

# CSE601 Peer Review - Paper #229

February 2020

## 1 Summary

Conducting ethical research is difficult. There are a lot of ways to conduct research incorrectly. Some things to look out for are plagiarism, conflicts of interest, data integrity, and treating published mistakes correctly.

There are four kinds of plagiarism: Improper/Missing Attributions, Improper Paraphrasing, Self-Plagiarism, and Unintentional Plagiarism. Each come with their own means of occurring and issues. Conflicts of interest occur from disputes among researchers and other sources. These can be avoided using a series of five benchmarks. Data integrity is important in making sure a claim can be backed up and an experiment can be replicated. There are three kinds of mistake in relation to published material, each with their own set of consequences and suggested response.

## 2 Positives

- The inclusion of treating mistakes after publishing was a nice touch – I'd forgotten about that myself
- Other than the first sentence of the conclusion (mentioned in my minor issues) the paper is wrapped up nicely with a clear purpose to the writing
- Everything is sourced well and backed by sound research. The addition of examples in some areas was helpful for comprehension and a good choice

## 3 Concerns

- The quotes at the beginning of 2.1, though a good talking point and creative, doesn't really mesh well with the feel of the paper, in my opinion
- The section on plagiarism seems a little large compared to the rest of the paper – perhaps a little shorter to-the-point definitions there would have evened it out more

- Conflicts of interest are not always actual 'conflicts' between researchers. Sometimes these are 'positive' biases, like being friends with a researcher and being asked to review their paper. I didn't see this side mentioned
- The ethics on human subjects was not mentioned, which while not completely necessary, would have been a topic that would have contributed to this paper

## 4 Significant Issues

I don't see any significant issues with the science in this paper.

## 5 Minor Issues

- Sectioning in the paper (i.e. 2 Research Ethics then 2.1 - 2.x), for a paper of this length, feels off. We already know this is about research ethics, so the need for one section titled ethics is unnecessary
- Long, wordy sentence in 2.2 listing off the types of 'clashes'. Consider taking out the words 'Sometimes' and 'just'
- Section 2.3: data transparency as allowed by who?
- Unnecessary capitalization of 'Errata', 'Correction', and 'Retraction' in section 2.4
- The first sentence of the conclusion feels a little weird/wordy – perhaps consider breaking it down or omitting it

## 6 Overall Conclusions

Overall, I believe this is a good paper. There's some parts lacking with others trying to pick up the slack by including a lot of information. However, the science is sound. The beginning was a little 'fluffy', but by the end there was no unrelated content. A few minor issues here and there, but not enough to ruin the paper.