

REFERENCES

1. Kronick, D.A., *Peer review in 18th-century scientific journalism*. *Jama*, 1990. **263**(10): p. 1321-1322.
2. Wagner, W.E. and R. Steinzor, *Rescuing Science from Politics: Regulation and the Distortion of Scientific Research*. 2006: Cambridge University Press.
3. Commons, H.o., *Peer review in scientific publications*, S.a.T. Committee, Editor. 2011, House of Commons London: The Stationery Office Limited: London.
4. BioMedCentral. *Peer review process*. 2017 [cited 2017 15 November]; Available from: <https://www.biomedcentral.com/getpublished/peer-review-process>.
5. Mahoney, M.J., *Publication prejudices: An experimental study of confirmatory bias in the peer review system*. *Cognitive therapy and research*, 1977. **1**(2): p. 161-175.
6. Kravitz, R.L., et al., *Editorial peer reviewers' recommendations at a general medical journal: are they reliable and do editors care?* *PLoS One*, 2010. **5**(4): p. e10072.
7. Herron, D.M., *Is expert peer review obsolete? A model suggests that post-publication reader review may exceed the accuracy of traditional peer review*. *Surgical endoscopy*, 2012. **26**(8): p. 2275-2280.
8. Kaatz, A., B. Gutierrez, and M. Carnes, *Threats to objectivity in peer review: the case of gender*. *Trends in pharmacological sciences*, 2014. **35**(8): p. 371-373.
9. Lee, C.J., et al., *Bias in peer review*. *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology*, 2013. **64**(1): p. 2-17.
10. Budden, A.E., et al., *Double-blind review favours increased representation of female authors*. *Trends in ecology & evolution*, 2008. **23**(1): p. 4-6.
11. Deer, B. *Exposed: Andrew Wakefield and the MMR-autism fraud*. 2017 [cited 2017 16 November]; Available from: <http://briandeer.com/mmr/lancet-summary.htm>.
12. Smith, R., *Classical peer review: an empty gun*. *Breast Cancer Research*, 2010. **12**(4): p. S13.
13. Schroter, S., et al., *What errors do peer reviewers detect, and does training improve their ability to detect them?* *Journal of the Royal Society of Medicine*, 2008. **101**(10): p. 507-514.
14. Nakao, N., et al., *Combination treatment of angiotensin-II receptor blocker and angiotensin-converting-enzyme inhibitor in non-diabetic renal disease (COOPERATE): a randomised controlled trial*. *Lancet*, 2003. **361**(9352): p. 117-24.
15. The Editors of The, L., *Retraction—Combination treatment of angiotensin-II receptor blocker and angiotensin-converting-enzyme inhibitor in non-diabetic renal disease (COOPERATE): a randomised controlled trial*. *The Lancet*, 2009. **374**(9697): p. 1226.
16. Relman, A.S., *Peer review in scientific journals--what good is it?* *Western Journal of Medicine*, 1990. **153**(5): p. 520-522.