentation of women in computer systems research. PLoS ONE, 2022, 17, e0266439.	1.1	8
456	Peer Review in Law Journals. Frontiers in Research Metrics and Analytics, 2021, 6, 787768.	0.9	2
457	How Diverse Is Medicinal Chemistry? Insights into Race, Ethnicity, Origin, Gender, and Geography. Journal of Medicinal Chemistry, 2022, 65, 37-57.	2.9	2
458	Don't Miss the Well-Being Train: A Radical Proposal for Revolution in Positive Psychology. Frontiers in Psychology, 2021, 12, 794065.	1.1	0
460	A method of measuring the article discriminative capacity and its distribution. Scientometrics, 0, , 1.	1.6	1
461	The iSchool Community: A Case Study of iConference Reviews. , 0, , .		4
462	Cognitive Biases in User Acceptance Testing of Cloud Software: A Vicious Cycle of User Disengagement?. SSRN Electronic Journal, 0, , .	0.4	0
463	Can transparency undermine peer review? A simulation model of scientist behavior under open peer review. Science and Public Policy, 2022, 49, 791-800.	1.2	10

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
464	Gender differences in peer review of innovation. <i>Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal</i> , 2022, 16, 255-280.	2.6	7
465	The Practice of Reviewing and Its Proactive Role in Building the Field of Mathematics Education Research. <i>Journal for Research in Mathematics Education</i> , 2022, 53, 174-180.	1.0	1
466	Promoting equity in the peer review process of journal publication. <i>Science Education</i> , 2022, 106, 1232-1248.	1.8	6
467	Triple-blind review as a solution to gender bias in academic publishing, a theoretical approach. <i>Studies in Higher Education</i> , 2022, 47, 2487-2496.	2.9	4
468	The LOTUS initiative for open knowledge management in natural products research. <i>ELife</i> , 0, 11, .	2.8	90
469	Expert decision support system as a means of improving the quality of reviewing articles in a scientific journal. <i>Ergodesign</i> , 2022, 2022, 128-136.	0.2	0
470	Dynamics of cross-platform attention to retracted papers. <i>Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America</i> , 2022, 119, .	3.3	11
471	Joining the meta-research movement: A bibliometric case study of the journal Perspectives on Medical Education. <i>Perspectives on Medical Education</i> , 2022, 11, 127-136.	1.8	1
472	Revealing the Demographic Attributes of the Authors from the Abstracts of Scientific Articles. , 2022, , .		1
473	Towards theorizing peer review. <i>Quantitative Science Studies</i> , 2022, 3, 815-831.	1.6	7
474	Cannibalism Among Like-Minded Scientists: Age Limit Release for Female Fund Applicants. <i>SSRN Electronic Journal</i> , 0, , .	0.4	0
475	Is the future of peer review automated?. <i>BMC Research Notes</i> , 2022, 15, .	0.6	22
476	Removing anonymity protection and utilization review decisions: a real-world case under a single-payer health system. <i>Scientific Reports</i> , 2022, 12, .	1.6	0
477	Reviews Gone South: A Subversive Experiment on Participatory Design Canons. , 2022, , .		1
478	Peer review: Risk and risk tolerance. <i>PLoS ONE</i> , 2022, 17, e0273813.	1.1	1
479	Peer reviewer topic choice and its impact on interrater reliability: A mixed-method study. <i>Quantitative Science Studies</i> , 2022, 3, 832-856.	1.6	1
480	Numbers of publications and citations for researchers in fields pertinent to the social services: a comparison of peer-reviewed journal publications across six disciplines. <i>Scientometrics</i> , 2022, 127, 6029-6046.	1.6	4
481	Exploring doctoral studentsâ€™ emotions in feedback on academic writing: a critical incident perspective. <i>Studies in Continuing Education</i> , 2024, 46, 1-19.	1.2	3

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
482	Surfacing Inequities and Their Broader Implications in the CS Education Research Community. , 2022, , .		4
483	Predictors of applying for and winning an ERC Proof-of-Concept grant: An automated machine learning model. Technological Forecasting and Social Change, 2022, 184, 122009.	6.2	4
484	Replicability and the Psychology of Science. , 2022, , 45-71.		2
485	Gender and Geographic Origin as Determinants of Manuscript Publication Outcomes: JBMRA® Bibliometric Analysis from 2017 to 2019. Journal of Bone and Mineral Research, 2020, 37, 2420-2434.	3.1	2
486	The Role of Peer Review in the Scientific Process. , 2022, , 409-416.		1
487	Exploring Bias in Scientific Peer Review: An ASCO Initiative. JCO Oncology Practice, 2022, 18, 791-799.	1.4	2
488	Influence of the first-mover advantage on the gender disparities in physics citations. Communications Physics, 2022, 5, .	2.0	9
489	Designing Community Tracking Indicators for Open and Inclusive Scholarship. Proceedings of the Association for Information Science and Technology, 2022, 59, 393-397.	0.3	0
490	Global impact or national accessibility? A paradox in China's science. Scientometrics, 2023, 128, 263-277.	1.6	1
491	Messing with Merton: The intersection between open science practices and Mertonian values. Accountability in Research, 0, , 1-28.	1.6	3
492	Effective Peer Review: Who, Where, or What?. JID Innovations, 2022, 2, 100162.	1.2	2
493	Building Inclusive Communities. Synthesis Lectures on Visualization, 2019, , 53-62.	0.1	0
494	Equity, diversity, inclusion, and accessibility in research. , 2023, , 63-86.		0
495	The ongoing narrative of Ivory-billed Woodpecker rediscovery and support for declaring the species extinct. Ibis, 2023, 165, 340-351.	1.0	5
496	Bias against scientific novelty: A prepublication perspective. Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology, 2023, 74, 99-114.	1.5	2
497	Is novel research worth doing? Evidence from peer review at 49 journals. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America, 2022, 119, .	3.3	5
498	Re-examining lexical and semantic attention: Dual-view graph convolutions enhanced BERT for academic paper rating. Information Processing and Management, 2023, 60, 103216.	5.4	5
499	Scientific peer review in the modern era: A comprehensive guide. Indian Journal of Rheumatology, 2022, 17, 342.	0.2	2

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
500	<i>Critical Care Nurse</i> Needs You! Behind the Scenes of Peer Review. <i>Critical Care Nurse</i> , 2022, 42, 8-10.	0.5	2
501	Perspectives on the narrowing and clustering of research trajectories: an epistemic threat to medical progress?. <i>Science and Public Policy</i> , 2023, 50, 559-563.	1.2	2
502	An evaluation of the process of peer review. <i>Palynology</i> , 2023, 47, .	0.7	1
503	Author-suggested reviewers rate manuscripts much more favorably: A cross-sectional analysis of the neuroscience section of PLOS ONE. <i>PLoS ONE</i> , 2022, 17, e0273994.	1.1	0
504	Further Silencing the Voiceless. <i>Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease</i> , 2023, 211, 5-10.	0.5	1
505	Feedback practices in journal peer-review: a systematic literature review. <i>Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education</i> , 2024, 49, 1-12.	3.9	2
506	Why Proposal Review Should Be More Like Meteorology. <i>Seeds of Science</i> , 0, , .	0.0	0
507	Open peer review: some considerations on the selection and management of reviewers. , 2023, 14, 71-80.		1
508	role of peer review in the evaluation of research in Italy. Some remarks on the evaluation of PRINs. , 2023, 14, 121-137.		0
509	Perceptions regarding open science appraised by editors of scholarly publications published in Spain. <i>Learned Publishing</i> , 0, , .	0.8	2
510	Citation metrics covary with researchersâ€™ assessments of the quality of their works. <i>Quantitative Science Studies</i> , 2023, 4, 105-126.	1.6	3
511	Terms in journal articles associating with high quality: canâ€™qualitative research beâ€™world-leading?. <i>Journal of Documentation</i> , 2023, 79, 1110-1123.	0.9	2
512	Association of ResearchGate research influence score with other metrics of top cited sports biomechanics scholars. <i>Biomedical Human Kinetics</i> , 2023, 15, 57-62.	0.2	0
513	Argumentative Exchange in Science: How Social Epistemology Brings Longino back down to Earth. , 2023, 37, 35-59.		0
514	Keynesian expectations, epistemic authority and pluralism in economics: placebo and nocebo effects in normal and abnormal times. <i>Cambridge Journal of Economics</i> , 0, , .	0.8	0
515	Cognitive colonialism: Nationality bias in Brazilian academic philosophy. <i>Metaphilosophy</i> , 2023, 54, 106-118.	0.2	0
516	Letâ€™s agree to agree: The situational academic quality of the UK REF as consensual public knowledge. <i>Social Studies of Science</i> , 2023, 53, 427-448.	1.5	1
517	How to include and recognize the work of ornithologists based in the Neotropics: Fourteen actions for<i>Ornithological Applications</i>,<i>Ornithology</i>, and other global-scope journals. <i>Condor</i> , 2023, 125, .	0.7	6

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
518	Quality peer review is mandatory for scientific journals: ethical constraints, computers, and progress of communication with the reviewers of International Orthopaedics. International Orthopaedics, 2023, 47, 605-609.	0.9	2
519	The gaming of citation and authorship in academic journals: a warning from medicine. Social Science Information, 2022, 61, 457-480.	1.1	4
520	On the Harms of Agnotological Practices and How to Address Them. International Studies in the Philosophy of Science, 2023, 36, 211-228.	0.2	2
521	Nanopublication-based semantic publishing and reviewing: a field study with formalization papers. PeerJ Computer Science, 0, 9, e1159.	2.7	3
522	The importance of reflective practices for decision makers: A possible part of the solution for helping the field. Industrial and Organizational Psychology, 2023, 16, 108-112.	0.5	0
523	The hierarchy in economics and its implications. Economics and Philosophy, 0, , 1-22.	0.3	3
524	From the Editorsâ€™ An Editorial Process Grounded in Empathy. Academy of Management Learning and Education, 2023, 22, 1-3.	1.6	0
525	Double-blind peer review affects reviewer ratings and editor decisions at an ecology journal. Functional Ecology, 2023, 37, 1144-1157.	1.7	28
526	Evaluation of research proposals by peer review panels: broader panels for broader assessments?. Science and Public Policy, 2023, 50, 619-632.	1.2	1
527	Problems with Peer Review Shine a Light on Gaps in Scientific Training. MBio, 0, , .	1.8	0
528	Predicting article quality scores with machine learning: The U.K. Research Excellence Framework. Quantitative Science Studies, 2023, 4, 547-573.	1.6	3
553	The future of academic publishing. Nature Human Behaviour, 2023, 7, 1021-1026.	6.2	7
570	Taking Part, Apart: Inclusion of Researchers from the German Democratic Republic in Their International Scientific Communities. Studies in Economic Transition, 2024, , 197-226.	0.1	0
578	An Empirical Analysis of Newcomersâ€™ Contributions to Software-Engineering Conferences. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, 2023, , 231-247.	1.0	0
580	Grey Literature. , 2023, , 259-268.		0
596	Judgesâ€™ Daubert Decisions. , 2024, , 144-158.		0