

# ***PEERLESS SCIENCE***

***Peer Review  
and U.S. Science Policy***

**Daryl E. Chubin  
and  
Edward J. Hackett**

**STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK PRESS**

## **Contents**

<b>Preface and Acknowledgments</b>	<b>xi</b>
<b>1. The Centrality of Peer Review</b>	<b>1</b>
What Is "Peer Review"? • Symbolism and Chauvinism • Approach to a Dialogue • Five Axioms about the Culture of Science • The Policy Context • Studying Grants Peer Review • Summary: A Study of Policy and Practice	
<b>2. Peer Review in Theory and Practice</b>	<b>17</b>
<i>Peer Review: Origins and Current Practices</i> Peer Review at the National Institutes of Health • Peer Review at the National Science Foundation • Trends in Proposal Volume and Award Rates  <i>Criticisms of Peer Review: More Than Sour Grapes</i> Rustum Roy's Critique • Roy Redux  <i>Criteria for Evaluating Peer Review</i> <i>Conclusions</i>	
<b>3. Funding Success and Failure</b>	<b>49</b>
<i>Entering the Black Box</i> Agency-Sponsored Studies • Agency-Funded Studies • Independent Studies  <i>Litigation and Science: The Story of a Social Survey</i> Obtaining the Sample of Scientists • The Appeal • Lessons from the Litigation  <i>Empirical Studies of Grants Peer Review</i> Surveys of Scientists • Success in the Pursuit of Research Support • The Consequences of Failure • Attitudes toward Peer Review	

*Competition for Research Support*

Upward Creep and Resubmission: A Protracted Process

• Anomie and Reform

*Inferences: Peer Review and Conflicts of Interest**Conclusions***4. Peer Review and the Printed Word 83***The Purposes of Scientific Publication and Journal**Peer Review*

New Burdens • “Truth” as Consequence

*Principles and Practices: The Tensions of Peer Review*

Journal Practices • Studies of Journal Peer Review

• The Dangers of Studying Journal Practices

• What the Studies Tell Us

*An Analysis of Referee Commentary*

A Sample of Referee-Editor Discourse • The Rhetoric of

Referees • Toward a Theory of Refereeing

*Vignette: The Sanctity of Journal Peer Review and a**Conspiracy of Ignorance**Sober Considerations**Conclusions***5. Scientific Malpractice and the Politics of Knowledge 125***Malpractice Defined*

Can Peer Review Help?

*The Emergence of Public Science*

Malpractice as a Grappling with Norms • Fraud in

Research: The Social Structure of Scapegoating

*Misconduct and Public Science*

The Mainstreaming of Dispute • Out of the Nursery,

Into the Night

*Earmarking and the Pork Barrel**Autonomy, Accountability, and the Politics**That Intervene*

<b>6.</b>	<b>Augmenting Peer Review: The Place of Research Evaluation</b>	<b>165</b>
	<i>Bibliometrics as Research Evaluation: The Promise</i> The First Generation of Bibliometrics (1961–1974) • The Second Generation (1975–present) • Lessons Learned • Lessons Applied	
	<i>Evaluative Bibliometrics and Beyond</i> Converging Partial Indicators • Qualitative Scientometrics	
	<i>Challenges and New Directions</i> Science Push–Application Pull • Broker Roles	
	<i>Conclusions</i>	
<b>7.</b>	<b>Peer Review and Unauthorized Science Policy</b>	<b>191</b>
	<i>Impediments and Nagging Issues</i>	
	<i>Reforming Peer Review: Slouching Toward Iconoclasm</i> Modest Improvements at the Margin • Changing Roles and Rules • Toward a Process of Reform	
	<i>Meta-Analysis, The Science Critic, and Science Policy</i> The Science Critic in Action • Policy Research and the Public Interest	
	<i>Science Policy and the Flywheel of Peer Review</i> Inventing Tools for Perception and Foresight	
	<b>Appendix: Survey of NCI Applicants</b>	<b>219</b>
	<b>Notes</b>	<b>221</b>
	<b>Glossary</b>	<b>255</b>
	<b>Index</b>	<b>257</b>