Conflicts of interest in peer review

Jonas Flodin
Konstantinos Koukos
Carl Leonardsson
Aleksandar Zeljic
Johannes Åman Pohjola

Uppsala University
Department of Information Technology

October 22th, 2013
Peer review
Why do we need it?

- For quality control, but:
- How do we define research quality?
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A sting in computer science...

Rooter: A Methodology for the Typical Unification ...

Abstract Many physicists would agree that, had it not been for congestion control, the evaluation of web browsers might never have occurred. In fact, few hackers worldwide would disagree with the essential unification of voice-over-IP and public/private key pair. In order to solve this riddle, we confirm that SMPs can be made stochastic, cacheable, and interposable.
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**Abstract** Many physicists would agree that, had it not been for congestion control, the evaluation of web browsers might never have occurred. In fact, few hackers worldwide would disagree with the essential unification of voice-over-IP and public/private key pair. In order to solve this riddle, we confirm that SMPs can be made stochastic, cacheable, and interposable.

- Joke paper
- “Written” by a computer program
- **Accepted** to *World Multiconference on Systemics, Cybernetics and Informatics* 2005!
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Conflicts of interest (Questions/Discussion)

▶ Reviewing your friend’s or foe’s paper.
  ▶ How blind are blind reviews?
▶ Bias for a method
  ▶ Expertise vs objectiveness in the research area.
▶ Exposure for your area