

# BLIND REVIEW

Authored by  
**mohammad looti**

November 10, 2025

## RECOMMENDED CITATION

mohammad looti (2025). *BLIND REVIEW*. PSYCHOLOGICAL SCALES. Retrieved from <https://scales.arabpsychology.com/?p=69416>

## BLIND REVIEW

**Primary Disciplinary Field(s):** Academic Publishing, Research Methodology, Scholarly Communication, Peer Review

### 1. Core Definition

The term **Blind Review** refers to a crucial methodological process within scholarly and commercial publishing wherein a submitted manuscript, proposal, or grant application is assessed by one or more experts (peers) in the relevant field without the reviewer knowing the identity of the original author. This procedure is structurally implemented to ensure that the evaluation of the content--including its originality, methodological rigor, and overall suitability for publication or funding--rests strictly upon its intrinsic merit, rather than being influenced by extraneous factors such as the author's institutional affiliation, prior reputation, seniority, or perceived social status. The fundamental premise, as highlighted by publishers, is that anonymity fosters the "most frank and honest feedback" possible, enabling reviewers to deliver objective critiques necessary for maintaining the integrity and high standards of the academic record. This process is a specialized subset of peer review, differing based on the level of anonymization applied to the communication channels between the author, the reviewer, and the editorial board.

In practice, the implementation of **Blind Review** requires the editorial staff of a journal or publishing house to meticulously strip all identifying information from the submitted material before it reaches the expert reviewers. This includes removing names, contact details, acknowledgments, and sometimes even overly specific self-citations that could betray the author's identity. The goal is the complete isolation of the intellectual work from the identity of its creator, thereby neutralizing potential biases rooted in prestige or demographic characteristics, such as gender, race, or geography. While the original source content emphasizes the determination of "suitability for publication and saleability in the market," the academic application of blind review overwhelmingly prioritizes scholarly rigor and scientific validity over purely commercial viability, though market suitability remains a secondary consideration, especially for trade or university press books.

### 2. Etymology and Historical Development

While the systematic practice of **peer review** has roots stretching back to the 17th century with the establishment of scholarly societies like the Royal Society of London, the formal adoption and standardization of the **blind** element is a relatively modern development, primarily emerging in the mid-to-late 20th century. Earlier forms of manuscript evaluation often relied on editorial discretion or a form of single-blind review, where the identity of the author was known to the reviewer, but the reviewer's identity was protected from the author. This traditional method, while providing some accountability for the review, left the process highly susceptible to favoritism, nepotism, or

confirmation bias--where reviewers might unduly favor manuscripts from well-known colleagues or, conversely, harshly judge submissions from unknown authors or rival institutions.

The movement toward double-blind review, the most rigorous form of the blind review process, gained significant traction in the 1970s and 1980s, particularly in fields such as psychology, sociology, and economics, in direct response to increasing awareness of systemic biases in publishing outcomes. Prominent journals began adopting stricter protocols to enforce anonymity as a means of increasing fairness and enhancing the overall quality of published literature. This historical shift reflects a broader professionalization of scholarly communication, moving away from informal networks of intellectual gatekeepers toward a formalized system designed to maximize objectivity and scholarly equity. The rise of digital publishing platforms further aided this standardization, allowing for smoother and more consistent removal of author identification metadata.

### 3. Key Characteristics and Methodological Variations

The concept of **Blind Review** is not monolithic but encompasses several distinct methodological variations, each with specific protocols regarding anonymity. These variations are designed to address different priorities concerning transparency, accountability, and bias mitigation, leading to nuanced applications across various academic disciplines. The decision on which model to employ--single-blind, double-blind, or even triple-blind--is typically determined by the journal's editorial policy and the norms of the subject field.

The most common and definitive form of this process is the **Double-Blind Review**. In this configuration, neither the reviewer knows the identity of the author, nor does the author know the identity of the reviewer. This reciprocal anonymity is considered the gold standard for reducing confirmation bias, gender bias, and institutional bias, ensuring that the manuscript stands on its own merits. Editorial teams must work diligently to prepare the manuscript for this process, often requiring authors to upload a separate, anonymized version of their work, stripped of identifying headers, file properties, and self-referential phrases.

Conversely, the **Single-Blind Review** system is far more prevalent in hard sciences (e.g., chemistry, biology) where the specialized nature of the research often makes complete blinding difficult. Here, the reviewer knows the author's identity, but the author does not know the reviewer's identity. Proponents argue that knowing the author's prior work is sometimes necessary for proper context and evaluation, and that reviewer anonymity promotes more candid critiques. However, critics maintain that single-blind review inherently risks bias, potentially favoring established researchers or prominent institutions. A less common, though increasingly utilized, system is the **Triple-Blind Review**, where even the journal editor who handles the manuscript may be unaware of the author's identity, adding an extra layer of protection against editorial bias.

## 4. Significance and Impact on Scholarly Communication

The institution of **Blind Review** holds profound significance for the integrity and functionality of modern scholarly communication. Its primary impact lies in reinforcing the core values of the scientific enterprise: objectivity, fairness, and methodological transparency. By enforcing anonymity, this process helps democratize the publishing landscape, ensuring that submissions from early-career researchers, scholars from less-prestigious institutions, or individuals from marginalized groups receive equal consideration alongside work submitted by established academic figures. This focus on equity enhances the diversity of perspectives entering the scholarly discourse.

Furthermore, blind review is instrumental in the quality control mechanism of research. Reviewers, knowing their critiques are anonymous, are often encouraged to provide more candid, critical, and rigorous assessments of the manuscript's claims and methods. This rigorous vetting process is essential not only for identifying flaws that need correction but also for strengthening the overall coherence and validity of the final published work. The high barrier to entry enforced by effective blind review gives published articles, especially in top-tier journals, a stamp of approval that signifies careful scrutiny by field experts, thus enhancing the trustworthiness and authority of the academic literature base used for further research, public policy, and educational purposes.

## 5. Challenges, Debates, and Criticisms

Despite its widespread adoption as a mechanism for fairness and quality assurance, the **Blind Review** process faces significant practical challenges and ongoing academic debates regarding its efficacy. One major practical challenge, particularly in the double-blind system, is the difficulty of maintaining perfect anonymity. In highly specialized or niche fields, reviewers may easily deduce the author's identity through self-citations, specific research methodologies, or the use of unique datasets or software. When blinding is compromised, the intended benefit of objectivity is instantly negated, potentially leading to residual biases.

A key methodological criticism relates to the perceived tension between anonymity and accountability. While reviewer anonymity encourages frankness, critics argue that it can also foster a lack of accountability, potentially leading to abusive, overly aggressive, or negligent reviews. Some reviewers, shielded by anonymity, may feel free to use the process to obstruct competitors' work or deliver non-constructive, subjective critiques. Conversely, authors often struggle to address vague criticisms without knowing the reviewer's perspective or field of expertise. These concerns have led some disciplines, particularly computer science and certain fields in medicine, to experiment with Open Peer Review, where identities are disclosed, emphasizing transparency over anonymity.

Finally, the **Blind Review** process is often criticized for its slow, resource-intensive nature. The

detailed preparation required to anonymize manuscripts, the difficulty in finding qualified reviewers willing to dedicate substantial time to the task, and the necessary back-and-forth communication between the editor, author, and reviewers can significantly lengthen the publication timeline. This delay is a crucial point of debate, especially in rapidly evolving scientific fields where the timely dissemination of new findings is paramount. Therefore, ongoing discussions focus on optimizing blinding protocols while balancing speed, quality, and ethical fairness in scholarly gatekeeping.

## Further Reading

[Peer review - Wikipedia](#)

[Double-blind review - Wikipedia](#)

[Blind Review definition \(Source reference\)](#)

ARABPSYCHOLOGY.COM