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Perceptions of Ethical Problems with Scientific Journal Peer Review: An Exploratory Study
David B. Resnik, Christina Gutierrez-Ford and Shyamal Peddada
The authors report on a survey of workers at National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences. The respondents reported having experienced a range of problems with peer review, from incompetent reviews (68%) to theft of ideas (5%).
By itself, this article does not raise many ethical issues, but put into the larger context of the cold fusion story, it can raise issues related to how resources are allocated (time, money, journal space) when a large portion of the scientific community is skeptical about an idea.
Peer review and innovation
Raymond Spier
The author looks at peer review in the U. K. of innovative research in the context of journal articles and grant proposals and concludes it is much easier to submit an article to an alternative journal for publication than it is to submit a proposal to an alternative agency for funding.

Mu h Ado about peer review, part 2
Commentary on “peer review and innovation”
Daryl E. Chubin
Commentary includes a brief discussion of the U. S. perspective on the above article.

‘Peer review’ culture
Malcolm Atkinson
This paper provides a critique of peer review as well as of prior peer review studies. Several true but anonymous case studies involving problems with peer review are discussed.