

How Far Goes the Un-ethic of the Authors Who Submit the Articles to the Journals, Or, Better to Say, Their “Scientific Insolence”?

Izet Masic

¹Editor-in-Chief of the Journal *Acta Informatica Medica*, Sarajevo, Bosnia and Herzegovina

²Bosnian Academy of Sciences and Arts “Kulin ban”, Sarajevo, Bosnia and Herzegovina

³Academy of Medical Sciences of Bosnia and Herzegovina, Sarajevo, Bosnia and Herzegovina

Corresponding author: Professor Emeritus Izet Masic, MD, PhD. WAAS, EASA, IAHSI, ACMI, EFMI. Faculty of Medicine. University of Sarajevo, Sarajevo, Bosnia and Herzegovina
E-mail: izetmasic@gmail.com, ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9080-5456>.

doi: 10.5455/aim.2023.31.154-158

ACTA INFORM MED. 2023 JUN 31(2): 154-158

Received: AUG 07, 2023

Accepted: AUG 14, 2023

© 2023 Izet Masic

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution Non-Commercial License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/>) which permits unrestricted non-commercial use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

1. BACKGROUND

The author of this text is a long-time editor of several indexed journals and is well versed in the problems of journal editing in all phases of publication processing: from the submission of the articles on the official journal’s website, their text editing, reviewing, formatting to the final stage, or sending the PDF formatting of articles for authors review, and correction of errors in the text and return of such corrected article to the Editorial Board and final processing (proofreading) until publication on the website and in the www.bibliomned.org system.

Even so far, it has happened that some of the authors create a problem when the authors withhold the return of the article or send it to the Editor and requesting the retraction of the article, thereby withholding the final processing of the article for its publication (printing) and sending it to index databases (PMC, Scopus, etc.). This significantly produces different consequences (of technical, material, stressful nature, etc.).

The culmination of the above has just reached its acmes because even the June issue of the journal *Acta Informatica Medica*, with 14 formatted articles, by 4 authors (attached below), has delayed the implementation of the procedures mentioned above and caused indescribable problems for the Editorial Board, which was the reason for disclosing in this way unethically, and even rudeness, of the authors of these 4 articles. The communication with them lasted about 20 days. It went so far that, in the end, it was reduced to insults unworthy of the rating of highly educated and ac-

ademically high-ranking professionals in biomedical sciences holding essential positions in the academic community and these authors’ roles in the educational or scientific process.

The author of this article pointed out similar problems in several of his publications, guided by editorial experience and trials and vicissitudes of a different nature, and defined such actions as unethical and unbecoming of those who research and make scientific contributions in their fields and question the veracity and intentions of what they do and want to contribute to the scientific and academic community with their research results. Earlier, I introduced the terms False Science and Money Science into scientific practice and scientific editing because publishing articles, even books, and monographs, became just a dry need to satisfy the wishes and intentions of advancing in a scientific or academic career.

2. THE MOST COMMON REASONS FOR THIS BEHAVIOR OF THE AUTHOR WHO SUBMITTED PAPERS TO THE JOURNALS

The most common reasons for this behavior of the author are:

a) In more than 95 percent of articles submitted by the DBMS system, the authors did not follow the Instructions for authors, BOMRAD Form for article preparation, COPE IJCME, and other guidelines;

b) In more than 97 percent of the articles, the authors did not correctly cite references, even those authors whose works were previously published in our journals;

c) Not a single article, out of the thou-

Manuscript No:	AIM-2023-02-020
Status:	New Submission
Title:	Reliability, Validity, and Responsiveness of the Arabic Version of the Upper Limb Functional Index
Article Type:	Original Article
Academic:	Imam Abdulrahman bin Faisal University imam.abdulrahman@unifal.edu.sa
Author Emails:	Yusef Abdulkarim Alahrami [yaf_156@hotmail.com] [ORCID:0000-0001-8186-7140] Ali Mubab Alaham [alaham@uau.edu.sa] [ORCID:0000-0003-0063-8866]
Corresponding author email:	yaf_156@hotmail.com
Sender Author:	Yusef Abdulkarim Alahrami [yaf_156@hotmail.com] SEND EMAIL Phone: 966 558475830 Mobile: 966 558475830
Plagiarism Check:	
Receiving Date:	Feb 26, 2023 04:58
Patient informed consent:	A written consent form was completed by each participant.
Conflict of interest:	This research did not receive any specific grant from funding agencies in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors. The authors have no conflict of interest to report.

Article (doc/docx/pdf)	
Initial Version: Original WORD document (docx) 115.3 KB - [Change This File]	
Initial Version (PDF): Original PDF Full Text (pdf) (442.3 KB) - [Change This File]	Convert to PDF again
See Answers to Revision Letters on the right side of page	

Manuscript No:	AIM-2023-04-032
Status:	New Publication
Title:	Typical Case Tinnitus-Traun Transition Syndrome Managed by Fostopic Laser Photocoagulation and Anniapatik, Single-Center Experience in Indonesia: A Case Report
Article Type:	Case Report
Academic:	@manuar no 5 medical faculty Universitas Sumatera Utara, Medan, Indonesia. @manuar no 5 medical faculty Universitas Sumatera Utara, Medan, Indonesia. @manuar no 5 medical faculty Universitas Sumatera Utara, Medan, Indonesia. @manuar no 5 medical faculty Universitas Sumatera Utara, Medan, Indonesia. @manuar no 5 medical faculty Universitas Sumatera Utara, Medan, Indonesia. @manuar no 5 medical faculty Universitas Sumatera Utara, Medan, Indonesia.
Author Emails:	Eddy Adharyan [edyadharyan@uau.ac.id] [ORCID:0000-0003-1595-7950] Bismillah Harefa [bismillahharefa200@gmail.com] [ORCID:0000-0001-6483-3677] Edwin Martin Anwar [edwinmartin@uau.ac.id] [ORCID:0000-0001-7634-8014] Mohammad Firdaus [firdausmohammad@gmail.com] [ORCID:0000-0000-9090-0000] Thomson Affandi [thomsonaffandi@gmail.com] [ORCID:0000-0000-0000-0000] Harubatu Hartono [harubatuhartono@uau.ac.id] [ORCID:0000-0000-0000-0000]
Corresponding author email:	edyadharyan@uau.ac.id
Sender Author:	Eddy Adharyan [edyadharyan@uau.ac.id] SEND EMAIL Phone: 082000000000 Mobile: 92 8529870000
Plagiarism Check:	
Receiving Date:	Apr 20, 2023 03:32
Patient informed consent:	Written informed consent was obtained from the patient for publication of this case report in accordance with the CARE (Case Report) guideline. A copy of informed consent is available for review upon request.
Conflict of interest:	No conflict interest

Article (doc/docx/pdf)	
Initial Version: Original WORD document (docx) 012 KB - [Change This File]	
Initial Version (PDF): Original PDF Full Text (pdf) (188.0 KB) - [Change This File]	Convert to PDF again

Figure 5 and 6. Screenshot of two submitted papers of the authors who asked its withdraw from the formatted issue of Acta Informatica Medica journal

sands that I have edited, has been proofread and linguistically edited; many of them are almost semi-literate and required serious language revisions during final processing;

d) Listing co-authors in articles has become a severe nuisance. Over 80 percent of authors write co-authors who have no professional or scientific connection with the article's content, nor do they work in the institutions where the research was conducted and its results presented. A particular problem is the addition of family members as co-authors, even though they have no or minimal technical relations with the submitted article. Authors defend themselves as they are forced to because they cover material costs to cover the requested publication fees;

e) In more than 95 percent of articles, authors do not fulfill the APC (Article Processing Charge) obligations that publishers require to guarantee that papers will not be withdrawn because it is an established practice that some authors submit the same article to several journals. However, the COPE Guidelines indicate that authors are not allowed to do so and cannot submit the article to other journals until they receive a written rejection (retraction letter) that their paper will not be published in the primarily submitted journal. COPE considers such a procedure unethical and places authors and co-authors on a "blacklist".

3. THE INFLUENCE FOR OTHER REASONS FOR UN-ETHICAL AUTHOR'S BEHAVIOR

One of the key reasons for the "earmarking" of certain publishers and the journals they publish, calling them "predators", was the way of taking APC in the so-called clean in advance amount, which crippled many, mostly small publishers, in every way, because many authors ran away from such publishers (who are not only publishers of the journals but also have other services that they provide and thus their other work activities were impaired and thus produced significant financial difficulties. Because of the above, many publishers resented and asked Geoffrey Beall to withdraw their names from his so-called "Bell's list of predators". Many authors abused this by referring to Beall and his unofficial list accepted by what kind of scientific institutions as an obligation and standard that is scientifically unfounded.

The Bologna concept (model) of education significantly helped to intensify what was described above – "scientific stormtroopers and fake scientists" used the Bologna concept of education to a great extent and produced articles from projects and research, which is over 60 percent are just waste

studies and socially useless, which is one of the key reasons why article authors behave this way. Someone has to deal with this problem seriously.

The editor has introduced the practice of sending PDF formatted articles in the form of Contents as a GROUP to all authors and asking for their consent for correction and permission for publication. In this way, transparency is achieved, but also the possibility to have in the argumentation how it went on and how the articles were processed before publication.

Attached are several texts from 55 e-mails exchanged with the authors, proof of the above facts. From the correspondence, I extracted several exciting views and opinions of authors and co-authors about their decisions to withdraw articles from the formatted journal issue. They are very illustrative and do not need a comment. One thing is sure: the behavior of the authors and co-authors of the articles is not only unethical but also rude. It is reprehensible - even of a criminal-legal nature because the associates who work on editing the journal's issues are financially damaged or stolen. They can be asked a question: can they go to the store and get necessary necessities and items without paying for them, whether it is food, clothing, medicine in the pharmacy, or any other thing that has its price-for-use value? And the helpful value for the authors is that by publishing the article, they can apply for some academic or scientific requirements - applications for master's degrees, doctorates, elections to academic and scientific positions, etc. And that is paid.

Nowhere does it say you get free article publication in a journal? Beall's categorization of APC does not make sense. I believe he has edited a single indexed journal in his life and does not know or know very little about the problems apostrophized here..

4. TITLES OF FORMATTED PAPERS IN THE CURRENT ISSUE OF ACTA INFORMATICA MEDICA WHICH TO BE RETRACTED (WITH AUTHOR'S STATEMENTS)

What are the 4 articles whose authors are the subject of this title and the text related to its title:

* **The Correlation Between Cyp2r1 Rs10741657 and Cyp27b1 Rs10877012 Gene Polymorphism with the Incidence of Latent Tuberculosis Infection on Pregnant Mothers with Vitamin D Deficiency in Medan, North Sumatera**

Fathia Meirina

* **Serum Periostin Levels in Acute Myocardial Infarction Patients: a 3-month Follow-up Study**

Nguyen Trung Tin, Huynh Van Minh, Doan Chi Thang, Phan Thi Minh Phuong

*** Reliability, Validity, and Responsiveness of the Arabic Version of the Upper Limb Functional Index**

Yousef Abdulkarim Albahrani, Ali Muteb Alshami

*** Atypical Case Twin-to-Twin Transfusion Syndrome Managed by Fetoscopic Laser Photocoagulation and Amniopatch, Single-Center Experience in Indonesia: a Case Report**

Dudy Aldiansyah, Binarwan Halim, Edwin Martin Asroel, Mohammad Fahdy, Hanudse Hartono, Thomson

D.A. I submitted an article by title Atypical Case Twin-to-Twin Transfusion Syndrome Managed by Fetoscopic Laser Photocoagulation and Amniopatch, Single-Center Experience in Indonesia; a Case Report in your journal, but there was no news and no update from you. Therefore, I decided to submit it to another journal, and now it is already reviewed and will publish as soon as possible. Still, at the same time, my article will be published in your journal, too; I'm so sorry, but I want to withdraw my article to prevent plagiarism. Please don't publish my article. It was already submitted and reviewed elsewhere; please remove my article and replace it with another person's article.

Y.A.M.A. I doubled recheck myself, and it shows as follows. I was confused between your valued journal and the other "Acta Biomedica" journal in the rejection decision. On the other hand, I checked my account in your journal and have received no response from you, neither an acceptance nor rejection. Up to this moment, the manuscript status is "waiting for Editor's first view". A screenshot is attached on Aug 4, 2023. In addition, I sent an email requesting to withdraw my paper more than three months after the submission. The submission date was on Feb 20, 2023, followed by a reminder on March 29, 2023, and a withdrawing email on May 5, 2023, but I have no response. This request was because your valued journal does not accept current articles, as stated in the platform. All the emails were attached. Please accept my appreciation for your valued decision, and I request you to take the full picture of the situation described above.

N.T.T. Thank you for your email. We have not received any email since June 17, 2023, when I sent you the manuscript. Could you please send the PDF again? We will pay the APC immediately.

F.M. Why is no status change for an editorial manager on your Acta Medica Informatica official website? The status of my article is still 'waiting for the editor's view.

5. CONCLUSION

Finally, there is the key unethically of the author in various variants of plagiarism, and I have written and published many articles about this that are cited in scientific databases and platforms. Still, these aspects of unethically I have mentioned here have not been openly described and disclosed in this way in written form. Many people know this but don't have the courage to face it openly and help reduce their frequency as much as possible. As a European Association of Science Editing member in 2013 at the General Assembly in Tallinn, I hinted at what I have described now. Still, nothing, in particular, has gone further in terms of any of the working groups taking steps to resolve them. I proposed to the EASE

members to establish variables and criteria for evaluating and recognizing types and levels of plagiarism and other unethical behaviors and establish a Body responsible for avoiding and punishing authors with appropriate measures besides COPE and its Guidelines.

- **Authors contribution:** The author were involved in all steops of preparation this text, including final proofreading.
- **Conflict of interest:** None declared.
- **Financial support and sponsorship:** Nil.

REFERENCES

1. Masic I, Kujundzic E. Science Editing in Biomedicine and Humanities. Avicena. Sarajevo. 2013: ISBN: 978-9958-720-49-9. 29-146.
2. Masic I, Medical Publication and Scientometrics, J Res Med Sci. 2013; 18(6): 516-521.
3. Masic I, Jankovic S, Kurjak A, Donev D, Zildzic M, Sinanovic O. et al. Guidelines for Editing Biomedical Journals: Recommended by Academy of Medical Sciences of Bosnia and Herzegovina. Acta Inform Med 2020 Dec; 28(4): 232-236. doi: 10.5455/aim.2020.28-232-236.
4. Masic I, Begic E, Donev MD, Gajovic S, Gasparyan YA, Jakovljevic M, Milosevic BD, Sinanovic O, Sokolovic S, Uzunovic S, Zerem E. Sarajevo Declaration on Integrity and Visibility of Scholarly Journals. Croat Med J. 2016; 57: 527-529. doi: 10.3325/cmj.2016.57.527.529.
5. Masic I, Jankovic MS. The Basic Principles of Editing Biomedical Scientific Journals. Int J Biomed Healthc. 2020; 8(1): 6-10. doi: 10.5455/ijbh.2020.:1.6-10.
6. Masic i. Writing and Editing of Scientific Papers Using BOMRAD Structured Form and Proper Style of Reference's Citation. Int J Biomed Healthc. 2021; 9(1): 4-14. doi: 10.5455/ijbh.2021.9.4-14.
7. Masic I. Bibliometric Indices and its Role for the Quality Assessment of the Author's Published Content in the Scientific Journals. Int J Biomed Healthc. 2021 Dec; 9(4): 244-253. doi: 10.5455/ijbh.2021.9.244-253.
8. Masic I. Scientometrics: The Imperative for Scientific Validity of the Scientific Publications Content. 2022; 1 (1):56-80. doi: 10.5005/jp-journals-11005-0017
9. Zunic L. Medical Publication and Scientometrics – a Writing and Preparation of Research Results in Fifth Steps for Publication in Scientific Journals. Int J Biomed Healthc. 2022 Dec; 10(3): 208-215. doi: 10.5455/ijbh.2'22.10.203-215.
10. Zunic L. Masic I. Peer Review–Essential for Article and Journal Scientific Assessment and Validity. Med Arch 2016 Jun; 70(3): 168-171. doi: 10.5455/medarh.2016.70.168-171.
11. Masic I, Sabzghabae AM. How clinicians can validate scientific contents? J Res Med Sci. 2014 Jul; 19(7): 583-585.
12. Masic I. Scientometric analysis: A technical need for medical science researchers either as authors or as peer reviewers. J Res Pharm Pract. 2016 Jan-Mar; 5(1): 1-6. doi: 10.4103/2279-042X.176562.
13. Masic I, Jankovic S. The Basic Principles of Editing Biomedical Scientific Journals. Int J Biomed Healthc. 2020 Jun; 8(1): 6-10. doi: 10.5455/ijbh.2020.8.6-10. doi: 10.5455/ijbh.2020.8.610.
14. Masic I, Begic E. Scientometric Dilemma: Is H-index Adequate for Scientific Validity of Academic Work? Acta Inform Med. 2016 Aug; 24(4): 228-232. doi: 10.5455/aim.24.228-232.
15. Masic I. The Malversations of Authorship–Current Status in Academic Community and How to Prevent It. Acta Inform Med. 2018; 26(1): 4-9. doi: 10.5455/aim.2018.26.4-9.

16. Masic I. The Most Important Google Scholar Index Advantages and Disadvantages. *Int J Biomed Healthc.* 2019 Jun; 7(1): 4-6. doi: 10.5455/ijbh.2019.7.4-6.
17. Ufnalska S. EASE Guidelines for Authors and Translators of Scientific Articles. *Int J Biomed Healthc.* 2020; 8(2): 129-130. doi: 10.5455/ijbh.2020.2.129-130.
18. Masic I, Sabzghabae AM. How clinicians can validate scientific contents? *J Res Med Sci.* 2014 Jul; 19(7): 583-585.
19. Masic I. Peer Review—Essential for Article and Journal Scientific Assessment and Validity. *Med Arch* 2016 Jun; 70(3): 168-171. doi: 10.5455/medarh.2016.70.168-171.
20. Masic I. Predatory Publishing - Experience with OMICS International. *Med Arch.* 2017 Oct;71(5):304-307. doi: 10.5455/medarh.2017.71.304-307.
21. Masic I. Instead of the Letter to the Editor-Dilemma: Is a New Form of Blackmail Emerging in the World of Scientific Journals Publishing? *Med Arch.* 2022 Jun;76(3):234-238. doi: 10.5455/medarh.2022.76.234-238.
22. Masic I. Predatory Journals and Publishers - Dilemmas: How to Assess it and How to Avoid it? *Med Arch.* 2021 Oct;75(5):328-334. doi: 10.5455/medarh.2021.75.328-334.
23. Duc NM, Hiep DV, Thong PM, Zunic L, Zildzic M, Donev D, Jankovic SM, Hozo I, Masic I. Predatory Open Access Journals are Indexed in Reputable Databases: a Revisiting Issue or an Unsolved Problem. *Med Arch.* 2020 Aug;74(4):318-322. doi: 10.5455/medarh.2020.74.318-322.
24. Donev D. Predatory in Scientific Publishing - a Burning Issue in Science. *Int J Biomed Healthc.* 2020; 8(2): 108-112. doi: 10.5455/ijbh.2020.8.108.112.
25. Donev MD. Predatory Publishing and Predators - Almost Unsolvable Problem of Today in Biomedical Sciences. *Int J Biomed Healthc.* 2021; 9(4): 269-274. doi: 10.5455/ijbh.2021.9.269-274.
26. Masic I. A new example of unethical behaviour in the academic journal "medical archives". *Med Arch.* 2014 Aug;68(4):228-30. doi: 10.5455/medarh.2014.68.228-230. Epub 2014 Jul 31.
27. Masic I. Ethical aspects and dilemmas of preparing, writing and publishing of the scientific papers in the biomedical journals. *Acta Inform Med.* 2012 Sep;20(3):141-8. doi: 10.5455/aim.2012.20.141-148.
28. Zunic L, Masic I. What pharmacy practitioners need to know about ethics in scientific publishing. *J Res Pharm Pract.* 2014 Oct;3(4):112-6. doi: 10.4103/2279-042X.145356.
29. Masic I, Hodzic A, Mulic S. Ethics in medical research and publication. *Int J Prev Med.* 2014 Sep;5(9):1073-82.
30. Zunic L, Karcic E, Masic I.. Medical ethics in the medieval Islamic sciences. *J Res Pharm Pract.* 2014 Jul;3(3):75-6. doi: 10.4103/2279-042X.141072.
31. Masic I. Plagiarism in scientific research and publications and how to prevent it. *Mater Sociomed.* 2014 Apr;26(2):141-6. doi: 10.5455/msm.2014.26.141-146. Epub 2014 Apr 11.
32. Masic I. Plagiarism in scientific publishing. *Acta Inform Med.* 2012 Dec;20(4):208-13. doi: 10.5455/aim.2012.20.208-213.
33. Masic I, Begic E, Dobraca A. Plagiarism Detection by Online Solutions. *Stud Health Technol Inform.* 2017;238:227-230.
34. Masic I, Jankovic SM. Inflated Co-authorship Introduces Bias to Current Scientometric Indices. *Med Arch.* 2021 Aug;75(4):248-255. doi: 10.5455/medarh.2021.75.248-255.
35. Masic I, Begic E. Evaluation of Scientific Journal Validity, It's Articles and Their Authors. *Stud Health Technol Inform.* 2016;226:9-14.
36. Masic I, Jankovic SM. Meta-Analysing Methodological Quality of Published Research: Importance and Effectiveness. *Stud Health Technol Inform.* 2020 Jun 26;272:229-232. doi: 10.3233/SHTI200536.
37. Masic I. On the Occasion of the Symposium "Scientometry, Citation, Plagiarism and Predatory in Scientific Publishing", Sarajevo, 2021. *Med Arch.* 2021 Dec;75(6):408-412. doi: 10.5455/medarh.2021.75.408-412.
38. Masic I. Unethical Behaviors of Authors Who Published Papers in the Biomedical Journals Became a Global Problem. *Med Arch.* 2020 Feb;74(1):4-7. doi: 10.5455/medarh.2020.74.4-7.
39. Donev DM, Masic I, Begic E. An Editorial View on Authors' Malversations. *Mater Sociomed.* 2017 Dec;29(4):228-230. doi: 10.5455/msm.2017.29.228-230.
40. Masic I. Missues of Authorship - Editors View. *Med Arch.* 2017 Aug;71(4):236-238. doi: 10.5455/medarh.2017.71.236-238.
41. Masic I. Scientometric analysis: A technical need for medical science researchers either as authors or as peer reviewers. *J Res Pharm Pract.* 2016 Jan-Mar; 5(1): 1-6. doi: 10.4103/2279-042X.176562.
42. Masic I, Begic E, Begic N. Validity of Scientometric Analysis of Medical Research Output. *Stud Health Technol Inform.* 2017; 238: 246-249.
43. Jankovic MS, Masic I. Importance of Adequate Research Design in Biomedicine. *Int J Biomed Healthc.* 2019; 7(2): 64-66. doi: 10.5455/ijbh.2019.2.64-66.
44. Masic I, Jankovic MS. Inflated Co-authorship Introduces Bias to Current Scientometric Indices. *Med Arch.* 2021; 75(4): 248-255. doi: 10.5455/medarh.2021.4.248-255.
45. Masic I. Quality assessment of medical education at faculty of medicine of sarajevo university—comparison of assessment between students in bologna process and old system of studying. *Acta inform med.* 2013; 21(2): 76-82. doi: 10.5455/aim.2013.21.76-82.
46. Masic I, Ciric D, Pulja A, Kulasin I, Pandza H. Quality assessment of medical education and use of information technology. *Medical informatics in a united and healthy Europe, 2009;* 898-902.