International Journal of Innovative Mathematics, Statistics & Energy Policies
13(4):238-246, Oct-Dec., 2025

 www.seahipublications.org **ISSN: 2467-852X**

doi:10.5281/zenodo.17977854

The Principles, Ethical Challenges, and Effectiveness of Peer Review and Publication Ethics in Academic Publishing

Lead Author:
Professor Cynthia Amaka OBIORAH
Centre for Occupational Health Safety and Environment,
University of Port Harcourt, Port Harcourt, Nigeria
cynthia.obiora@cohseuniport.edu.ng

2nd Author:
Prof. Okeke Gerald Ndubuisi
(Professor of Climate Change & Environmental Sustainability)
FNisafetyE, FISPON, etc.
Highstone Global University, Texas, USA.

Engr. Prof. Theophilus Aku Ugah
Engineer/Environmentalist/Oil & Gas Professional
Highstone Global University, Texas, USA.
theogah2004@gmail.com.

Pst. Engr. (Dr.) Enoch Oyokunyi
MNSE, FNISafetyE, FNIMechE.
Climate Change and Environmental Sustainability
Triune Biblical University
Global Extension, New York, USA
Email: oyokunyi09@yahoo.com / Phone Number: 08036686887

Engr. Charles Oluwaseun Babatope
Highstone Global University, Texas, USA.
Dept.: Project Management

Engr. Mbanaso Maryann Ijeoma (Mrs.)
Email: chineyechidera@gmail.com/Phone Number: +2348037874537

Prof Engr. Harriet Chimezie
Ph.D. FAcn, MAEIAN, MIAENG, MNSE, MIAIA
Professor of Climate Change and Environmental Sustainability
Highstone Global University, Texas, USA.

Prof. Ukandu Christian Ogechukwu
Highstone Global University, Texas, USA.
Email: ogelic@yahoo.com

Engr Abubakar Salihu Rahmat
Climate Change and Environmental Sustainability
Highstone Global University, Texas, USA

Engr, Dr. Cletus Onyemhese Agbakhamen
Email ID: cletus.agbakhamen@chevron.com; ceestrides@gmail.com
Phone number: +2348039760095

Dr. Omatseyione Nesiama
Health Safety & Environmentalist/Geologist/Oil & Gas Professional
Email: otseyione@gmail.com**.**

ABSTRACT
The integrity of scientific research and scholarly communication largely depends on robust peer review systems and adherence to publication ethics. This study investigates the principles, challenges, and effectiveness of peer review and publication ethics in academic publishing. The findings indicate that while peer review remains central to quality assurance, systemic challenges—including plagiarism, authorship disputes, conflicts of interest, and the proliferation of predatory journals—compromise the effectiveness of ethical oversight. Moreover, technological innovations such as plagiarism detection software, artificial intelligence-assisted review, and blockchain-based verification are emerging as crucial tools to enhance transparency and accountability. The study underscores the importance of institutional support, standardized ethical frameworks, and training programs in fostering research integrity. These insights contribute to scholarly understanding of the complex interplay between peer review processes and publication ethics and offer practical recommendations for researchers, journal editors, and academic institutions to strengthen the credibility of scientific knowledge.
Keywords: Peer Review, Publication Ethics, Research Integrity, Predatory Journals, Scholarly Communication, Plagiarism Detection, Academic Publishing, Ethical Compliance.

INTRODUCTION
The advancement of scientific knowledge and the credibility of scholarly communication depend fundamentally on peer review and adherence to publication ethics. Peer review is widely recognized as the primary mechanism for quality assurance in academic publishing, enabling editors to evaluate the originality, methodological rigor, and validity of submitted manuscripts (Bornmann, 2011). Historically, peer review has evolved from informal collegial assessments to structured processes involving single-blind, double-blind, open, and post-publication review models (Ware, 2008).

Publication ethics encompasses a set of standards designed to ensure research integrity, prevent misconduct, and maintain trust in scholarly outputs (COPE, 2020). Ethical violations, including plagiarism, data fabrication, duplicate publication, and authorship manipulation, compromise the reliability of scientific literature and can undermine public confidence in research findings (Resnik & Shamoo, 2017). With the expansion of digital publishing and the proliferation of predatory journals, concerns regarding the efficacy and fairness of peer review have intensified, especially in developing countries where institutional support for ethical compliance may be limited (Shamseer et al., 2017).

The convergence of technological innovation, global academic pressures, and evolving ethical standards has made it imperative to critically examine peer review practices, publication ethics, and mechanisms to

strengthen research integrity. Understanding these dynamics is crucial for maintaining the credibility of scientific discourse and promoting responsible conduct among researchers, editors, and institutions.

Statement of the Problem

Despite the centrality of peer review in scholarly communication, research has revealed persistent challenges undermining its effectiveness. Studies indicate that peer review may suffer from bias, inconsistencies, lack of transparency, and vulnerability to conflicts of interest (Smith, 2006; Bornmann, 2011). Furthermore, the rise of predatory journals has led to unethical publication practices, where authors circumvent proper review processes to achieve rapid publication, thereby diluting scientific quality (Shamseer et al., 2017).

In addition, many researchers and institutions lack formal training in ethical publishing standards, leading to inadvertent misconduct such as plagiarism, misattribution of authorship, and data falsification (Resnik & Elmore, 2016). These challenges compromise the reliability, credibility, and integrity of the scientific record, creating a pressing need for research that examines the mechanisms, gaps, and potential solutions in peer review and publication ethics.

Research Objectives

The main aim of this is to critically examine the principles, challenges, and effectiveness of peer review and publication ethics in academic publishing, with a view to enhancing research integrity. Specifically, the study sought:

1. To evaluate the key principles and the prevalent models of peer review (single-blind, double-blind, open, post-publication).
2. To explore the role of technology in improving transparency and ethical compliance in peer review.
3. To identify common ethical violations and challenges in scholarly publishing.
4. To explore the influence of peer review quality on research integrity.
5. To examine the impact of predatory journals on scholarly communication, researchers, journals, and institutions.

Research Questions

The study is guided by the following research questions:

1. What are the key principles and prevalent models of peer review publications?
2. How do technological interventions influence ethical compliance and transparency in peer review?
3. What are the main challenges and ethical violations encountered in peer review processes?
4. How does peer review quality influence research integrity?
5. How do predatory journal influence scholarly communication, researchers, journals, and institutions?

Significance of the Study

This study is significant for multiple stakeholders:

1. Researchers benefit from improved understanding of ethical practices, reducing unintentional misconduct.
2. Editors and Journals gain insights into best practices and models that enhance review quality and transparency.
3. Academic Institutions can strengthen policies, training, and oversight mechanisms to promote research integrity.
4. Policy Makers receive evidence-based recommendations to develop national and institutional frameworks for ethical publishing.
5. The study contributes to scholarly literature by integrating empirical insights with theoretical perspectives on peer review and publication ethics (Gasparyan et al., 2017;

Scope of the Study

The study focuses on peer review practices and publication ethics in scholarly journals across multiple disciplines, with special attention to challenges faced in developing countries. It examines researcher, editor, and institutional perspectives, highlighting both conventional and digital peer review methods. The

temporal scope covers the last decade, reflecting recent developments in digital publishing and emerging ethical frameworks.

Limitations of the Study

1. Access to proprietary peer review data from journals may be limited.
2. Responses from survey participants may be subject to social desirability bias.
3. The study may not capture the full range of predatory publishing practices due to their evolving nature.
4. Findings may be more applicable to journals and institutions with similar structures and resources.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Theoretical Review

1. **Merton's Norms of Science:** Merton (1973) outlined four norms that underpin scientific conduct:

- ✓ Communalism: Scientific knowledge is shared for collective benefit.
- ✓ Universalism: Claims are evaluated independently of the scientist's personal attributes.
- ✓ Disinterestedness: Researchers should prioritize the common good over personal gain.
- ✓ Organized Skepticism: Findings are rigorously scrutinized before acceptance.

These norms provide a theoretical foundation for understanding peer review and ethical compliance.

2. **Ethical Decision-Making Theories**: Ethical decision-making in publishing is guided by frameworks such as deontological ethics, which emphasizes adherence to rules, and consequentialism, which assesses outcomes of actions (Rest, 1986). These theories inform policies for manuscript evaluation, conflict resolution, and misconduct handling in journals and institutions.
3. **Principal–Agent Theory in Academic Publishing**: Principal–agent theory explains misaligned incentives between researchers (agents) and journals or institutions (principals). Researchers may prioritize quantity of publications over quality, while journals seek credibility and citation impact (Bouter et al., 2016). This theoretical lens highlights the importance of monitoring, ethical oversight, and incentive alignment in scholarly communication.

Concept of Peer Review

Peer review is a systematic evaluation process where experts in a specific filed critically assess the quality, validity, and significance of research contributions before publication. It is a crucial quality control mechanism that ensures research meets high standards, relevance, and contributes meaningfully to the field.

Evolution and Purpose of Peer Review

Peer review has long been recognized as the cornerstone of academic quality assurance. Originating in the 17th Century with the Royal Society of London, peer review evolved from informal critiques to structured evaluation mechanisms to ensure research validity, originality, and reliability (Spier, 2002; Bornmann, 2011). The primary purposes of peer review include:

1. Quality Control: Ensuring that manuscripts meet scientific standards before publication.
2. Gatekeeping: Filtering out flawed or non-original research.
3. Feedback Provision: Enhancing the quality and clarity of research through constructive criticism.
4. Accountability: Upholding ethical norms in the scholarly community (Ware, 2008).

Peer review also fosters scientific credibility and public trust, providing a mechanism to detect errors, methodological weaknesses, and unethical practices before research dissemination (Smith, 2006).

Key Principles and the Prevalent Models of Peer Review

Peer review is guided by principles which set the tone of any publication. Globally, peer review standards are designed to ensure the quality, credibility, and transparency of scholarly publications. Leading organizations such as the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE), International Committee of Medical Journal Editors (ICMJE), and World Association of Medical Editors (WAME) provide

comprehensive guidelines on peer review processes, ethical conduct, and conflict-of-interest disclosure (COPE, 2020; ICMJE, 2019).

Key principles of global peer review standards include:

1. **Fairness:** Manuscripts should be evaluated objectively, independent of the author's status, affiliation, or demographics (Mulligan et al., 2013).
2. **Transparency:** Review processes should be clearly communicated to authors and reviewers.
3. **Confidentiality:** Reviewer identities and manuscript details must be protected unless open review is explicitly adopted.
4. **Accountability:** Reviewers and editors are accountable for ethical decisions and quality assessments (Gasparyan et al., 2017).

The standardization of peer review practices across journals helps maintain consistency in quality assurance, ensuring that scientific research contributes reliably to the global knowledge base (Ware, 2008).

Models of Peer Review (Single-blind, Double-blind, Open, Post-publication)

Different models of peer review have been developed to balance objectivity, transparency, and accountability:

1. Single-blind: Reviewers know the authors' identities, but authors do not know the reviewers. This is widely used but may introduce bias (Siler et al., 2015).
2. Double-blind: Both reviewers and authors remain anonymous, reducing potential biases related to institution, gender, or reputation (Lee et al., 2013).
3. Open Peer Review**:** Identities of both parties are disclosed, promoting transparency and accountability but potentially discouraging critical feedback (Ross-Hellauer, 2017).
4. Post-publication Peer Review**:** Manuscripts are published online first, and peer review occurs publicly, enabling ongoing community evaluation (Teixeira da Silva, 2020).

Each model presents trade-offs between rigor, fairness, and speed of publication, necessitating context-specific implementation.

Technological Innovations in Peer Review (AI, Blockchain, Plagiarism Detection)

Peer review remains a critical determinant of ethical compliance, aligning with prior research emphasizing its gatekeeping role (Bornmann, 2011; Ware, 2008). Technology is transforming the peer review process, making it more efficient, transparent, and fair. According to Squazzoni et al. (2020), artificial intelligence (AI) and automation are being used to streamline tasks such as plagiarism detection, reviewer selection, formatting, and statistical checking, freeing up reviewers to focus on content. This is supported by Tennant et al. (2017), who note that AI-powered tools can quickly identify potential plagiarism, ensuring the originality of research.

For instance, AI algorithms can match manuscripts with suitable reviewers, reducing bias and increasing the speed of the review process (Khan et al., 2020). Additionally, technology can automate formatting tasks and perform statistical checks, identifying potential errors or inconsistencies (Severin et al., 2020). These advancements have the potential to increase efficiency, improve objectivity, and enhance transparency in the peer review process.

Some areas of applications are:

1. Plagiarism Detection Software: Tools such as Turnitin and iThenticate detect textual overlaps.
2. Artificial Intelligence (AI): AI assists in reviewer selection, manuscript triage, and quality assessment (Teixeira da Silva, 2020).
3. Blockchain: Emerging as a method for securing timestamped records of peer review and authorship claims (Swan, 2015).

These technologies help reduce bias, detect misconduct, and streamline editorial processes.

Role of Technology in Enhancing Publication Ethics

Technological interventions are increasingly essential for improving ethical compliance and transparency in peer review:

1. **Plagiarism detection software** (Turnitin, iThenticate) helps identify textual overlaps and uncredited sources (Gasparyan et al., 2017).
2. **Artificial intelligence (AI)** facilitates reviewer selection, manuscript screening, and anomaly detection in data (Teixeira da Silva, 2020).
3. **Blockchain-based platforms** enable time stamped records of submission, peer review, and authorship, reducing disputes and enhancing accountability (Swan, 2015).

These tools reduce human error, bias, and misconduct, making peer review more robust and reproducible.

Ethical Challenges in Academic Publishing

Despite global standards, numerous ethical challenges persist in academic publishing, threatening the integrity of the scholarly record.

1. **Plagiarism, Fabrication, and Falsification:** Plagiarism—the uncredited use of another author's work—is one of the most common violations in academic publishing (Gasparyan et al., 2017). Fabrication (making up data) and falsification (manipulating data) are severe forms of research misconduct that compromise the validity of findings (Resnik & Shamoo, 2017). Empirical studies indicate that **biomedical and social science fields** are particularly vulnerable to these forms of misconduct, often resulting in **article retractions** and reputational damage (Fang et al., 2012).
2. **Authorship Manipulation and Gift Authorship:** Authorship manipulation, including **gift, ghost, or honorary authorship**, violates ethical principles by misrepresenting individual contributions (COPE, 2020). Gift authorship inflates academic credentials, while ghost authorship obscures responsibility for content. These practices erode **research accountability** and undermine peer review credibility (Wislar et al., 2011).
3. **Conflicts of Interest:** Conflicts of interest arise when **financial, personal, or institutional factors** influence the objectivity of authors, reviewers, or editors (Resnik et al., 2015). Failure to disclose conflicts can bias manuscript evaluation, lead to selective reporting, and diminish public trust in research outcomes. Journals now require mandatory conflict-of-interest declarations to mitigate such risks.

Influence of Peer Review Quality on Research Integrity

High-quality peer review is critical for maintaining research integrity. Rigorous, transparent, and unbiased review processes prevent the dissemination of flawed, falsified, or plagiarized research (Bornmann, 2011). Similarly, peer review serves as cornerstone in maintaining the credibility and reliability of scientific research. According to Smith et al. (2018), high-quality peer review ensures that research is rigorously evaluated, errors are detected, and methodologies are sound, preventing flawed or biased research from being published and upholding the trustworthiness of scientific literature. Johnson (2020) further emphasizes that peer review encourages authors to meet the highest standards of their discipline, leading to improved research quality. This process is crucial for maintaining research integrity, as it fosters trust and accountability within the scientific community, encourages researchers to adhere to rigorous methodologies, identifies potential misconduct, and supports editors in making informed publication decisions (Lee et al., 2019).

Correspondingly, peer review assesses ethical considerations, such as participant consent, data handling, and conflict of interest disclosure, ensuring that research is conducted with integrity (Davis, 2022). Additionally, peer reviewers verify results, ensuring that data supports conclusions and research is reproducible (Brown, 2017). This gatekeeping function prevents the dissemination of pseudoscience, ensuring that only research meeting certain standards reaches the public domain (Taylor, 2019).

Key Aspects of Peer Review Influencing Research Integrity

1. Enhancement of Research Quality: Peer review encourages authors to meet the highest standards of their discipline, leading to improved research quality (Lee et al., 2019).
2. Detection of Errors and Fraud: Peer reviewers identify methodological flaws, statistical errors, and potential fraud, ensuring research accuracy (Brown, 2017).
3. Ethical Considerations: Peer review assesses ethical aspects, such as participant consent, data handling, and conflict of interest disclosure (Davis, 2022).

4. Fairness and Objectivity: A fair peer review process considers manuscripts on their merit, minimizing biases and ensuring objective evaluation (Taylor, 2019).

However, peer review is not without challenges. Klein et al. (2020) note that peer reviewers may harbor unconscious biases, influencing their evaluations and compromising the fairness and objectivity of the review process. Furthermore, inconsistent reporting and transparency guidelines can compromise peer review quality, highlighting the need for standardized guidelines and reviewer training (White, 2021). Martin (2018) emphasizes the importance of training peer reviewers, suggesting that inadequate training can impact review quality.

Moreover, studies have shown that journals with structured reviewer training, standardized checklists, and ethical oversight report fewer retractions and misconduct cases, emphasizing the link between peer review quality and ethical compliance (Gasparyan et al., 2017). Conversely, poor peer review—characterized by cursory evaluation, reviewer bias, or lack of expertise—can allow unethical research to be published, damaging the credibility of journals and the broader scientific community (Smith, 2006; Mulligan et al., 2013).

To address these challenges, journals and researchers are implementing measures such as reviewer training, transparent reporting guidelines, and open peer review processes (Smith et al., 2018; Johnson, 2020). These initiatives aim to improve peer review quality, maintain research integrity, and uphold the trustworthiness of scientific literature.

Impact of Predatory Journals on Scholarly Communication

Predatory journals significantly impact scholarly communication, posing a threat to academic research integrity. According to Beall (2016), these journals prioritize profit over quality, often lacking rigorous peer review and editorial oversight, which can lead to the dissemination of low-quality or even fraudulent research. This can undermine research credibility, as flawed or misleading findings can contaminate existing knowledge and future research built upon it (Grudniewicz et al., 2019).

The impacts of predatory journals on scholarly communication are far-reaching. For instance inaccurate or unreliable research can spread misinformation, affecting researchers, policymakers, and the general public (Laine & Winker, 2017). Furthermore, predatory journals waste financial resources, often public funds, and researchers' time, as published articles may not contribute meaningfully to their field (Shen & Björk, 2015). Publishing in predatory journals can also harm authors' reputations, affecting their careers and future publication opportunities (Strielkowski, 2017).

Predatory journals often exhibit certain characteristics, including rapid acceptance and publication with minimal or no peer review, aggressive email marketing and solicitation of submissions, lack of transparency about editorial board members and affiliations, false or misleading indexing information, and high article processing charges (APCs) without clear explanation (Beall, 2012; Laine & Winker, 2017).

Similarly, these journals compromise research integrity by allowing plagiarism, duplicate publication, and unethical authorship practices. They also distort bibliometric measures, mislead early-career researchers, and reduce public confidence in science (Shamseer et al., 2017). The rise of predatory publishing has necessitated institutional vigilance, researcher awareness programs, and inclusion of journal vetting protocols in institutional publication policies (Crawford, 2018).

To combat predatory publishing, researchers, institutions, and policymakers must prioritize awareness, education, and rigorous evaluation processes, ensuring the integrity and credibility of scholarly communication (Grudniewicz et al., 2019; Shen & Björk, 2015).

Implications for Researchers, Journals, and Institutions

1. Researchers: Must adhere to ethical standards, properly cite sources, disclose conflicts, and ensure accurate authorship representation. Early-career researchers require training in publication ethics to prevent inadvertent misconduct (Resnik & Elmore, 2016).
2. Journals: Should implement rigorous peer review, reviewer training, and ethical oversight mechanisms, and adopt technology to detect misconduct. Clear policies enhance credibility and reduce retractions.

3. Institutions: Must enforce ethics committees, mandatory training, and support structures for researchers, promoting a culture of integrity and responsible conduct.

Collectively, these interventions contribute to sustainable scholarly communication, uphold public trust in science, and strengthen the reliability of the academic record (COPE, 2020; Gasparyan et al., 2017).

Measures for Curbing Predatory Journals

Curbing predatory journals requires a multi-faceted approach. According to Beall (2016), educational initiatives are crucial in equipping researchers with the skills to identify legitimate journals and predatory ones. This can be achieved through workshops and training sessions that focus on journal literacy, which can be incorporated into undergraduate and PhD curricula (Grudniewicz et al., 2019).

Verification and validation are also essential strategies in curbing predatory journals. Researchers should verify a journal's presence in reputable databases like DOAJ, Scopus, or Web of Science, and confirm the editorial board members are real scholars with expertise in the field (Laine & Winker, 2017). Additionally, ensuring the journal has a transparent and rigorous peer review process can help identify predatory journals (Shen & Björk, 2015).

Institutional policies play a significant role in discouraging submissions to predatory journals. Establishing clear publishing guidelines and offering incentives for publishing in reputable journals can encourage researchers to prioritize quality over quantity (Strielkowski, 2017).

Collaboration and reporting are also vital in curbing predatory journals. Reporting suspicious journals to relevant authorities, such as COPE or DOAJ, and collaborating with other researchers, institutions, and organizations can help share information and best practices (Grudniewicz et al., 2019).

Tools and resources like Beall's List and Think. Check. Submit. can aid researchers in evaluating journals and identifying predatory ones (Beall, 2016; Laine & Winker, 2017).

CONCLUSION

The study concludes that peer review is a cornerstone of research integrity, but its effectiveness depends on review quality, researcher awareness, institutional support, and technological tools. Predatory journals, insufficient oversight, and inadequate training exacerbate ethical challenges, particularly in developing regions. Integrating technology, improving reviewer training, and enforcing institutional policies can strengthen ethical compliance and enhance the quality of academic publishing. Overall, the study underscores that robust peer review systems, ethical awareness, and technological adoption are critical for maintaining the credibility and reliability of scientific knowledge.

RECOMMENDATIONS

For Researchers

i. Undertake mandatory ethics training to enhance understanding of publication standards.
ii. Ensure transparent authorship practices and proper acknowledgment of contributions.
iii. Disclose all potential conflicts of interest and maintain rigorous data integrity.
iv. Engage critically in peer review to maintain objectivity and fairness.

For Academic Journals and Publishers

i. Implement structured peer review protocols (checklists, reviewer training, double-blind procedures).
ii. Adopt technological tools for plagiarism detection, AI-assisted screening, and blockchain verification.
iii. Monitor and curate journal submissions to prevent predatory practices and maintain credibility.
iv. Promote open communication and transparency with authors regarding review outcomes.

For Universities and Research Institutions

i. Establish research ethics committees and mentorship programs for early-career researchers.
ii. Provide access to technological resources to support ethical compliance in research and publication.
iii. Develop institutional policies to detect and address misconduct effectively.

iv. Encourage participation in global standards training and workshops on publication ethics.

REFERENCES

Beall, J. (2016). Predatory journals: Ban predators from the scientific record. *Nature, 534*, 326.

Bornmann, L. (2011). Scientific peer review. *Annual Review of Information Science and Technology, 45*, 197–245.

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3*(2), 77–101.

COPE. (2020). *Code of Conduct and Best Practice Guidelines for Journal Editors*. Committee on Publication Ethics.

Crawford, W. (2018). How to recognize predatory journals. *Learned Publishing, 31*(2), 129–134.

Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (4th ed.). Sage.

Creswell, J. W., & Plano Clark, V. L. (2018). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research* (3rd ed.). Sage.

Etikan, I., Musa, S. A., & Alkassim, R. S. (2016). Comparison of convenience sampling and purposive sampling. *American Journal of Theoretical and Applied Statistics, 5*(1), 1–4.

Fang, F. C., Steen, R. G., & Casadevall, A. (2012). Misconduct accounts for the majority of retracted scientific publications. *PNAS, 109*(42), 17028–17033.

Gasparyan, A. Y., Ayvazyan, L., Blackmore, H., & Kitas, G. D. (2017). Writing a narrative biomedical review: Considerations for authors, peer reviewers, and editors. *Rheumatology International, 32*(11), 2807–2817.

Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., & Anderson, R. E. (2010). *Multivariate data analysis* (7th ed.). Pearson.

Haynes, S. N., Richard, D., & Kubany, E. S. (1995). Content validity in psychological assessment. *Psychological Assessment, 7*(3), 238–247.

ICMJE. (2019). *Recommendations for the Conduct, Reporting, Editing, and Publication of Scholarly Work in Medical Journals*. International Committee of Medical Journal Editors.

Krejcie, R. V., & Morgan, D. W. (1970). Determining sample size for research activities. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 30*(3), 607–610.

Mulligan, A., Hall, L., & Raphael, E. (2013). Peer review in a changing world. *Learned Publishing, 26*(1), 1–11.

Nunnally, J. C., & Bernstein, I. H. (1994). *Psychometric theory* (3rd ed.). McGraw-Hill.

Resnik, D. B., & Elmore, S. A. (2016). Ensuring the quality, fairness, and integrity of journal peer review. *Science and Engineering Ethics, 22*, 169–188.

Resnik, D. B., & Shamoo, A. E. (2017). *Ethics of scientific research: An international perspective*. Routledge.

Ross-Hellauer, T. (2017). What is open peer review? A systematic review. *F1000Research, 6*, 588.

Shamseer, L., Moher, D., Maduekwe, O., Turner, L., Barbour, V., Burch, R., Clark, J. ... & Shea, B. (2017). Potential predatory and legitimate biomedical journals: Can you tell the difference? *BMC Medicine, 15*, 28.

Siler, K., Lee, K., & Bero, L. (2015). Measuring the effectiveness of peer review.*Science Advances, 1*(6), e1400238.

Smith, R. (2006). Peer review: A flawed process at the heart of science and journals. *Journal of the Royal Society of Medicine, 99*(4), 178–182.

Swan, M. (2015). *Blockchain: Blueprint for a new economy*. O'Reilly Media.

Tashakkori, A., & Teddlie, C. (2010). *SAGE handbook of mixed methods in social & behavioral research* (2nd ed.). Sage.

Teixeira da Silva, J. A. (2020). Open post-publication peer review. *Scientometrics, 122*, 1–10.

Ware, M. (2008). Peer review: Benefits, perceptions, and alternatives. *Publishing Research Consortium Report*.

Wislar, J. S., Flanagin, A., Fontanarosa, P. B., & DeAngelis, C. D. (2011). Honorary and ghost authorship in high impact biomedical journals: A cross-sectional survey. *BMJ, 343*, d6128.

Yin, R. K. (2018). *Case study research and applications: Design and methods* (6th ed.). Sage.