**Gallery Walk: What Shapes Information?**

**Poster content ideas**

*Gina Schlesselman-Tarango, 2017*

**1. Excerpt:** “Sometimes drug companies conduct lots of trials, and when they see that the results are unflattering, they simply fail to publish them. This is not a new problem, and it’s not limited to medicine. In fact, this issue of negative results that go missing in action cuts into almost every corner of science. It distorts findings in fields as diverse as brain imaging and economics, it makes a mockery of all our efforts to exclude bias from our studies, and despite everything that regulators, drug companies and even some academics will tell you, it is a problem that has been left unfixed for decades. In fact, it is so deep-rooted that even if we fixed it today—right now, for good, forever, without any flaws or loopholes in our legislation—that still wouldn’t help, because we would still be practicing medicine, cheerfully making decisions about which treatment is best, on the basis of decades of medical evidence which is—as you’ve now seen—fundamentally distorted.”

Source:<https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/trial-sans-error-how-pharma-funded-research-cherry-picks-positive-results/>

\*This is very text-heavy, and students struggled with this. I’ll probably revisit this next year – maybe keep the first line and add some imagery or provide more context up front.

**2. Comics:** <https://s3.amazonaws.com/lowres.cartoonstock.com/business-commerce-peer_review-bureaucrat-bureaucracy-beaten_down-colleagues-aton4161_low.jpg>

<https://s3.amazonaws.com/lowres.cartoonstock.com/science-appraisal-peer_review-peer_review-review-fight-shr1351_low.jpg>

**3. Another comic:** [http://www.nature.com/polopoly\_fs/7.37513.1467623561!/image/peer-review\_review.jpg\_gen/derivatives/nature\_homepage/peer-review\_review.jpg](http://www.nature.com/polopoly_fs/7.37513.1467623561%21/image/peer-review_review.jpg_gen/derivatives/nature_homepage/peer-review_review.jpg)

and a **short, bulleted list of ideal functions of peer review** (ensures validity, improves quality, guards against bias, etc.)

**4. Abstract and title of one or two articles that were retracted**, including a note that they were retracted (vaccines and autism, for example)

**5. Demographic information** (graphs or charts)for full-time U.S. faculty (see <https://works.bepress.com/charlotteroh/26/>) and same information for faculty at your institution (available through Common Data set).

**6. Example of sexism or racism** in peer review process: <http://www.sbs.com.au/news/sites/sbs.com.au.news/files/styles/full/public/twitter_plos_fiona_ingleby.jpg?itok=mKzJlTSF&mtime=1430462105>

Background available here: <http://retractionwatch.com/2015/04/29/its-a-mans-world-for-one-peer-reviewer-at-least/>