



Problematic Possible Unethical Re-decision and Retraction: Questionable Practices in Academic Publishing of Journals

Pathum Sookaromdee¹, Viroj Wiwanitkit²

¹Private Academic Consultant, Bangkok, Thailand.

²Joseph Aypabalola University, Ikei-Arakeji, Nigeria.

Abstract

In the world of academic publishing, integrity and honesty are fundamental principles that are expected to be upheld by both authors and publishers. However, there is growing concern over the unethical practices of re-decision and retraction in academic publishing, which can have damaging effects on the credibility and reliability of research. This paper examines the prevalence of these questionable practices and explores potential solutions to mitigate their impact on the scholarly community. Here, two important case studies are discussed. In the first case, the journal displayed unethical behavior by re-decision to reject an already accepted submission without providing specific reasons or feedback to the author, indicating a low standard of ethics and professionalism. The lack of transparency and refusal to engage in further communication with the author raises concerns about the journal's integrity and credibility, potentially harming the academic community and diminishing the quality of research being disseminated. This unethical conduct can negatively impact the reputation of the journal and erode trust within the scientific community. In the second case, the retraction of the commentary letter by academicians raises questions about the ethical practices of the journal, as the reasons provided for the retraction seem vague and potentially biased. The failure to address the conflict of interest of the author in the retraction decision undermines the journal's commitment to upholding ethical standards in academic publishing. By allowing biases and conflicts of interest to influence editorial decisions, the journal compromises its credibility and raises doubts about the validity of its peer-review process. Overall, both cases highlight the importance of ethical conduct and transparency in academic publishing. Authors should be treated fairly and given the opportunity to engage in constructive dialogue, while journals should prioritize rigorous peer review and uphold ethical publishing practices to maintain the integrity and trustworthiness of scientific research. Without strict adherence to ethical standards, the academic community risks losing confidence in the reliability and credibility of published research.

Key words: re-decision, retraction, unethical, journal.

Case 1

There is an email from a journal to the author of an accepted work using one person's name in Chinese, but the @ address is different from what the publisher provided for the journal, and the problem was eventually resolved because the magazine is funded by another open access publisher. It indicates a reason of a journal “Ann Med (Elevate)” on a re-decision from accept to reject by a standard journal *"The submission(s) was subject to additional editorial checks and unfortunately did not pass this check. The prolific nature of submissions being made was found to be outside an acceptable level of publishing standards. The Research Integrity Manager has advised that no further consideration can be made to this decision and no further correspondence on the matter will be provided. The Research Integrity Manager has advised that no further consideration can be made to this decision and no further correspondence on the matter will be provided."*This statement suggests that the journal has a possible low standard of ethics and professionalism, as they are rejecting a submission without providing specific reasons or feedback to the author. Additionally, the fact that the Research Integrity Manager is involved in the decision-making process raises red flags about the journal's integrity and credibility. The lack of transparency and refusal to engage in further communication with the author indicates that the journal may not prioritize rigorous peer review or uphold ethical publishing practices. This unethical behavior can harm the academic community and diminish the quality and reliability of research being disseminated.

Case 2

This case study indicates a possible unethical practice and questionable for the standard journal, which indicate a reason of a journal on an unfair retraction of a letter to editor by academicians who commenting to open access publication by a qualified author namely "Lataster R" (single non-MD and has no work in a medical institute who also have undisclosed business of Anti-COVID-19 blogpost) and the reason for retraction of the commentary letter is *"The above article, published online on ..., has been retracted by agreement between the journal Editor-in-Chief, Karen Grimmer and Michael Loughlin; and John Wiley & Sons Ltd. The retraction has been agreed as this Letter to the Editor lacks relevant scientific discussion and the statements in this letter are not sufficiently supported by references to the literature"* despite there is a fact that “Lataster R” has unethical hidden conflict of interest when published in “J Eval Cin Pract” (edited by “Grimmer K” and “Loughlin M”)[1].

This situation involving the retraction of a commentary letter by authors is highly concerning as it raises questions about the ethical practices of the journal in question. The retraction reasons provided by the Editor-in-Chief and Publisher, citing lack of scientific discussion and unsupported statements, seem questionable given the content of the letter. The fact that the author, “Lataster R”, has undisclosed conflicts of interest, such as running an anti-COVID-19 blogpost, indicates a potential bias in the retraction decision [2].

The retraction of a commentary letter based on vague reasons like lack of scientific discussion and unsupported statements, while ignoring the crucial issue of conflict of interest, raises doubts about the journal's integrity and standards. It is unethical to retract a valid criticism or

observation simply because it may have negative implications for a certain individual or group. This type of behavior might be considered predatory as it prioritizes protecting certain interests over promoting transparency and scientific scrutiny.

The failure to address the conflict of interest of the author, “Lataster R,” in the retraction decision reflects poorly on the journal's commitment to upholding ethical standards in academic publishing. By allowing biases and conflicts of interest to influence editorial decisions, the journal undermines its credibility and raises questions about the validity of its peer-review process.

The unfair practice towards authors of the unfairly retracted letter to editor who highlight the ethical problem of problematic author in this situation is evident in the lack of transparency and accountability in the retraction process of their commentary letter. All authors of the unfairly retracted commentary followed the standard practices of academic publication by submitting their commentary for peer-review and publication, only to have it retracted for reasons that appear to be unsubstantiated and biased. The authors of the unfairly retracted letter to editor who highlight the ethical problem of problematic author did not engage in any unethical behavior in their commentary letter, and they followed the proper procedures for submitting their work to the journal. The fact that the retraction decision did not address any specific errors or inaccuracies in their commentary, but instead cited vague reasons like lack of scientific discussion and unsupported statements, raises concerns about the underlying motives behind the retraction [1].

It is clear that those affected authors of letter to editor were unfairly targeted in this situation, as the retraction decision seems to have been influenced by undisclosed conflicts of interest and potential biases. The lack of transparency and integrity in the retraction process reflects poorly on the journal's commitment to upholding ethical standards in academic publishing.

By highlighting the unjust treatment of affected authors of letter to editor in this situation, it is important to emphasize the importance of fair and ethical practices in academic publishing. Authors should not be unfairly retracted or censored based on hidden agendas or conflicts of interest, but should be given the opportunity to defend their work and engage in constructive dialogue within the scientific community.

The retraction of the commentary letter by affected authors of letter to editor, without addressing the unethical conduct of “Lataster R”, raises serious concerns about the journal's ethical standards and potential conflicts of interest. This situation highlights the importance of transparency, integrity, and accountability in academic publishing to ensure the credibility and trustworthiness of scientific research [1].

Conclusion

The two case studies highlight the new emerging problem of the low standard and possible predatory practice of the journals. The concerns about the ethical standards and practices of the journal. The lack of transparency, failure to address conflicts of interest, and potential bias in the retraction decision reflect poorly on the journal's integrity. It is crucial for academic publishing to

prioritize fairness, accountability, and ethical conduct to maintain credibility and trust within the scientific community.

References

Dungsupawong H. Ethical dilemma in the journal retraction process. Case Study and Case Report 2024; 14(1): 1-2.

Buala D. Uncovering Hidden Conflicts of Interest in Published Articles: The Case of COVID-19 Vaccine Recommendations. Case Study and Case Report 2024; 14(1): 6-8.