

Adorable Hulk: Hyper-Competition of Research Publication!

Anil Patil¹,
Atul Deshpande²,
Kasar Parag² and
Shigli Anand¹

Abstract

There is outburst of scientific papers published by all research scholars. It produces nuisance to researcher, over and above to funding agencies, employment and promotion boards because they need to evaluate emergent adorable hulk of hyper-competition research publications. Furthermore, remarkable transformation in the publication form and biomedical information broadcast happened because of innumerable new publishers and journals. Therefore, Substandard and unethical papers in 'predatory', journals is escalating dramatically, with authorship conflicts, research misconduct, duplicate publication, ghost authors, plagiarism, unethical citations, and inappropriate journal impact metrics may occur. Reversing these trends with digitization governance, thorough peer review and stringent editorial policies is possible.

Keywords: Citation; Publication; Research; Peer review; Duplicate publication; Plagiarism; Publication retractions; Publication misconduct; Authorship; Research governance

- 1 Bharati Vidyapeeth Deemed University Dental College and Hospital, Maharashtra, India
- 2 Pandit Deendayal Upadhyay Dental College, Maharashtra, India

Corresponding author: Anil Patil

✉ dranilp0888@gmail.com

Department of Pedodontics and Preventive Dentistry, Bharati Vidyapeeth Deemed University Dental College and Hospital, Sangli, Maharashtra 416414, India.

Tel: +91 9850983500

Received: October 06, 2016; **Accepted:** October 12, 2016; **Published:** October 17, 2016

Introduction

There is outburst of scientific papers published by all research scholars. It produces nuisance to researcher, over and above to funding agencies, employment and promotion boards because they need to evaluate emergent adorable hulk of hyper-competition research publications. Furthermore, remarkable transformation in the publication form and biomedical information broadcast happened because of innumerable new publishers and journals. Publication ethics and professional values are divergent for various disciplines and nations. Research scholars in low- and middle-income countries lack appropriate representation in research papers as well as editorial board members of journals [1].

An embezzlement of authorship weakens the reliability of the authorship system. Honorary authorship (guest or gift authorship) is defined as naming, as an author, an individual who does not meet authorship criteria [2,3]. Honorary authorship may be offered as an honor to a department chair or to grants acquiring researcher [2]. Ghost authorship is defined as failure to name, as an author, an individual who has made substantial contributions to the research or writing of the article [3].

Even if the International Committee of Medical Journal Editors (ICMJE) recognized authorship criteria, still authors frequently

ignore or are uninformed of these criteria [4]. An array of the existing authorship system abuses are documented [2,3,5]. Resnik et al. [6] randomly analyzed the authorship policies of 600 journals from the Journal Citation Reports database. But, there is lack of equivalent author contribution statements in authorship policy. They concluded that a considerable percentage of articles in peer-reviewed medical journals have honorary authors and ghost authors [6]. However, observance to global standards of paper writing, reviewing, editing, soliciting manuscripts, and publishing may improve journal standards.

A primary ideology of the entire scientific and scholarly work is to question every aspect of study to critical appraisal as peer review, as part of the editorial process. Regardless of its universal recognition of peer review process, it had faced diversity of criticisms [7], but, undeniably, very less is known regarding its effects on the quality and usefulness of published information. In last decade, there is cropping of new journal as well as new publishers and open-access publishing models focusing on specialized sub- fields of each discipline, with an inexcusable outburst of research information generated by each scholar. This plight was predicted by Toffler [8]. He pioneered the concept

of “information overload”, in the biomedical sciences papers. Then, the quality and excellence of research papers may be overshadowed by this hypercompetitive scenario. Furthermore, hyper-competition affects the careers of young scientists in the biomedical sciences [9].

Research misconduct, comprising of fabrication, falsification, guest authorship, and plagiarism are unethical behaviors in biomedical research which concerns research world in near future [10]. The proportion of research articles withdrawn owing to deception have been rising nowadays [11]. Thus, these misconduct and academic dishonesty may impede the invention of new knowledge, misuse resources, decline public trust, and diminished contribution in research and surveys [12]. Furthermore, it also endangers the author’s reputation nevertheless may cause troubles for the affiliated institutes [13]. Interdisciplinary, collaboration amid diverse institutions, and international consortiums is the current trend in research where ghost collaborator are seen, who are thoroughly involved, contributed to a project's design, although they are excluded from meetings and publications [14].

Wasteful, or ‘predatory,’ journals affect new researchers’ reputation [15]. Hence, researcher should verify record of predatory open access publishers, standalone journals, and hijacked journal’s list published by Beall (<https://scholarlyoa.com/>) [16]. The predatory publishing mends profits further than poor services to the authors. Predatory journals publish

redundant, poorly edited, unchecked, or rejected by other journals. Some of the indexed predatory journals are influenced by commercial editing personnel and companies procuring unethical corrupt misconduct [17].

Ethical standards of scientific papers are grey areas, because data falsification may affect patients and society evidence basis [18]. The majority of journals evaluate their publications quantitatively and readership statistically to draw attention. Novel types of metrics are employed currently to calculate impact for instance Impact Story [<https://impactstory.org/>], Alt-Metrics [<http://altmetrics.org/manifesto/>], <http://altmetric.com>], and “Leiden Manifesto” [19], containing a ten-point list for assessment of research. Nonetheless, journals should be judged by SCImago journal rank, impact factor, citation indices, and cited half-life, and must be indexed in global publication directories like Scopus or PubMed.

Conclusion

It is quite uncertain to control the speed, commercialization and digitalization influence on research discipline. However, rigorous data analysis, peer review governance, stringent funding, ethics and global indexing can be solution for these publication abuses. This paper doesn’t critically review all published data with egotistical, prejudiced and dogmatic manner but certainly underlines the on-going endangers of adorable Hulk with hyper-competition of research publication.

References

- 1 Patel V, Kim YR (2007) Contribution of low- and middle-income countries to research published in leading general psychiatry journals, 2002-2004. *Br J Psychiatry* 190: 77-78.
- 2 Rennie D, Yank V, Emanuel L (1997) When authorship fails: a proposal to make contributors accountable. *JAMA* 278: 579-585.
- 3 Rennie D, Flanagan A (1994) Authorship! authorship! guests, ghosts, grafters, and the two-sided coin. *JAMA* 271: 469-471.
- 4 Bhopal R, Rankin J, McColl E (1997) The vexed question of authorship: views of the researchers in British medical faculty. *BMJ* 314: 1009-1012.
- 5 Smith J (1994) Gift authorship: a poisoned chalice? *BMJ* 309: 1456-1457.
- 6 Resnik DB, Tyler AM, Black JR, Kissling G (2016) Authorship policies of scientific journals. *J Med Ethics* 42: 199-202.
- 7 Wager E, Jefferson T (2001) The shortcomings of peer review. *Learned Publishing* 14: 257-263.
- 8 Toffler A (1970) *Future Shock*. Random House, New York.
- 9 Kamerlin SC (2015) Hypercompetition in biomedical research evaluation and its impact on young scientist careers. *Int Microbiol* 18: 253-261.
- 10 Mavrinac M, Brumini G, Bilić-Zulle L (2010) Construction and Validation of Attitudes toward Plagiarism Questionnaire. *Croat Med J* 51: 195-201.
- 11 Fang FC, Steen RG, Casadevall A (2012) Misconduct accounts for the majority of retracted scientific publications. *Proc Natl Acad Sci* 109: 17028-17033.
- 12 DuBois JM (2004) Is compliance a professional virtue of researchers? Reflections on promoting the responsible conduct of research. *Ethics Behav* 14: 383-395.
- 13 Kenkre JE, Semple M (2003) Research fraud: Why nurses should become aware. *J Res Nursing* 8: 47-56.
- 14 Shaw D, Elger B (2016) The Ghost Collaborator. *Account Res* 30: 1-9.
- 15 Gasparyan AY, Yessirkepov M, Diyanova SN, Kitash GD (2015) Publishing ethics and predatory practices: a dilemma for all stakeholders of science communication. *J Korean Med Sci* 30: 1010-1016.
- 16 Beall J (2012) Predatory publishers are corrupting open access. *Nature* 489: 179.
- 17 Gasparyan AY, Yessirkepov M, Voronov AA, Gorin SV, Koroleva AM, et al. (2016) Statement on Publication Ethics for Editors and Publishers. *J Korean Med Sci* 31: 1351-1354.
- 18 Wiedermann CJ (2016) Ethical publishing in intensive care medicine: A narrative review. *World J Crit Care Med* 5: 171-179.
- 19 Hicks D, Wouters P, Waltman L, de Ricjke S (2015) The Leiden manifesto for research metrics. *Nature* 520: 429-431.