

The Dark Sides of Modern Science: Credit Attribution, Citation and Impact

Taha Sochi (Contact: t.sochi@ucl.ac.uk)
London, United Kingdom

Abstract: This is the sixth article in our series “The Dark Sides of Modern Science” and is about the credit attribution, citation and impact in the scientific circles and literature (where science means knowledge in general). The remarks that we stated in the Introduction of the first article of this series (i.e. “Knowledge Production and Authoring”) generally apply to this article and hence we do not need to repeat.

Keywords: Ethics of science, ethics of knowledge, morality in science, academic misconduct, corruption in science, corruption related to science.

Contents

Abstract	1
Table of Contents	2
1 Citation Metrics	3
2 Citation Misconduct	8
3 Citation Biases and Disparities	13
4 Questionable Types and Practices of Citation	17
5 Citation Value	21
6 Citation and Artificial Intelligence	24
7 Citation and Questionable Publishing	25
8 Citation and Retraction	27
9 Citation and Indexing Engines and Databases	30
10 Awards and Honors	34
11 Idolization, Fabrication and Inflation	36
12 Celebrity Culture	39
13 ORCID	40
14 Grade Inflation	40
15 Evaluating and Quantifying Credit	42
16 Fake Qualifications	43
17 Miscellaneous	43

1 Citation Metrics

1. J.B. Thomas. Scholarly Productivity in Psychology: a criticism of citation count research, 1980. DOI: [10.1080/0141192800060109](https://doi.org/10.1080/0141192800060109)
2. S. Hansson. Impact factor as a misleading tool in evaluation of medical journals, 1995. DOI: [10.1016/s0140-6736\(95\)92749-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0140-6736(95)92749-2)
3. P.O. Seglen. Why the impact factor of journals should not be used for evaluating research, 1997. DOI: [10.1136/bmj.314.7079.497](https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.314.7079.497)
4. N.M. Meenen. The impact factor—a reliable scientometric parameter?, 1997. DOI: [10.1007/BF02630217](https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02630217)
5. F. Hecht; B.K. Hecht; A.A. Sandberg. The Journal "Impact Factor": A Misnamed, Misleading, Misused Measure, 1998. DOI: [10.1016/S0165-4608\(97\)00459-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0165-4608(97)00459-7)
6. S. Bloch; G. Walter. The Impact Factor: Time for Change, 2001. DOI: [10.1080/0004867010060502](https://doi.org/10.1080/0004867010060502)
7. D. Colquhoun. Challenging the tyranny of impact factors, 2003. DOI: [10.1038/423479a](https://doi.org/10.1038/423479a)
8. R. Eston. The impact factor: a misleading and flawed measure of research quality, 2005. DOI: [10.1080/02640410400014208](https://doi.org/10.1080/02640410400014208)
9. J.E. Hirsch. An index to quantify an individual's scientific research output, 2005. DOI: [10.1073/pnas.0507655102](https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0507655102)
10. Editorial. The Impact Factor Game, 2006. DOI: [10.1371/journal.pmed.0030291](https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.0030291)
11. C.L.S. Coryn. The Use and Abuse of Citations as Indicators of Research Quality, 2006. DOI: [10.56645/jmde.v3i4.82](https://doi.org/10.56645/jmde.v3i4.82)
12. D.L. Parnas. Stop the numbers game, 2007. DOI: [10.1145/1297797.1297815](https://doi.org/10.1145/1297797.1297815)
13. P. Jacso. The pros and cons of computing the h-index using Google Scholar, 2008. DOI: [10.1108/14684520810889718](https://doi.org/10.1108/14684520810889718)
14. R. Smith. Beware the tyranny of impact factors, 2008. DOI: [10.1302/0301-620X.90B2.20258](https://doi.org/10.1302/0301-620X.90B2.20258)
15. M. Szklo. Impact Factor: Good Reasons for Concern, 2008. DOI: [10.1097/EDE.0b013e31816b6a7a](https://doi.org/10.1097/EDE.0b013e31816b6a7a)
16. M.E. Falagas; V.G. Alexiou. The top-ten in journal impact factor manipulation, 2008. DOI: [10.1007/s00005-008-0024-5](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00005-008-0024-5)
17. D.A. Pendlebury. The use and misuse of journal metrics and other citation indicators, 2009. DOI: [10.1007/s00005-009-0008-y](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00005-009-0008-y)
18. C. Labbé. Ike Antkare one of the great stars in the scientific firmament, 2010. HAL Id: [hal-00713564](https://hal.archives-ouvertes.fr/hal-00713564), version 1

19. J. Beel; B. Gipp. Academic Search Engine Spam and Google Scholar's Resilience Against it, 2010. DOI: [10.3998/3336451.0013.305](https://doi.org/10.3998/3336451.0013.305)
20. A.F. Mavrogenis; P. Ruggieri; P.J. Papagelopoulos. Editorial: Self-citation in Publishing, 2010. DOI: [10.1007/s11999-010-1480-8](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11999-010-1480-8)
21. G.E. Hunt; M. Cleary; G. Walter. Psychiatry and the Hirsch h -index: The Relationship Between Journal Impact Factors and Accrued Citations, 2010. DOI: [10.3109/10673229.2010.493742](https://doi.org/10.3109/10673229.2010.493742)
22. E.D. Lopez-Cozar; N. Robinson-Garcia; D. Torres-Salinas. Manipulating Google Scholar Citations and Google Scholar Metrics: simple, easy and tempting, 2012. DOI: [10.48550/arXiv.1212.0638](https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.1212.0638)
23. R. Mutz; H.-D. Daniel. Skewed citation distributions and bias factors: Solutions to two core problems with the journal impact factor, 2012. DOI: [10.1016/j.joi.2011.12.006](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joi.2011.12.006)
24. M. Jalalian; H. Mahboobi. New corruption detected: Bogus impact factors compiled by fake organizations, 2013. DOI: [10.14661/2013.685-686](https://doi.org/10.14661/2013.685-686)
25. C. Fleck. The Impact Factor Fetishism, 2013. DOI: [10.1017/S0003975613000167](https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003975613000167)
26. C.R. Carpenter; D.C. Cone; C.C. Sarli. Using Publication Metrics to Highlight Academic Productivity and Research Impact, 2014. DOI: [10.1111/acem.12482](https://doi.org/10.1111/acem.12482)
27. W. Blockmans; L. Engwall; D. Weaire. *Bibliometrics: Use and Abuse in the Review of Research Performance*. 2014. ISBN: 9781855781955
28. S.-C. Fu; K.-M. Chan. Ranking of orthopaedic journals: A challenge to the citation-based metrics, 2014. DOI: [10.1016/j.jot.2014.03.005](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jot.2014.03.005)
29. F.R.S. Gutierrez; J. Beall; D.A. Forero. Spurious alternative impact factors: The scale of the problem from an academic perspective, 2015. DOI: [10.1002/bies.201500011](https://doi.org/10.1002/bies.201500011)
30. M. Jalalian. The story of fake impact factor companies and how we detected them, 2015. DOI: [10.14661/2015.1069-1072](https://doi.org/10.14661/2015.1069-1072)
31. H.I. Browman. The use and misuse of bibliometric indices in evaluating scholarly performance, 2015. DOI: [10.7557/5.3670](https://doi.org/10.7557/5.3670)
32. E. Callaway. Beat it, impact factor! Publishing elite turns against controversial metric, 2016. DOI: [10.1038/nature.2016.20224](https://doi.org/10.1038/nature.2016.20224)
33. J. Bohannon. Hate journal impact factors? New study gives you one more reason, 2016. DOI: [10.1126/science.aag0643](https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aag0643)
34. M. Dadkhah; G. Borchardt; M. Lagzian; G. Bianciardi. Academic Journals Plagued by Bogus Impact Factors, 2017. DOI: [10.1007/s12109-017-9509-4](https://doi.org/10.1007/s12109-017-9509-4)
35. J. Ravenscroft; M. Liakata; A. Clare; D. Duma. Measuring scientific impact beyond academia: An assessment of existing impact metrics and proposed improvements, 2017.

[DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0173152](https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0173152)

36. J.A.T. da Silva; J. Dobranszki. Multiple versions of the h-index: cautionary use for formal academic purposes, 2018. [DOI: 10.1007/s11192-018-2680-3](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-018-2680-3)
37. R. Costas; T. Franssen. Reflections around ‘the cautionary use’ of the h-index: response to Teixeira da Silva and Dobranszki, 2018. [DOI: 10.1007/s11192-018-2683-0](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-018-2683-0)
38. F.M. Paulus; N. Cruz; S. Krach. The Impact Factor Fallacy, 2018. [DOI: 10.3389/fpsyg.2018.01487](https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2018.01487)
39. E.C. McKiernan; L.A. Schimanski; C.M. Nieves; et al. Meta-Research: Use of the Journal Impact Factor in academic review, promotion, and tenure evaluations, 2019. [DOI: 10.7554/eLife.47338](https://doi.org/10.7554/eLife.47338)
40. M. Fire; C. Guestrin. Over-optimization of academic publishing metrics: observing Goodhart’s Law in action, 2019. [DOI: 10.1093/gigascience/giz053](https://doi.org/10.1093/gigascience/giz053)
41. D. Juyal; V. Thawani; A. Sayana; S. Pal. Impact factor: Mutation, manipulation, and distortion, 2019. [DOI: 10.4103/jfmpe.jfmpe_515_19](https://doi.org/10.4103/jfmpe.jfmpe_515_19)
42. H. Else. Impact factors are still widely used in academic evaluations, 2019. [DOI: 10.1038/d41586-019-01151-4](https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-019-01151-4)
43. C.A. Chapman; J.C. Bicca-Marques; S. Calvignac-Spencer; et al. Games academics play and their consequences: how authorship, h-index and journal impact factors are shaping the future of academia, 2019. [DOI: 10.1098/rspb.2019.2047](https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2019.2047)
44. J.R. Dettori; D.C. Norvell; J.R. Chapman. Measuring Academic Success: The Art and Science of Publication Metrics, 2019. [DOI: 10.1177/2192568219831003](https://doi.org/10.1177/2192568219831003)
45. D.G. Katritsis. Journal Impact Factor: Widely Used, Misused and Abused, 2019. [PMID: 31463051](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/31463051/)
46. L. Bennet; D.A. Eisner; A.J. Gunn. Misleading with citation statistics?, 2019. [DOI: 10.1113/JP277847](https://doi.org/10.1113/JP277847)
47. A.M. Petersen; R.K. Pan; F. Pammolli; S. Fortunato. Methods to account for citation inflation in research evaluation, 2019. [DOI: 10.1016/j.respol.2019.04.009](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2019.04.009)
48. M. Biagioli; A. Lippman (Editors). *Gaming the Metrics: Misconduct and Manipulation in Academic Research*. 2020. [ISBN: 9780262356565](https://www.isbn-international.org/product/9780262356565)
49. J. Qian; Z. Yuan; J. Li; H. Zhu. Science Citation Index (SCI) and scientific evaluation system in China, 2020. [DOI: 10.1057/s41599-020-00604-w](https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-020-00604-w)
50. L. Lei; Y. Sun. Should highly cited items be excluded in impact factor calculation? The effect of review articles on journal impact factor, 2020. [DOI: 10.1007/s11192-019-03338-y](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-019-03338-y)
51. F. Buttner; C.L. Ardern; P. Blazey; et al. Counting publications and citations is not

- just irrelevant: it is an incentive that subverts the impact of clinical research, 2020. DOI: [10.1136/bjsports-2020-103146](https://doi.org/10.1136/bjsports-2020-103146)
52. R.I. Aroeira; M.A.R.B. Castanho. Can citation metrics predict the true impact of scientific papers?, 2020. DOI: [10.1111/febs.15255](https://doi.org/10.1111/febs.15255)
53. J.A.T. da Silva. Paper mills and on-demand publishing: Risks to the integrity of journal indexing and metrics, 2021. DOI: [10.1016/j.mjafi.2020.08.003](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mjafi.2020.08.003)
54. V. Koltun; D. Hafner. The h-index is no longer an effective correlate of scientific reputation, 2021. DOI: [10.1371/journal.pone.0253397](https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0253397)
55. A. Jain; K.S. Khor; D. Beard; et al. Do journals raise their impact factor or SCImago ranking by self-citing in editorials? A bibliometric analysis of trauma and orthopaedic journals, 2021. DOI: [10.1111/ans.16546](https://doi.org/10.1111/ans.16546)
56. Z. Taskin; G. Dogan; E. Kulczycki; A.A. Zuccala. Self-Citation Patterns of Journals Indexed in the Journal Citation Reports, 2021. DOI: [10.1016/j.joi.2021.101221](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joi.2021.101221)
57. E. Quaia; F. Vernuccio. The H Index Myth: A Form of Fanaticism or a Simple Misconception?, 2022. DOI: [10.3390/tomography8030102](https://doi.org/10.3390/tomography8030102)
58. M.R. Dougherty; Z. Horne. Citation counts and journal impact factors do not capture some indicators of research quality in the behavioural and brain sciences, 2022. DOI: [10.1098/rsos.220334](https://doi.org/10.1098/rsos.220334)
59. Y. Zhou. Factors, components and dynamics: investigation of journal self-citation and citation by equal opportunity model, 2022. DOI: [10.1016/j.heliyon.2022.e10292](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2022.e10292)
60. C. Bricker-Anthony; R.W. Herzog. Distortion of journal impact factors in the era of paper mills, 2023. DOI: [10.1016/j.yymthe.2023.05.008](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.yymthe.2023.05.008)
61. H. Mondal; K.K. Deepak; M. Gupta; R. Kumar. The h-Index: Understanding its predictors, significance, and criticism, 2023. DOI: [10.4103/jfmpe.jfmpe_1613_23](https://doi.org/10.4103/jfmpe.jfmpe_1613_23)
62. E. Shiah; A.J. Heiman; J.A. Ricci. Evaluation of the i10-Index in Plastic Surgery Research and its Correlation with Altmetric Attention Scores and Traditional Author Bibliometrics: An Evaluation of a Single Journal, 2023. DOI: [10.1055/s-0043-1760827](https://doi.org/10.1055/s-0043-1760827)
63. A. Mace. The Limits of Citation Counts, 2023. DOI: [10.48550/arXiv.1711.02695](https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.1711.02695)
64. D.W. Aksnes; F.N. Piro; L.W. Fossum. Citation metrics covary with researchers' assessments of the quality of their works, 2023. DOI: [10.1162/qss_a_00241](https://doi.org/10.1162/qss_a_00241)
65. G. Kendall. More Transparency is Needed When Citing h-Indexes, Journal Impact Factors and CiteScores, 2024. DOI: [10.1007/s12109-024-09983-3](https://doi.org/10.1007/s12109-024-09983-3)
66. P. Mora; S. Pilia. A proposed framework to address metric inflation in research publications, 2024. DOI: [10.1080/08989621.2024.2445280](https://doi.org/10.1080/08989621.2024.2445280)
67. M.K. Akhtar. The H-index is an unreliable research metric for evaluating the publication

- impact of experimental scientists, 2024. DOI: [10.3389/frma.2024.1385080](https://doi.org/10.3389/frma.2024.1385080)
68. T. Sochi. Practices and Metrics of Citation in Scholarly Publishing, 2025. DOI: [10.2139/ssrn.5297510](https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.5297510)
69. I.R. Dhamsania; A.E. Zhou; B. Sloan; J.M. Grant-Kels. Ethics of citation inflation, authorship inflation, and bribery in academic research, 2025. DOI: [10.1016/j.jaad.2024.10.015](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jaad.2024.10.015)
70. Misleading Metrics.
71. Misleading Metrics.
72. Understanding research metrics.
73. Does authorship mean anything when academic papers are simply citable tokens?.
74. Performance-driven culture is ruining scientific research.
75. The pros and cons of key metrics.
76. Metrics to avoid - the impact factor.
77. The corrupting effects of academic citation metrics.
78. Fraud by Numbers: Metrics and the New Academic Misconduct.
79. Editor manipulation of impact factor.
80. Skewed Citations Affecting Journal Impact Factor - Need for tailoring journal evaluation metrics across disciplines.
81. Are standard metrics of academic output skewed by the relative popularity of a field?.
82. The "impact" of the Journal Impact Factor in the review, tenure, and promotion process.
83. The Impact Factor Debate: Assessing Journal Prestige and Research Quality.
84. The allure of the journal impact factor holds firm, despite its flaws.
85. Measuring What Matters: On the Tyranny of Academic Metrics.
86. Journal impact factors wrongly used to evaluate research.
87. Sick of Impact Factors.
88. Why is it bad to judge a paper by citation count?.
89. The academic papers researchers regard as significant are not those that are highly cited.
90. Assessing individual research performance.
91. What's wrong with the h-index, according to its inventor.
92. Why the h-index is a bogus measure of academic impact.
93. Reliability of researcher metric the h-index is in decline.
94. How Bibliometrics Incentivize Self-Citation.
95. Four reasons to stop caring so much about the h-index.
96. If I write a really bad, but controversial, paper, can I increase my h-index?.
97. What are the limitations of using citation counts to evaluate research impact?.

98. [The Unfairness of Citations.](#)
99. [Citation indexes make research more unequal.](#)
100. [How Performance Evaluation Metrics Corrupt Researchers.](#)
101. [Dressing up Irresponsible Metrics as Responsible Metrics.](#)
102. [Be the educated user - Article metrics.](#)
103. [Citation metrics, do they work?.](#)
104. [Reading between the lines on citation value.](#)
105. [List of Predatory Indexers and Fake Impact Factors.](#)
106. [Manipulatable Google Scholar Citation Counts.](#)
107. [Limitations of citation analysis on the measurement of research impact: A summary.](#)
108. [Three Common Pitfalls To Avoid When Using Citation Metrics.](#)
109. [Predatory and Misleading Metrics.](#)
110. [Major indexing service sounds alarm on self-citations by nearly 50 journals.](#)
111. [Citation inflation.](#)
112. [How the Inflation of Journal Citations Impacts Academia.](#)
113. [Impact Factor inflation : Multidisciplinary Publishing Institute \(MDPI\).](#)
114. ["Researchers must play games that damage the quality of science".](#)

2 Citation Misconduct

1. D. Teodorescu; T. Andrei. An examination of "citation circles" for social sciences journals in Eastern European countries, 2014. DOI: [10.1007/s11192-013-1210-6](#)
2. M. Jalalian. The story of fake impact factor companies and how we detected them, 2015. DOI: [10.14661/2015.1069-1072](#)
3. M. Biagioli. Watch out for cheats in citation game, 2016. DOI: [10.1038/535201a](#)
4. I. Fister Jr.; I. Fister; M. Perc. Toward the Discovery of Citation Cartels in Citation Networks, 2016. DOI: [10.3389/fpsy.2016.00049](#)
5. E.A. Fong; A.W. Wilhite. Authorship and citation manipulation in academic research, 2017. DOI: [10.1371/journal.pone.0187394](#)
6. C.F. Hickman; E.A. Fong; A.W. Wilhite; Y. Lee. Academic misconduct and criminal liability: Manipulating academic journal impact factors, 2019. DOI: [10.1093/scipol/scz019](#)
7. A. Wilhite; E.A. Fong; S. Wilhite. The influence of editorial decisions and the academic network on self-citations and journal impact factors, 2019. DOI: [10.1016/j.respol.2019.03.003](#)

8. R.V. Noorden; D.S. Chawla. Hundreds of extreme self-citing scientists revealed in new database, 2019. DOI: [10.1038/d41586-019-02479-7](https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-019-02479-7)
9. M. Biagioli; A. Lippman (Editors). *Gaming the Metrics: Misconduct and Manipulation in Academic Research*. 2020. ISBN: 9780262356565
10. S. Moussa. A "Trojan horse" in the reference lists: Citations to a hijacked journal in SSCI-indexed marketing journals, 2021. DOI: [10.1016/j.acalib.2021.102388](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acalib.2021.102388)
11. S. Kojaku; G. Livan; N. Masuda. Detecting anomalous citation groups in journal networks, 2021. DOI: [10.1038/s41598-021-93572-3](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-021-93572-3)
12. M. Gain; N. Soni; S.D. Bhavani. Detection of Potential Citation Clubs in Bibliographic Networks, 2021. DOI: [10.1007/978-981-16-5348-3_56](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-16-5348-3_56)
13. M. Mehregan. Scientific journals must be alert to potential manipulation in citations and referencing, 2022. DOI: [10.1177/17470161211068745](https://doi.org/10.1177/17470161211068745)
14. J.D. Wren; C. Georgescu. Detecting anomalous referencing patterns in PubMed papers suggestive of author-centric reference list manipulation, 2022. DOI: [10.1007/s11192-022-04503-6](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-022-04503-6)
15. D.S. Chawla. Researchers who agree to manipulate citations are more likely to get their papers published, 2023. DOI: [10.1038/d41586-023-01532-w](https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-023-01532-w)
16. S.J.A. Zaidi; M. Taqi. Citation Cartels in Medical and Dental Journals, 2023. DOI: [10.29271/jcpsp.2023.06.700](https://doi.org/10.29271/jcpsp.2023.06.700)
17. P. Lu. The Right, Wrong, and Unethical Ways in Reference Citations, 2023. DOI: [10.2514/1.G007372](https://doi.org/10.2514/1.G007372)
18. M. Catanzaro. Saudi universities lose highly cited researchers after payment schemes raise ethics concerns, 2023. DOI: [10.1126/science.zhs1429](https://doi.org/10.1126/science.zhs1429)
19. P. Mora; S. Pilia. A proposed framework to address metric inflation in research publications, 2024. DOI: [10.1080/08989621.2024.2445280](https://doi.org/10.1080/08989621.2024.2445280)
20. D.S. Chawla. The citation black market: schemes selling fake references alarm scientists, 2024. DOI: [10.1038/d41586-024-01672-7](https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-024-01672-7)
21. M. Catanzaro. Citation cartels help some mathematicians - and their universities - climb the rankings, 2024. DOI: [10.1126/science.zcl2s6d](https://doi.org/10.1126/science.zcl2s6d)
22. M.M. Willie. Citation Cartels: Understanding Their Emergence and Impact on the Academic World, 2024. DOI: [10.52970/grdis.v4i2.581](https://doi.org/10.52970/grdis.v4i2.581)
23. D.E. Wright. Five problems plaguing publishing in the life sciences-and one common cause, 2024. DOI: [10.1002/1873-3468.15018](https://doi.org/10.1002/1873-3468.15018)
24. K. Langin. Vendor offering citations for purchase is latest bad actor in scholarly publishing, 2024. DOI: [10.1126/science.zk7dou0](https://doi.org/10.1126/science.zk7dou0)

25. V.A. Markel. Addressing citation manipulation: Advice for authors, reviewers and editors, 2024. DOI: [10.1016/j.rinp.2024.107618](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rinp.2024.107618)
26. L. Giray. Academic Citation Partnership: A Predatory Practice that Undermines Scholarly Integrity, 2024. DOI: [10.1007/s10439-024-03598-7](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10439-024-03598-7)
27. J. Liu; X. Bai; M. Wang; et al. Anomalous citations detection in academic networks, 2024. DOI: [10.1007/s10462-023-10655-5](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10462-023-10655-5)
28. A.J. Abduh. Trust and Integrity in Research: Clarivate Removed Highly Cited Biochar Researchers, 2024. DOI: [10.22541/au.173264015.56511681/v1](https://doi.org/10.22541/au.173264015.56511681/v1)
29. H. Ibrahim; F. Liu; Y. Zaki; T. Rahwan. Citation manipulation through citation mills and pre-print servers, 2025. DOI: [10.1038/s41598-025-88709-7](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-025-88709-7)
30. S. Macdonald. Authorship in Academic Publishing and the Thirst for Citation, 2025. DOI: [10.2139/ssrn.5134231](https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.5134231)
31. V. Plevris. From Integrity to Inflation: Ethical and Unethical Citation Practices in Academic Publishing, 2025. DOI: [10.1007/s10805-025-09631-1](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10805-025-09631-1)
32. L.V. Hove. Fake references and the value of citation databases, 2025. DOI: [10.1016/j.acalib.2025.103123](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acalib.2025.103123)
33. H.S. Al-Sinani; C.J. Mitchell. From Content Creation to Citation Inflation: A GenAI Case Study, 2025. DOI: [10.48550/arXiv.2503.23414](https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2503.23414)
34. S.V. Bruton; A.L. Macchione; M. Brown; M. Hosseini. Citation Ethics: An Exploratory Survey of Norms and Behaviors, 2025. DOI: [10.1007/s10805-024-09539-2](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10805-024-09539-2)
35. I.R. Dhamsania; A.E. Zhou; B. Sloan; J.M. Grant-Kels. Ethics of citation inflation, authorship inflation, and bribery in academic research, 2025. DOI: [10.1016/j.jaad.2024.10.015](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jaad.2024.10.015)
36. [Does authorship mean anything when academic papers are simply citable tokens?](#)
37. [Springer Nature book on machine learning is full of made-up citations.](#)
38. [Journal self-citations are increasingly biased toward impact factor years.](#)
39. [Citation manipulation: a new wave of metrics ‘gaming’?](#)
40. [A fraud accusation like nothing you’ve seen before.](#)
41. [What Is a Peer Review and Citation Ring?](#)
42. [Beyond Predatory Publishing: Additional Questionable Offers in Scholarly Publishing.](#)
43. [Citation Statistics and Citation Rings.](#)
44. [SAGE Publications busts "peer review and citation ring," 60 papers retracted.](#)
45. [Peer review request with fake citations?](#)
46. [Publisher offers cash for citations.](#)
47. [Exposing citation manipulation and fraud in the community.](#)

48. [How thousands of invisible citations sneak into papers and make for fake metrics.](#)
49. [The corrupting effects of academic citation metrics.](#)
50. [Unmasking and Combating Publishing Malpractices 2: Citation Manipulation.](#)
51. [Citation Manipulation Continues to Wreak Havoc on Publishing.](#)
52. [How Much Citation Manipulation Is Acceptable?.](#)
53. [How Citation Manipulation Is Corrupting Research - and What Scholars Can Do to Stop It.](#)
54. [Seventeen journals lose impact factors for suspected citation manipulation.](#)
55. [Academic Competition Fueling Citation Manipulation.](#)
56. [Fraud by Numbers: Metrics and the New Academic Misconduct.](#)
57. [Citation Cartels: Manipulating the Metrics of Authors and Journals.](#)
58. [Visualizing Citation Cartels.](#)
59. [What do we know about journal citation cartels? A call for information.](#)
60. [Citation Cartels: The Mafia of Scientific Publishing.](#)
61. [Journal citation cartels on the rise.](#)
62. [Journal Impact Factor Manipulation and Citation Cartels.](#)
63. [Citation cartel.](#)
64. [The Emergence of a Citation Cartel.](#)
65. [How citation cartels give ‘strategic scholars’ an advantage: A simple model.](#)
66. [The Citation Crisis: Citation Cartels, Self-Citation, and Survey Papers in Computer Science Research.](#)
67. [The Dark World of ‘Citation Cartels’: Predatory journals and bad-faith scholars are gaming the system - at scale.](#)
68. [Citations cartels: an emerging problem in scientific publishing.](#)
69. [Gaming the system, scientific ‘cartels’ band together to cite each others’ work.](#)
70. [Citation Manipulation: A Growing Threat to Academic Publishing Integrity.](#)
71. [How journals manipulate the importance of research and one way to fix it.](#)
72. [Citation manipulation.](#)
73. [Ethically Questionable Citation Practices.](#)
74. [When scientific citations go rogue: Uncovering ‘sneaked references’.](#)
75. [List of Predatory Indexers and Fake Impact Factors.](#)
76. [Manipulatable Google Scholar Citation Counts.](#)
77. [Citation manipulation.](#)
78. [Top tips on identifying citation misconduct.](#)
79. [Citation Manipulation / Misconduct.](#)

80. Misconduct: Taylor & Francis Editorial Policies.
81. What is Citation Manipulation?.
82. Unmasking and Combating Publishing Malpractices 2: Citation Manipulation.
83. Citation Manipulation: A Growing Threat to Academic Publishing Integrity.
84. Reviewer requesting addition of multiple citations of their own work.
85. An Introduction to Citation Stacking.
86. Citation Stacking: editorial misconduct & my response.
87. What do we know about journal citation cartels? A call for information.
88. Is this considered citation stuffing?.
89. Citation Stuffing.
90. Citation cartels, ghost writing and fake peer-review: Fraud is causing a crisis in science - here's what we need to do to stop it.
91. Exclusive: Iraqi university forcing students to cite its journals to graduate.
92. Get the best article citation services.
93. Citation cartels boost rankings of mathematicians - Analysis.
94. Is citation farming the new norm for research publication?.
95. I will increase citations and h index in google scholar by promoting your articles.
96. Asked to cite papers for money.
97. How Scholars Hack the World of Academic Publishing Now.
98. Andrew Akbashev's Post.
99. Publisher offers cash for citations.
100. Cash for Citations: The Newest Scam in Scholarly Publishing.
101. Publisher offers cash for citations.
102. Another journal distances itself from cash for citations after Retraction Watch report.
103. Clarivate Crackdown on Biochar Citation Cartel: Safeguarding Academic Integrity in Research Recognition.
104. Citation cartels help some mathematicians-and their universities-climb the rankings.
105. Citation Rings: Inflating Impact, Undermining Integrity.
106. The Citation Crisis: Citation Cartels, Self-Citation, and Survey Papers in Computer Science Research.
107. Engineering the world's highest cited cat, Larry.
108. Cat Becomes Well-Cited Scholar With New Scam Method.
109. Citation milling is common in academia. Here is an example from tweet by @fake_journals. Have any of you faced such a thing?.
110. Clubby and 'disturbing' citation behavior by researchers in Italy has surged.

111. [Academic Mafia.](#)
112. [A. Murat Eren's Post.](#)
113. [Citation manipulation is undermining research integrity.](#)
114. [What is "citation farm"?](#)
115. [Weekend reads: Self-citation farms; an editor refuses to retract; publishing enters politics.](#)
116. [Gaming the H-Index: The Dark Side of Google Scholar and ResearchGate.](#)
117. [Paper with fake references.](#)
118. [Free Citation Checker.](#)
119. [Citation amnesia: Newton and Alhacen's forgotten connection.](#)
120. [Preventing Citation Manipulation During Peer Reviews.](#)
121. [Citation manipulation: Clarivate excludes entire field of Math from the HCR list.](#)
122. [A Vulnerable System: Fake Papers and Imaginary Scientists.](#)
123. [Unethical journals tell academics to pad their papers with citations.](#)

3 Citation Biases and Disparities

1. T.N. Van Leeuwen; H.F. Moed; R.J.W. Tijssen; et al. Language biases in the coverage of the Science Citation Index and its consequences for international comparisons of national research performance, 2001. DOI: [10.1023/A:1010549719484](https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1010549719484)
2. M. Brysbaert; S. Smyth. Self-Enhancement in Scientific Research: The Self-citation Bias, 2011. DOI: [10.5334/pb-51-2-129](https://doi.org/10.5334/pb-51-2-129)
3. M. Correa; L. Gonzalez-Sabate; I. Serrano. Home bias effect in the management literature, 2013. DOI: [10.1007/s11192-012-0876-5](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-012-0876-5)
4. D. Maliniak; R. Powers; B.F. Walter. The Gender Citation Gap in International Relations, 2013. DOI: [10.1017/S0020818313000209](https://doi.org/10.1017/S0020818313000209)
5. M. Kivimaki; G.D. Batty; I. Kawachi; et al. Don't Let the Truth Get in the Way of a Good Story: An Illustration of Citation Bias in Epidemiologic Research, 2014. DOI: [10.1093/aje/kwu164](https://doi.org/10.1093/aje/kwu164)
6. E. Meijaard; M. Cardillo; E.M. Meijaard; H.P. Possingham. Geographic bias in citation rates of conservation research, 2015. DOI: [10.1111/cobi.12489](https://doi.org/10.1111/cobi.12489)
7. A.F. Delgado; A.F. Delgado. Home institution bias in the New England Journal of Medicine? A noninferiority study on citation rates, 2017. DOI: [10.1007/s11192-017-2584-7](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-017-2584-7)

8. M. Krawczyk. Are all researchers male? Gender misattributions in citations, 2017. DOI: [10.1007/s11192-016-2192-y](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-016-2192-y)
9. N. Gaind. Few UK universities have adopted rules against impact-factor abuse, 2018. DOI: [10.1038/d41586-018-01874-w](https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-018-01874-w)
10. M.L. Wuestman; J. Hoekman; K. Frenken. The geography of scientific citations, 2019. DOI: [10.1016/j.respol.2019.04.004](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2019.04.004)
11. R.V. Noorden; D.S. Chawla. Hundreds of extreme self-citing scientists revealed in new database, 2019. DOI: [10.1038/d41586-019-02479-7](https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-019-02479-7)
12. A.M. Petersen; R.K. Pan; F. Pammolli; S. Fortunato. Methods to account for citation inflation in research evaluation, 2019. DOI: [10.1016/j.respol.2019.04.009](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2019.04.009)
13. J.D. Dworkin; K.A. Linn; E.G. Teich; et al. The extent and drivers of gender imbalance in neuroscience reference lists, 2020. DOI: [10.1038/s41593-020-0658-y](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41593-020-0658-y)
14. M. Lockwood. Editorial: citation malpractice, 2020. DOI: [10.1098/rspa.2020.0746](https://doi.org/10.1098/rspa.2020.0746)
15. M. Skopec; H. Issa; J. Reed; M. Harris. The role of geographic bias in knowledge diffusion: a systematic review and narrative synthesis, 2020. DOI: [10.1186/s41073-019-0088-0](https://doi.org/10.1186/s41073-019-0088-0)
16. N. Bray. Insight into citation bias, 2020. DOI: [10.1038/s41583-020-0357-4](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41583-020-0357-4)
17. A.L. Kim. The Politics of Citation, 2020. DOI: [10.1353/dia.2020.0016](https://doi.org/10.1353/dia.2020.0016)
18. L. Zhou; U. Amadi; D. Zhang. Is Self-Citation Biased? An Investigation via the Lens of Citation Polarity, Density, and Location, 2020. DOI: [10.1007/s10796-018-9889-9](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10796-018-9889-9)
19. P. Chatterjee; R.M. Werner. Gender Disparity in Citations in High-Impact Journal Articles, 2021. DOI: [10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2021.14509](https://doi.org/10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2021.14509)
20. S. Reardon. Fewer citations for female authors of medical research, 2021. DOI: [10.1038/d41586-021-02102-8](https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-021-02102-8)
21. A. Rubin; E. Rubin. Systematic Bias in the Progress of Research, 2021. DOI: [10.1086/715021](https://doi.org/10.1086/715021)
22. C. Rovira; L. Codina; C. Lopezosa. Language Bias in the Google Scholar Ranking Algorithm, 2021. DOI: [10.3390/fi13020031](https://doi.org/10.3390/fi13020031)
23. A. Jain; K.S. Khor; D. Beard; et al. Do journals raise their impact factor or SCImago ranking by self-citing in editorials? A bibliometric analysis of trauma and orthopaedic journals, 2021. DOI: [10.1111/ans.16546](https://doi.org/10.1111/ans.16546)
24. M.J.E. Urlings; B. Duyx; G.M.H. Swaen; et al. Citation bias and other determinants of citation in biomedical research: findings from six citation networks, 2021. DOI: [10.1016/j.jclinepi.2020.11.019](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclinepi.2020.11.019)
25. C. Nishioka; M. Farber; T. Saier. How does author affiliation affect preprint cita-

- tion count?: analyzing citation bias at the institution and country level, 2022. DOI: [10.1145/3529372.3530953](https://doi.org/10.1145/3529372.3530953)
26. P. Sebo. Publication and citation inequalities faced by African researchers, 2022. DOI: [10.1016/j.ejim.2022.08.014](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejim.2022.08.014)
 27. C.J. Gomez; A.C. Herman; P. Parigi. Leading countries in global science increasingly receive more citations than other countries doing similar research, 2022. DOI: [10.1038/s41562-022-01351-5](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-022-01351-5)
 28. P.C. Gotzsche. Citation bias: questionable research practice or scientific misconduct?, 2022. DOI: [10.1177/01410768221075881](https://doi.org/10.1177/01410768221075881)
 29. K.S. Ray; P. Zurn; J.D. Dworkin; et al. Citation bias, diversity, and ethics, 2022. DOI: [10.1080/08989621.2022.2111257](https://doi.org/10.1080/08989621.2022.2111257)
 30. M. Teplitskiy; E. Duede; M. Menietti; K.R. Lakhani. How status of research papers affects the way they are read and cited, 2022. DOI: [10.1016/j.respol.2022.104484](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2022.104484)
 31. E.G. Teich; J.Z. Kim; C.W. Lynn; et al. Citation inequity and gendered citation practices in contemporary physics, 2022. DOI: [10.1038/s41567-022-01770-1](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41567-022-01770-1)
 32. X. Zheng; J. Chen; E. Yan; C. Ni. Gender and country biases in Wikipedia citations to scholarly publications, 2022. DOI: [10.1002/asi.24723](https://doi.org/10.1002/asi.24723)
 33. F. Macgilchrist; J. Potter; B. Williamson. Reading internationally: if citing is a political practice, who are we reading and who are we citing?, 2022. DOI: [10.1080/17439884.2022.2140673](https://doi.org/10.1080/17439884.2022.2140673)
 34. H. Lyu; Y. Bu; Z. Zhao; et al. Citation bias in measuring knowledge flow: Evidence from the web of science at the discipline level, 2022. DOI: [10.1016/j.joi.2022.101338](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joi.2022.101338)
 35. A. Oza. Citations show gender bias - and the reasons are surprising, 2023. DOI: [10.1038/d41586-023-03474-9](https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-023-03474-9)
 36. A. Heidt. Racial inequalities in journals highlighted in giant study, 2023. DOI: [10.1038/d41586-023-01457-4](https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-023-01457-4)
 37. S. Pandey; T. Burch-Smith. Overcoming citation bias is necessary for true inclusivity in Plant Science, 2023. DOI: [10.1093/plcell/koad248](https://doi.org/10.1093/plcell/koad248)
 38. T. Asubiaro; S. Onaolapo; D. Mills. Regional disparities in Web of Science and Scopus journal coverage, 2024. DOI: [10.1007/s11192-024-04948-x](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-024-04948-x)
 39. A. Mattiazzi; M.Vila-Petroff. Unveiling the ethical void: Bias in reference citations and its academic ramifications, 2024. DOI: [10.1016/j.crphys.2024.100130](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.crphys.2024.100130)
 40. C. Wu. The gender citation gap: Approaches, explanations, and implications, 2024. DOI: [10.1111/soc4.13189](https://doi.org/10.1111/soc4.13189)
 41. S. Zhou; S. Chai; R.B. Freeman. Gender homophily: In-group citation preferences and

- the gender disadvantage, 2024. DOI: [10.1016/j.respol.2023.104895](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2023.104895)
42. D.S. Chawla. Self-citations in around a dozen countries are unusually high, 2024. DOI: [10.1038/d41586-024-00090-z](https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-024-00090-z)
 43. D. Normile. A ‘home bias’ in citations boosts China’s global science ranking, 2024. DOI: [10.1126/science.adt5690](https://doi.org/10.1126/science.adt5690)
 44. S. Qiu; C. Steinwender; P. Azoulay. Paper Tiger? Chinese Science and Home Bias in Citations, 2025. DOI: [10.1016/j.jinteco.2025.104123](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jinteco.2025.104123)
 45. Editorial. Citation diversity statements, 2025. DOI: [10.1038/s44159-025-00497-z](https://doi.org/10.1038/s44159-025-00497-z)
 46. R.A. Campbell; E. Helstrom; L. Chew; et al. Gender Disparities in Citations and Altmetric Attention Score in Oncology, 2025. DOI: [10.1200/OP-24-00767](https://doi.org/10.1200/OP-24-00767)
 47. I.F. de Fuentes. The gender citation gap, 2025. DOI: [10.1016/j.newton.2025.100099](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.newton.2025.100099)
 48. X. Yang; P. Zhou. Unveiling citation bias in economics: Taste-based discrimination against Chinese-authored papers, 2025. DOI: [10.1016/j.labeco.2025.102725](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.labeco.2025.102725)
 49. L. Bornmann; C. Leibel. Citation accuracy, citation noise, and citation bias: A foundation of citation analysis, 2025. DOI: [10.48550/arXiv.2508.12735](https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2508.12735)
 50. J. He. Who Gets Cited? Gender- and Majority-Bias in LLM-Driven Reference Selection, 2025. DOI: [10.48550/arXiv.2508.02740](https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2508.02740)
 51. [Home bias and China’s global standing in science.](#)
 52. [Unintended Consequences: The Perils of Publication and Citation Bias.](#)
 53. [China’s scientists often cite work from their own nation. Is that skewing global research rankings?.](#)
 54. [Some of The World’s Most-Cited Scientists Have a Secret That’s Just Been Exposed.](#)
 55. [Stop fake citations.](#)
 56. [Citation Bias - Confirmation Bias for Scientists.](#)
 57. [Chemistry researchers cite their own work the most.](#)
 58. [One-sided reference bias.](#)
 59. [What is in a Name? Additional Sources of Bias in Citation Counts.](#)
 60. [Weekend reads: Self-citation farms; an editor refuses to retract; publishing enters politics.](#)
 61. [Do We Need A Self-Citation Index?.](#)
 62. [Use and Abuse of Citations.](#)
 63. [Reference Bias: Identifying and Reducing in Surveys and Research.](#)
 64. [Citation indexes make research more unequal.](#)
 65. [Inequities of Race, Place, and Gender Among the Communication Citation Elite, 2000-](#)

2019.

66. Why are women cited less than men?.
67. Men Forget About Female Researchers, Says Study On Gender Citation Gap.
68. The Racial Politics of Citation.
69. Citational Racism: How Leading Medical Journals Reproduce Segregation in American Medical Knowledge.
70. Citations in science are biased towards a handful of nations - and the gap is growing.
71. The politics of citation: Is the peer review process biased against Indigenous academics?.
72. Wealthy nations rake in the citations while poorer countries go under-acknowledged.
73. What to do about gender and geo/linguistic bias in academic citations?.
74. The politics of citation.
75. Waking up to the politics of citation.
76. Academic publishing trends: self-citations and favoritism.
77. Citation: Research Management Tools.
78. The Politics of Citation: An Analysis of Doctoral Theses across Disciplines.
79. Towards Citational Justice.
80. Aspirational metrics - A guide for working towards citational justice.
81. Journal self-citations are increasingly biased toward impact factor years.
82. The role of trust and authority in the citation behaviour of researchers.
83. Losing the numbers game: abundant self-citations put journals at risk for a life without an impact factor.
84. Bias against novelty in science: A cautionary tale for users of bibliometric indicators.

4 Questionable Types and Practices of Citation

1. A.F. Mavrogenis; P. Ruggieri; P.J. Papagelopoulos. Editorial: Self-citation in Publishing, 2010. DOI: [10.1007/s11999-010-1480-8](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11999-010-1480-8)
2. A.W. Wilhite; E.A. Fong. Coercive Citation in Academic Publishing, 2012. DOI: [10.1126/science.1212540](https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1212540)
3. B.D. Thombs; I. Razykov. A solution to inappropriate self-citation via peer review, 2012. DOI: [10.1503/cmaj.120597](https://doi.org/10.1503/cmaj.120597)
4. M.R. Olsson. Author-Constructs & Trojan horse-ing: Academic citation as a strategic discursive practice, 2012. DOI: [10.1002/meet.2011.14504801087](https://doi.org/10.1002/meet.2011.14504801087)
5. C.-L. Chang; M. McAleer; L. Oxley. Coercive journal self citations, impact factor,

- Journal Influence and Article Influence, 2013. DOI: [10.1016/j.matcom.2013.04.006](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.matcom.2013.04.006)
6. B.D. Thombs; A.W. Levis; I. Razykov; et al. Potentially coercive self-citation by peer reviewers: A cross-sectional study, 2015. DOI: [10.1016/j.jpsychores.2014.09.015](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpsychores.2014.09.015)
 7. M. Maes. A review on citation amnesia in depression and inflammation research, 2015. PMID: [25789583](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/25789583/)
 8. C. Chorus; L. Waltman. A Large-Scale Analysis of Impact Factor Biased Journal Self-Citations, 2016. DOI: [10.1371/journal.pone.0161021](https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0161021)
 9. D. Shaw. The Trojan Citation and the "Accidental" Plagiarist, 2016. DOI: [10.1007/s11673-015-9696-7](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11673-015-9696-7)
 10. J.A.T. da Silva. The ethics of peer and editorial requests for self-citation of their work and journal, 2016. DOI: [10.1016/j.mjafi.2016.11.008](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mjafi.2016.11.008)
 11. M. Dadkhah; M. Lagzian; G. Borchardt. Questionable papers in citation databases as an issue for literature review, 2017. DOI: [10.1007/s12079-016-0370-6](https://doi.org/10.1007/s12079-016-0370-6)
 12. J.D. Wren; A. Valencia; J. Kelso. Reviewer-coerced citation: case report, update on journal policy and suggestions for future prevention, 2019. DOI: [10.1093/bioinformatics/btz071](https://doi.org/10.1093/bioinformatics/btz071)
 13. M. van de Weert; L. Stella. The dangers of citing papers you did not read or understand, 2019. DOI: [10.1016/j.molstruc.2019.03.024](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.molstruc.2019.03.024)
 14. J. Baas; C. Fennell. When Peer Reviewers Go Rogue - Estimated Prevalence of Citation Manipulation by Reviewers Based on the Citation Patterns of 69,000 Reviewers, 2019. Source: https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=3339568
 15. D.S. Chawla. Elsevier investigates hundreds of peer reviewers for manipulating citations, 2019. DOI: [10.1038/d41586-019-02639-9](https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-019-02639-9)
 16. L. Zhou; U. Amadi; D. Zhang. Is Self-Citation Biased? An Investigation via the Lens of Citation Polarity, Density, and Location, 2020. DOI: [10.1007/s10796-018-9889-9](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10796-018-9889-9)
 17. M. Szomszor; D.A. Pendlebury; J. Adams. How much is too much? The difference between research influence and self-citation excess, 2020. DOI: [10.1007/s11192-020-03417-5](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-020-03417-5)
 18. R.V. Noorden. Highly cited researcher banned from journal board for citation abuse, 2020. DOI: [10.1038/d41586-020-00335-7](https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-020-00335-7)
 19. D. Lyu; X. Ruan; J. Xie; Y. Cheng. The classification of citing motivations: a meta-synthesis, 2021. DOI: [10.1007/s11192-021-03908-z](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-021-03908-z)
 20. F. Sanfilippo; S. Tigano; A. Morgana; et al. Self-citation policies and journal self-citation rate among Critical Care Medicine journals, 2021. DOI: [10.1186/s40560-021-00530-2](https://doi.org/10.1186/s40560-021-00530-2)
 21. Z. Taskin; G. Dogan; E. Kulczycki; A.A. Zuccala. Self-Citation Patterns of Journals

- Indexed in the Journal Citation Reports, 2021. DOI: [10.1016/j.joi.2021.101221](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joi.2021.101221)
22. S. Moussa. A "Trojan horse" in the reference lists: Citations to a hijacked journal in SSCI-indexed marketing journals, 2021. DOI: [10.1016/j.acalib.2021.102388](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acalib.2021.102388)
 23. Y. Zhou. Factors, components and dynamics: investigation of journal self-citation and citation by equal opportunity model, 2022. DOI: [10.1016/j.heliyon.2022.e10292](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2022.e10292)
 24. A. Abalkina; G. Cabanac; C. Labbe; A. Magazinov. Improper legitimization of hijacked journals through citations, 2022. DOI: [10.48550/arXiv.2209.04703](https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2209.04703)
 25. S.P.J.M. Horbach; F.J.W.O. Maatman; W. Halfman; W.M. Hepkema. Automated citation recommendation tools encourage questionable citations, 2022. DOI: [10.1093/reseval/rvac016](https://doi.org/10.1093/reseval/rvac016)
 26. P. Lu. The Right, Wrong, and Unethical Ways in Reference Citations, 2023. DOI: [10.2514/1.G007372](https://doi.org/10.2514/1.G007372)
 27. N. Shomoossi; M. Rad. Self-citation: to do or not to do?, 2023. DOI: [10.18502/jmehm.v16i1.12884](https://doi.org/10.18502/jmehm.v16i1.12884)
 28. D.Z. Basil; S. Burton; A. Soboleva; P. Nesbit. Coercive Citation: Understanding the Problem and Working Toward a Solution, 2023. DOI: [10.5465/amp.2022.0081](https://doi.org/10.5465/amp.2022.0081)
 29. E.A. Fong; R. Patnayakuni; A.W. Wilhite. Accommodating coercion: Authors, editors, and citations, 2023. DOI: [10.1016/j.respol.2023.104754](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2023.104754)
 30. M. Mehregan; M. Moghiman. The Unnoticed Issue of Coercive Citation Behavior for Authors, 2024. DOI: [10.1007/s12109-024-09994-0](https://doi.org/10.1007/s12109-024-09994-0)
 31. J.P. Wahle; T. Ruas; M. Abdalla; et al. Citation Amnesia: On The Recency Bias of NLP and Other Academic Fields, 2024. DOI: [10.48550/arXiv.2402.12046](https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2402.12046)
 32. S. Burton; D.Z. Basil; A. Soboleva; P. Nesbit. Cite me! Perspectives on coercive citation in reviewing, 2024. DOI: [10.1108/JSM-08-2024-0387](https://doi.org/10.1108/JSM-08-2024-0387)
 33. S. Macdonald. Authorship in Academic Publishing and the Thirst for Citation, 2025. DOI: [10.2139/ssrn.5134231](https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.5134231)
 34. T. Sochi. Practices and Metrics of Citation in Scholarly Publishing, 2025. DOI: [10.2139/ssrn.5297510](https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.5297510)
 35. Self-citation: why (or why not), how, and when?.
 36. Addressing Reviewer Misconduct in Scholarly Publishing: MDPI's Proactive Steps.
 37. Editor manipulation of impact factor.
 38. What is self-citation and what does it have to do with academic integrity?.
 39. Do We Need A Self-Citation Index?.
 40. 14 Kinds of Bogus Citations.

41. Ethically Questionable Citation Practices.
42. The Problem with Too Much Self-Citation.
43. The Ethics of Self-Citation.
44. I spotted a paper with an absurd amount of self citations. Is this normal?.
45. The dangers of excessive self-citation.
46. on the perils of self-citation.
47. The Perils of Self-Citation: How It Can Ruin Your Academic Career.
48. Self-Citation: The Risks and Benefits.
49. Should you cite yourself or not? avoid citing your published papers in this publisher whenever possible in the future.
50. Should self-citations be included or excluded from measures of academic performance?.
51. Journal self-citation in the Journal Citation Reports - Science Edition (2002).
52. 2 open-access publishers accused of excessive self-citation.
53. Major indexing service sounds alarm on self-citations by nearly 50 journals.
54. Coercive citation.
55. Experiences with ‘coercive citation’.
56. Ways to Avoid Coercive Citations in Your Research Writing.
57. Let’s talk about coercive citation - and stand up to it.
58. Self-citations: are they good or bad?.
59. Citation amnesia: Not good for our health.
60. Forgotten Knowledge: Examining the Citational Amnesia in NLP.
61. Citation amnesia: The results.
62. Citation amnesia: Newton and Alhacen’s forgotten connection.
63. From Citation Amnesia to Bibliographic Plagiarism.
64. The Perils of Citation.
65. Cite yourself excessively, apologize, then republish the papers with fewer self-citations. Journal says: Fine.
66. What does citation mean? Values and practices in scholarly work.
67. Survey on inadequate and omitted citations in manuscripts: a precursory study in identification of tasks for a literature review and manuscript writing assistive system.
68. Citing Sources that Were Not Read or Thoroughly Understood.
69. The Impact of Incorrect Citations in Academic Work.
70. Coercive citations: the price of being published.
71. How Bibliometrics Incentivize Self-Citation.
72. A. Murat Eren’s Post.

73. Reviewer asking for citing 5 of his irrelevant articles.
74. A ‘joke’: Paper with ‘completely irrelevant’ citations retracted.
75. Timo Mandler’s Post.
76. Preventing Citation Manipulation During Peer Reviews.
77. Citing works in a list without having read them.
78. the citation dump - and three more citation tactics to avoid.
79. Editor and reviewers requiring authors to cite their own work.
80. My reviewer forced me to cite his papers.
81. Cite or be damned: Some Thoughts on Reviewer-Coerced Citation.
82. The case of the reviewer who said cite me or I won’t recommend acceptance of your work.
83. When Journal Editors Coerce Authors to Self-Cite.

5 Citation Value

Also see the previous sections (refer to § 1, § 2, § 3 and § 4).

1. M.A. Ferber. Citations: Are They an Objective Measure of Scholarly Merit?, 1986. DOI: [10.1086/494230](https://doi.org/10.1086/494230)
2. Editorial. Citation data: the wrong impact?, 1998. DOI: [10.1038/3639](https://doi.org/10.1038/3639)
3. P. Nieminen; J. Carpenter; G. Rucker; M. Schumacher. The relationship between quality of research and citation frequency, 2006. DOI: [10.1186/1471-2288-6-42](https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2288-6-42)
4. P.O. Seglen. Citations and journal impact factors: questionable indicators of research quality, 2007. DOI: [10.1111/j.1398-9995.1997.tb00175.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1398-9995.1997.tb00175.x)
5. C.T. Bergstrom; J.D. West; M.A. Wiseman. The Eigenfactor™ Metrics, 2008. DOI: [10.1523/JNEUROSCI.0003-08.2008](https://doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.0003-08.2008)
6. P.A. Todd; R.J. Ladle. Citations: poor practices by authors reduce their value, 2008. DOI: [10.1038/451244b](https://doi.org/10.1038/451244b)
7. B.R. Martin. Whither research integrity? Plagiarism, self-plagiarism and coercive citation in an age of research assessment, 2013. DOI: [10.1016/j.respol.2013.03.011](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2013.03.011)
8. Editorial. The maze of impact metrics, 2013. DOI: [10.1038/502271a](https://doi.org/10.1038/502271a)
9. C.W. Belter. Bibliometric indicators: opportunities and limits, 2015. DOI: [10.3163/1536-5050.103.4.014](https://doi.org/10.3163/1536-5050.103.4.014)
10. J. Ruscio. Taking Advantage of Citation Measures of Scholarly Impact: Hip Hip *h* Index!, 2016. DOI: [10.1177/1745691616664436](https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691616664436)

11. L. Leydesdorff; L. Bornmann; J.A. Comins; S. Milojevic. Citations: Indicators of Quality? The Impact Fallacy, 2016. DOI: [10.3389/frma.2016.00001](https://doi.org/10.3389/frma.2016.00001)
12. B. Duyx; M.J.E. Urlings; G.M.H. Swaen. Scientific citations favor positive results: a systematic review and meta-analysis, 2017. DOI: [10.1016/j.jclinepi.2017.06.002](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclinepi.2017.06.002)
13. D. Herrmannova; R.M. Patton; P. Knoth; C.G. Stahl. Citations and Readership are Poor Indicators of Research Excellence: Introducing TrueImpactDataset, a New Dataset for Validating Research Evaluation Metrics, 2017. DOI: [10.1145/3057148.3057154](https://doi.org/10.1145/3057148.3057154)
14. I.A. Moosa. The citation approach to journal ranking, 2018. DOI: [10.4337/9781786434937.00011](https://doi.org/10.4337/9781786434937.00011)
15. T. Tyler. Citation Metrics and Impact Factors Fail as Measures of Scientific Quality, in Particular in Taxonomy, and are Biased by Biological Discipline and by Geographic and Taxonomic Factors, 2018. DOI: [10.5735/085.055.0123](https://doi.org/10.5735/085.055.0123)
16. D.W. Aksnes; L. Langfeldt; P. Wouters. Citations, Citation Indicators, and Research Quality: An Overview of Basic Concepts and Theories, 2019. DOI: [10.1177/2158244019829575](https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244019829575)
17. M. Fire; C. Guestrin. Over-optimization of academic publishing metrics: observing Goodhart's Law in action, 2019. DOI: [10.1093/gigascience/giz053](https://doi.org/10.1093/gigascience/giz053)
18. A.M. Petersen; R.K. Pan; F. Pammolli; S. Fortunato. Methods to account for citation inflation in research evaluation, 2019. DOI: [10.1016/j.respol.2019.04.009](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2019.04.009)
19. R.I. Aroeira; M.A.R.B. Castanho. Can citation metrics predict the true impact of scientific papers?, 2020. DOI: [10.1111/febs.15255](https://doi.org/10.1111/febs.15255)
20. F. Buttner; C.L. Ardern; P. Blazey; et al. Counting publications and citations is not just irrelevant: it is an incentive that subverts the impact of clinical research, 2020. DOI: [10.1136/bjsports-2020-103146](https://doi.org/10.1136/bjsports-2020-103146)
21. M. Serra-Garcia; U. Gneezy. Nonreplicable publications are cited more than replicable ones, 2021. DOI: [10.1126/sciadv.abd1705](https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.abd1705)
22. D. Lyu; X. Ruan; J. Xie; Y. Cheng. The classification of citing motivations: a meta-synthesis, 2021. DOI: [10.1007/s11192-021-03908-z](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-021-03908-z)
23. F. Shu. Limitations of citation analysis on the measurement of research impact: A summary, 2021. DOI: [10.59494/dsi.2021.3.4](https://doi.org/10.59494/dsi.2021.3.4)
24. M.R. Dougherty; Z. Horne. Citation counts and journal impact factors do not capture some indicators of research quality in the behavioural and brain sciences, 2022. DOI: [10.1098/rsos.220334](https://doi.org/10.1098/rsos.220334)
25. M. Teplitzkiy; E. Duede; M. Menietti; K.R. Lakhani. How status of research papers affects the way they are read and cited, 2022. DOI: [10.1016/j.respol.2022.104484](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2022.104484)

26. N. Pontika; T. Klebel; A. Correia; et al. Indicators of research quality, quantity, openness, and responsibility in institutional review, promotion, and tenure policies across seven countries, 2022. DOI: [10.1162/qss_a_00224](https://doi.org/10.1162/qss_a_00224)
27. D.W. Aksnes; F.N. Piro; L.W. Fossum. Citation metrics covary with researchers' assessments of the quality of their works, 2023. DOI: [10.1162/qss_a_00241](https://doi.org/10.1162/qss_a_00241)
28. A. Mace. The Limits of Citation Counts, 2023. DOI: [10.48550/arXiv.1711.02695](https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.1711.02695)
29. M. Thelwall; K. Kousha; E. Stuart; et al. In which fields are citations indicators of research quality?, 2023. DOI: [10.1002/asi.24767](https://doi.org/10.1002/asi.24767)
30. A. Mutti. Pride and Concern for Bibliometric Achievements: Deserved Results or Result of Cites Inflation?, 2023. DOI: [10.23749/mdl.v114i4.14990](https://doi.org/10.23749/mdl.v114i4.14990)
31. I. Evdaimon; J.P.A. Ioannidis; G. Nikolentzos; et al. Metrics to Detect Small-Scale and Large-Scale Citation Orchestration, 2024. DOI: [10.48550/arXiv.2406.19219](https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2406.19219)
32. A. Matorevhu. Bibliometrics: Application Opportunities and Limitations, 2024. DOI: [10.5772/intechopen.1005292](https://doi.org/10.5772/intechopen.1005292)
33. A.W.K. Yeung. Is Citation Count a Legitimate Indicator of Scientific Impact? A Case Study of Upper (1974) "The Unsuccessful Self-Treatment of a Case of Writer's Block" and Its Derivatives, 2024. DOI: [10.3390/publications12040035](https://doi.org/10.3390/publications12040035)
34. L.V. Hove. Fake references and the value of citation databases, 2025. DOI: [10.1016/j.acalib.2025.103123](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acalib.2025.103123)
35. Performance-driven culture is ruining scientific research.
36. Beyond Predatory Publishing: Additional Questionable Offers in Scholarly Publishing.
37. Citation Statistics and Citation Rings.
38. How thousands of invisible citations sneak into papers and make for fake metrics.
39. What does citation mean? Values and practices in scholarly work.
40. What are the limitations of using citation counts to evaluate research impact?.
41. Limitations of citation analysis on the measurement of research impact: A summary.
42. Limitations of bibliometrics.
43. Pros and cons of bibliometrics.
44. Bibliometrics and Research Evaluation.
45. 'Highly Cited,' Highly Controversial.
46. Reading between the lines on citation value.
47. Is citation a true indicator of someone's research capability?.
48. Do Academic Citations Measure the Impact of New Ideas?.
49. Citation metrics, do they work?.

50. [Why is it bad to judge a paper by citation count?](#).
51. [Why Metrics Cannot Measure Research Quality: A Response to the HEFCE Consultation.](#)
52. [The role of trust and authority in the citation behaviour of researchers.](#)
53. [Research paper citation may skew its influence.](#)
54. [Do Academic Citations Measure the Impact of New Ideas?](#).
55. [When Do Citations Reflect "Impact?"](#).
56. [How Junk Citations Have Discredited the Academy.](#)
57. [Over 400 Scientific Papers Have Cited a ‘Phantom’ Reference That Never Existed.](#)
58. [Cat Becomes Well-Cited Scholar With New Scam Method.](#)

6 Citation and Artificial Intelligence

1. T. Day. A Preliminary Investigation of Fake Peer-Reviewed Citations and References Generated by ChatGPT, 2023. DOI: [10.1080/00330124.2023.2190373](https://doi.org/10.1080/00330124.2023.2190373)
2. A. De Cassai; B. Dost. Concerns regarding the uncritical use of ChatGPT: a critical analysis of AI-generated references in the context of regional anesthesia, 2023. DOI: [10.1136/rapm-2023-104771](https://doi.org/10.1136/rapm-2023-104771)
3. W.H. Walters; E.I. Wilder. Fabrication and errors in the bibliographic citations generated by ChatGPT, 2023. DOI: [10.1038/s41598-023-41032-5](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-023-41032-5)
4. M. Bhattacharyya; V.M. Miller; D. Bhattacharyya; L.E. Miller. High Rates of Fabricated and Inaccurate References in ChatGPT-Generated Medical Content, 2023. DOI: [10.7759/cureus.39238](https://doi.org/10.7759/cureus.39238)
5. A. Chen; D.O. Chen. Accuracy of Chatbots in Citing Journal Articles, 2023. DOI: [10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2023.27647](https://doi.org/10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2023.27647)
6. H.S. Al-Sinani; C.J. Mitchell. From Content Creation to Citation Inflation: A GenAI Case Study, 2025. DOI: [10.48550/arXiv.2503.23414](https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2503.23414)
7. A. Sharifi. Tackle fake citations generated by AI, 2025. DOI: [10.1038/d41586-025-02482-1](https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-025-02482-1)
8. J. He. Who Gets Cited? Gender- and Majority-Bias in LLM-Driven Reference Selection, 2025. DOI: [10.48550/arXiv.2508.02740](https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2508.02740)
9. E. Gibney. Can researchers stop AI making up citations?, 2025. DOI: [10.1038/d41586-025-02853-8](https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-025-02853-8)
10. N.T. Camp; J.A. Bengtson; J.C. Sandstrom. The citation catastrophe: Propagation of

AI-generated counterfeit citations in scholarship, 2025.

DOI: [10.1016/j.acalib.2025.103065](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acalib.2025.103065)

11. [ChatGPT and Fake Citations.](#)
12. [The Fabrication Problem: How AI Models Generate Fake Citations, URLs, and References.](#)
13. [Stop fake citations.](#)
14. [Free Citation Checker.](#)
15. [Springer Nature retracts book with fake citations. Help us find more cases like this.](#)
16. [ChatGPT and Generative Artificial Intelligence \(AI\): Incorrect bibliographic references.](#)
17. [Fake citations in academic papers: a growing concern.](#)
18. [AI Citation Fakes: Eroding Trust in Research and Legal Integrity.](#)
19. [Generative Artificial Intelligence : Fake Citations.](#)
20. [ChatGPT Fake Citations.](#)
21. [AI Search Has A Citation Problem.](#)
22. [Be Careful... ChatGPT Appears to be Making up Academic References.](#)
23. [Why does ChatGPT generate fake references?.](#)
24. [Why ChatGPT Creates Non-Existing Scientific Citations \(And How I Learned This the Hard Way\).](#)
25. [Don't get ghosted: Beware of ChatGPT generated citations.](#)
26. [Don't be surprised by AI chatbots creating fake citations.](#)
27. [Watch Out for Fake Citations from ChatGPT.](#)
28. [Recent study: AI search engines messing up citations.](#)

7 Citation and Questionable Publishing

1. T.F. Frandsen. Are predatory journals undermining the credibility of science? A bibliometric analysis of citers, 2017. DOI: [10.1007/s11192-017-2520-x](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-017-2520-x)
2. D.S. Chawla. Predatory-journal papers have little scientific impact, 2020. DOI: [10.1038/d41586-020-00031-6](https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-020-00031-6)
3. S. Moussa. A "Trojan horse" in the reference lists: Citations to a hijacked journal in SSCI-indexed marketing journals, 2021. DOI: [10.1016/j.acalib.2021.102388](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acalib.2021.102388)
4. S. Moussa. Citation contagion: a citation analysis of selected predatory marketing journals, 2021. DOI: [10.1007/s11192-020-03729-6](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-020-03729-6)

5. S. Moussa. Contamination by citations: references to predatory journals in the peer-reviewed marketing literature, 2021. DOI: [10.1108/SAJM-02-2021-0021](https://doi.org/10.1108/SAJM-02-2021-0021)
6. S. Akca; M. Akbulut. Are predatory journals contaminating science? An analysis on the Cabells' Predatory Report, 2021. DOI: [10.1016/j.acalib.2021.102366](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acalib.2021.102366)
7. M.A. Oviedo-Garcia. Journal citation reports and the definition of a predatory journal: The case of the Multidisciplinary Digital Publishing Institute (MDPI), 2021. DOI: [10.1093/reseval/rvab020](https://doi.org/10.1093/reseval/rvab020)
8. A. Abalkina; G. Cabanac; C. Labbe; A. Magazinov. Improper legitimization of hijacked journals through citations, 2022. DOI: [10.48550/arXiv.2209.04703](https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2209.04703)
9. T. You; J. Park; J.Y. Lee; J. Yun; W.-S. Jung. Disturbance of questionable publishing to academia, 2022. DOI: [10.1016/j.joi.2022.101294](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joi.2022.101294)
10. W.H. Walters. The citation impact of the Open Access accounting journals that appear on Beall's List of potentially predatory publishers and journals, 2022. DOI: [10.1016/j.acalib.2021.102484](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acalib.2021.102484)
11. B.S.L. Barrantes; S. Dalton; D. Andre. Bibliometrics Methods in Detecting Citations to Questionable Journals, 2023. DOI: [10.1016/j.acalib.2023.102749](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acalib.2023.102749)
12. C. Candal-Pedreira; C. Guerra-Tort; A. Ruano-Ravina; et al. Retracted papers originating from paper mills: a cross-sectional analysis of references and citations, 2024. DOI: [10.1016/j.jclinepi.2024.111397](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclinepi.2024.111397)
13. G. Tang; H. Cai. Citation Contamination of Systematic Review Literature in the Life Sciences by Paper Mills, 2024. DOI: [10.1101/2024.12.26.24319521](https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.12.26.24319521)
14. G. Tang; H. Cai. Citation Contamination by Paper Mill Articles in Systematic Reviews of the Life Sciences, 2025. DOI: [10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2025.15160](https://doi.org/10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2025.15160)
15. M.A. Albert; M.M. Lalu; A. Grudniewicz. Investigating the trustworthiness of research evidence used to inform public health policy: a qualitative interview study on the use of predatory journal citations in policy documents, 2025. DOI: [10.1186/s12961-024-01282-9](https://doi.org/10.1186/s12961-024-01282-9)
16. J.P. Berrio; O. Kalliokoski. Fraudulent studies are undermining the reliability of systematic reviews: on the prevalence of problematic images in preclinical depression studies, 2025. DOI: [10.1002/1873-3468.70077](https://doi.org/10.1002/1873-3468.70077)
17. E. Watson; L. Zhang. Analyzing the citation impact of predatory journals in the health sciences, 2025. DOI: [10.5195/jmla.2025.2024](https://doi.org/10.5195/jmla.2025.2024)
18. A. Martinino; F.W.J.M. Smeenk; V. Basile; et al. Understanding the Influence of Predatory Journals Articles Included within Systematic Reviews: A Scoping Review, 2025. DOI: [10.1080/0361526X.2025.2523389](https://doi.org/10.1080/0361526X.2025.2523389)

19. Citation Contamination: References to Predatory Journals in the Legitimate Scientific Literature.
20. How Predatory Journal Citations Affect Legitimate Medical Publications and the Phenomenon of Citation Contamination.
21. Predatory Publishing Practices and Citation Pollution.
22. Citation Contamination: Citations to Predatory Journals in the Mainstream Scientific Literature.
23. Retracted covid-19 papers and the levels of ‘citation pollution’: a preliminary analysis and directions for further research.
24. Fighting Citation Pollution - The Challenge of Detecting Fraudulent Journals in Works Cited.
25. Improper legitimization of hijacked journals through citations.
26. Improper Legitimization of Hijacked Journals Through Citations.
27. Discouraging citations to predatory journals could be counterproductive.
28. Poisoning the Well: Citation Contamination of Systematic Review Literature in the Life Sciences by Paper Mills.
29. Ioana A. Cristea’s Post.
30. Have You Cited a Fake Paper? Here’s How to Check.
31. Is it acceptable to cite good papers published in predatory journals?.
32. Citing articles from predatory journals.
33. How can someone avoid citing a research paper published in a predatory journal?.
34. Is it ethical to obliquely cite articles published by a predatory publisher?.
35. Impact Factor inflation : Multidisciplinary Publishing Institute (MDPI).

8 Citation and Retraction

1. J.M. Budd; M. Sievert; T.R. Schultz; C. Scoville. Effects of article retraction on citation and practice in medicine, 1999. [PMCID: PMC226618](#)
2. N.E. Drury; D.M. Karamanou. Citation of Retracted Articles: A Call for Vigilance, 2009. [DOI: 10.1016/j.athoracsur.2008.07.108](#)
3. A.M. Cosentino; D. Verissimo. Ending the citation of retracted papers, 2016. [DOI: 10.1111/cobi.12676](#)
4. J.A.T. da Silva; J. Dobranszki. Citing Retracted Papers Affects Education and Librar-

- ianship, so Distorted Academic Metrics Need a Correction, 2018.
DOI: [10.7710/2162-3309.2258](https://doi.org/10.7710/2162-3309.2258)
5. A. Mott; C. Fairhurst; D. Torgerson. Assessing the impact of retraction on the citation of randomized controlled trial reports: an interrupted time-series analysis, 2018. DOI: [10.1177/1355819618797965](https://doi.org/10.1177/1355819618797965)
 6. C. Candal-Pedreira; A. Ruano-Ravina; E. Fernandez; et al. Does retraction after misconduct have an impact on citations? A pre-post study, 2020.
DOI: [10.1136/bmjgh-2020-003719](https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjgh-2020-003719)
 7. A.B. Nagella; V.S. Madhugiri. Journal Retraction Rates and Citation Metrics: An Ouroboric Association?, 2020. DOI: [10.7759/cureus.11542](https://doi.org/10.7759/cureus.11542)
 8. M.J. Bolland; A. Grey; A. Avenell. Citation of retracted publications: A challenging problem, 2021. DOI: [10.1080/08989621.2021.1886933](https://doi.org/10.1080/08989621.2021.1886933)
 9. Y. Kataoka; M. Banno; Y. Tsujimoto; et al. Retracted randomized controlled trials were cited and not corrected in systematic reviews and clinical practice guidelines, 2022. DOI: [10.1016/j.jclinepi.2022.06.015](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclinepi.2022.06.015)
 10. A. De Cassai; F. Geraldini; S. De Pinto; et al. Inappropriate Citation of Retracted Articles in Anesthesiology and Intensive Care Medicine Publications, 2022.
DOI: [10.1097/ALN.0000000000004302](https://doi.org/10.1097/ALN.0000000000004302)
 11. Z. Wang; Q. Shi; Q. Zhou; et al. Retracted systematic reviews continued to be frequently cited: a citation analysis, 2022. DOI: [10.1016/j.jclinepi.2022.05.013](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclinepi.2022.05.013)
 12. A. Kuhberger; D. Streit; T. Scherndl. Self-correction in science: The effect of retraction on the frequency of citations, 2022. DOI: [10.1371/journal.pone.0277814](https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0277814)
 13. J.A.T. da Silva. Risks associated with the citation of retracted medical literature, 2023.
DOI: [10.19204/2022/RSKS2](https://doi.org/10.19204/2022/RSKS2)
 14. S. Khademizadeh; F. Danesh; S. Esmaeili; et al. Evolution of retracted publications in the medical sciences: Citations analysis, bibliometrics, and altmetrics trends, 2023.
DOI: [10.1080/08989621.2023.2223996](https://doi.org/10.1080/08989621.2023.2223996)
 15. C. Bakker; S. Boughton; C.M. Faggion; et al. Reducing the residue of retractions in evidence synthesis: ways to minimise inappropriate citation and use of retracted data, 2024. DOI: [10.1136/bmjebm-2022-111921](https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjebm-2022-111921)
 16. S. Woo; J.P. Walsh. On the shoulders of fallen giants: What do references to retracted research tell us about citation behaviors?, 2024. DOI: [10.1162/qss_a_00303](https://doi.org/10.1162/qss_a_00303)
 17. Y. Huang; J. Zhao; D. Cui; et al. Quantifying the Dynamics of Harm Caused by Retracted Research, 2024. DOI: [10.48550/arXiv.2501.00473](https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2501.00473)
 18. S.B. Xu; G. Hu. Worryingly high prevalence of retraction among top-cited researchers,

2024. DOI: [10.1038/d41586-024-03704-8](https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-024-03704-8)
19. A.J. Million; J. Budd. Disinformation in Science: Ethical Considerations for Citing Retracted Works, 2024. DOI: [10.1002/pra2.1025](https://doi.org/10.1002/pra2.1025)
 20. M. Schmidt. Why do some retracted articles continue to get cited?, 2024. DOI: [10.1007/s11192-024-05147-4](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-024-05147-4)
 21. S.R. Hosseiniara. Impact of Publication Retractions on Researcher and Journal Metrics: A Call for New Evaluation Formulas, 2024. DOI: [10.22037/jmlis.v5i.45983](https://doi.org/10.22037/jmlis.v5i.45983)
 22. S. Yang; F. Qi; H. Diao; I. Ajiferuke. Do retraction practices work effectively? Evidence from citations of psychological retracted articles, 2024. DOI: [10.1177/01655515221097623](https://doi.org/10.1177/01655515221097623)
 23. K.-C. Lin; Y.-C. Chen; M.-H. Lin; T.-J. Chen. The trend and ripple effects of retractions in primary health care: A bibliometric analysis, 2024. DOI: [10.1097/JCMA.0000000000001149](https://doi.org/10.1097/JCMA.0000000000001149)
 24. R. Magoon; V. Suresh. Living Up to the Recommendations on the Citation of Retracted Articles, 2025. DOI: [10.4103/aca.aca_144_24](https://doi.org/10.4103/aca.aca_144_24)
 25. J.A.T. da Silva; K. Santos-d’Amorim; H. Bornemann-Cimenti. The Citation of Retracted Papers and Impact on the Integrity of the Scientific Biomedical Literature, 2025. DOI: [10.1002/leap.1667](https://doi.org/10.1002/leap.1667)
 26. S.A. Memon; K. Makovi; B. AlShebli. Characterizing the effect of retractions on publishing careers, 2025. DOI: [10.1038/s41562-025-02154-0](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-025-02154-0)
 27. J.P.A. Ioannidis; A.M. Pezzullo; A. Cristiano; et al. Linking citation and retraction data reveals the demographics of scientific retractions among highly cited authors, 2025. DOI: [10.1371/journal.pbio.3002999](https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pbio.3002999)
 28. F. Song; B. Wu; G. Wei; et al. A systematic analysis of temporal trends, characteristics, and citations of retracted stem cell publications, 2025. DOI: [10.1186/s12916-025-03965-8](https://doi.org/10.1186/s12916-025-03965-8)
 29. H. Shi; Y. Yu; D.M. Romero; E.-A. Horvat. When Collaborative Maintenance Falls Short: The Persistence of Retracted Papers on Wikipedia, 2025. DOI: [10.48550/arXiv.2509.18403](https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2509.18403)
 30. G.F. Lendvai; P. Sasvari. ‘Wasted’ research and lost citations: A scientometric assessment of retracted documents in Scopus between 2001 and 2024, 2025. DOI: [10.1177/01655515251362383](https://doi.org/10.1177/01655515251362383)
 31. J. Ryan. Thousands of highly cited scientists have at least one retraction, 2025. DOI: [10.1038/d41586-025-00257-2](https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-025-00257-2)

32. Weekend reads: When retracted work is cited; another retraction for a Nobelist; should scientific fraud be illegal?.
33. Citing retracted papers has a negative domino effect on science, education, and society.
34. Springer Nature retracts book with fake citations. Help us find more cases like this.
35. A ‘joke’: Paper with ‘completely irrelevant’ citations retracted.
36. Citing a retracted paper.
37. How to Avoid Citing Retracted Papers.
38. Ask Retraction Watch: Is it OK to cite a retracted paper?.
39. What happens if a paper I cited gets retracted?.
40. If a paper you cite was retracted you will probably never know.
41. The challenge of citing retracted research.
42. Bad science: the role of media coverage in retractions of journal articles.
43. Context Analysis of Top Seven Retracted Articles: Should Retraction Watch Revisit the List?.
44. Researchers keep citing retracted papers.
45. Most citations to retracted papers don’t note they’re problematic, authors say.
46. More evidence scientists continue to cite retracted papers.
47. Retraction awareness: Equipping researchers with timely insights.
48. Clarivate to stop counting citations to retracted articles in journals’ impact factors.
49. Retracted data: how far do the ripples spread?.
50. Retracted papers keep being cited as if they weren’t retracted. Two researchers suggest how Elsevier could help fix that.
51. Why do some retracted articles continue to get cited?.
52. Top 10 most highly cited retracted papers.
53. Retracted scientific articles continue to be cited by other scientists as reliable sources.
54. Stanford Top 2% list: Quality vs Retractions.

9 Citation and Indexing Engines and Databases

1. T.N. Van Leeuwen; H.F. Moed; R.J.W. Tijssen; et al. Language biases in the coverage of the Science Citation Index and its consequences for international comparisons of national research performance, 2001. DOI: [10.1023/A:1010549719484](https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1010549719484)
2. D.D. Ridley. Citation searches in on-line databases: possibilities and pitfalls, 2001. DOI: [10.1016/S0167-2940\(01\)90065-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0167-2940(01)90065-2)

3. K. Dickersin; R. Scherer; E.S.T. Suci; M. Gil-Montero. Problems with indexing and citation of articles with group authorship, 2002. DOI: [10.1001/jama.287.21.2772](https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.287.21.2772)
4. P. Jacso. Testing the Calculation of a Realistic *h*-index in Google Scholar, Scopus, and Web of Science for F. W. Lancaster, 2008. DOI: [10.1353/lib.0.0011](https://doi.org/10.1353/lib.0.0011)
5. P. Jacso. The pros and cons of computing the *h*-index using Google Scholar, 2008. DOI: [10.1108/14684520810889718](https://doi.org/10.1108/14684520810889718)
6. C. Labbé. Ike Antkare one of the great stars in the scientific firmament, 2010. HAL Id: [hal-00713564](https://hal.archives-ouvertes.fr/hal-00713564), version 1
7. J. Beel; B. Gipp. Academic Search Engine Spam and Google Scholar's Resilience Against it, 2010. DOI: [10.3998/3336451.0013.305](https://doi.org/10.3998/3336451.0013.305)
8. M.A. Garcia-Perez. Strange attractors in the Web of Science database, 2011. DOI: [10.1016/j.joi.2010.07.006](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joi.2010.07.006)
9. E.D. Lopez-Cozar; N. Robinson-Garcia; D. Torres-Salinas. Manipulating Google Scholar Citations and Google Scholar Metrics: simple, easy and tempting, 2012. DOI: [10.48550/arXiv.1212.0638](https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.1212.0638)
10. E.D. Lopez-Cozar; N. Robinson-García; D. Torres-Salinas. The Google scholar experiment: How to index false papers and manipulate bibliometric indicators, 2013. DOI: [10.1002/asi.23056](https://doi.org/10.1002/asi.23056)
11. D. Giustini; M.N.K. Boulos. Google Scholar is not enough to be used alone for systematic reviews, 2013. DOI: [10.5210/ojphi.v5i2.4623](https://doi.org/10.5210/ojphi.v5i2.4623)
12. Y.-X.J. Wang; R. Arora; Y. Choi; et al. Implications of Web of Science journal impact factor for scientific output evaluation in 16 institutions and investigators' opinion, 2014. DOI: [10.3978/j.issn.2223-4292.2014.11.16](https://doi.org/10.3978/j.issn.2223-4292.2014.11.16)
13. C. Stansfield; K. Dickson; M. Bangpan. Exploring issues in the conduct of website searching and other online sources for systematic reviews: how can we be systematic?, 2016. DOI: [10.1186/s13643-016-0371-9](https://doi.org/10.1186/s13643-016-0371-9)
14. F. Franceschini; D. Maisano; L. Mastrogiacomo. The museum of errors/horrors in Scopus, 2016. DOI: [10.1016/j.joi.2015.11.006](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joi.2015.11.006)
15. F. Franceschini; D. Maisano; L. Mastrogiacomo. Empirical analysis and classification of database errors in Scopus and Web of Science, 2016. DOI: [10.1016/j.joi.2016.07.003](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joi.2016.07.003)
16. P. Mongeon; A. Paul-Hus. The journal coverage of Web of Science and Scopus: a comparative analysis, 2016. DOI: [10.1007/s11192-015-1765-5](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-015-1765-5)
17. F.R. Jensenius; M. Htun; D.J. Samuels; et al. The Benefits and Pitfalls of Google Scholar, 2018. DOI: [10.1017/S104909651800094X](https://doi.org/10.1017/S104909651800094X)
18. J.P. Tennant. Web of Science and Scopus are not global databases of knowledge, 2020.

[DOI: 10.3897/ese.2020.e51987](https://doi.org/10.3897/ese.2020.e51987)

19. A. Cortegiani; M. Ippolito; G. Ingoglia; et al. Citations and metrics of journals discontinued from Scopus for publication concerns: the GhoS(t)copus Project, 2020. [DOI: 10.12688/f1000research.23847.2](https://doi.org/10.12688/f1000research.23847.2)
20. N.M. Duc; D.V. Hiep; P.M. Thong; et al. Predatory Open Access Journals are Indexed in Reputable Databases: a Revisiting Issue or an Unsolved Problem, 2020. [DOI: 10.5455/medarh.2020.74.318-322](https://doi.org/10.5455/medarh.2020.74.318-322)
21. C. Rovira; L. Codina; C. Lopezosa. Language Bias in the Google Scholar Ranking Algorithm, 2021. [DOI: 10.3390/fi13020031](https://doi.org/10.3390/fi13020031)
22. S.-G. Kim. Critics for major indexing service, 2021. [DOI: 10.1186/s40902-021-00321-7](https://doi.org/10.1186/s40902-021-00321-7)
23. F.A. Loan; N. Nasreen; B. Bashir. Do authors play fair or manipulate Google Scholar h-index?, 2021. [DOI: 10.1108/LHT-04-2021-0141](https://doi.org/10.1108/LHT-04-2021-0141)
24. W. Liu. Caveats for the use of Web of Science Core Collection in old literature retrieval and historical bibliometric analysis, 2021. [DOI: 10.1016/j.techfore.2021.121023](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2021.121023)
25. D.S. Chawla. Hundreds of ‘predatory’ journals indexed on leading scholarly database, 2021. [DOI: 10.1038/d41586-021-00239-0](https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-021-00239-0)
26. Z. Li; A.W. Rainer. Academic search engines: constraints, bugs, and recommendations, 2022. [DOI: 10.1145/3548659.3561310](https://doi.org/10.1145/3548659.3561310)
27. R. Sauvayre. Types of Errors Hiding in Google Scholar Data, 2022. [DOI: 10.2196/28354](https://doi.org/10.2196/28354)
28. L. Delgado-Quiros; I.F. Aguillo; A. Martin-Martin; et al. Why are these publications missing? Uncovering the reasons behind the exclusion of documents in free-access scholarly databases, 2023. [DOI: 10.1002/asi.24839](https://doi.org/10.1002/asi.24839)
29. A. Abalkina. Challenges posed by hijacked journals in Scopus, 2023. [DOI: 10.1002/asi.24855](https://doi.org/10.1002/asi.24855)
30. T. Asubiaro; S. Onaolapo; D. Mills. Regional disparities in Web of Science and Scopus journal coverage, 2024. [DOI: 10.1007/s11192-024-04948-x](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-024-04948-x)
31. H. Ibrahim; F. Liu; Y. Zaki; T. Rahwan. Google Scholar is manipulatable, 2024. [DOI: 10.48550/arXiv.2402.04607](https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2402.04607)
32. C. Kacperski; M. Bielig; M. Makhortykh; et al. Examining bias perpetuation in academic search engines: An algorithm audit of Google and Semantic Scholar, 2024. [DOI: 10.5210/fm.v29i11.13730](https://doi.org/10.5210/fm.v29i11.13730)
33. H. Ibrahim; F. Liu; Y. Zaki; T. Rahwan. Citation manipulation through citation mills and pre-print servers, 2025. [DOI: 10.1038/s41598-025-88709-7](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-025-88709-7)
34. [Criticisms of the Citation System, and Google Scholar in Particular.](#)

35. [Manipulatable Google Scholar Citation Counts.](#)
36. [Citation indexing and indexes.](#)
37. [What are the advantages and disadvantages of citation databases?.](#)
38. [‘Sort by relevance’? Algorithms may bias literature searches.](#)
39. [Engineering the world’s highest cited cat, Larry.](#)
40. [Google Scholar is not broken \(yet\), but there are alternatives.](#)
41. [How to Fix Google Scholar Indexing Issues for Your Research Paper.](#)
42. [Critiques of Google Scholar.](#)
43. [Web of Science: A Web of Nonsense.](#)
44. [Scopus is broken - just look at its literature category.](#)
45. [Challenges posed by hijacked journals in Scopus.](#)
46. [GPT-fabricated scientific papers on Google Scholar: Key features, spread, and implications for preempting evidence manipulation.](#)
47. [Google Scholar is \(still\) doing nothing about citation manipulation.](#)
48. [Gaming the H-Index: The Dark Side of Google Scholar and ResearchGate.](#)
49. [Elsevier Unethically Promotes its Journals via Scopus: The Case of Heliyon.](#)
50. [Exclusive: Web of Science company involved in dubious awards in Iraq.](#)
51. [The wolf in Scopus’ clothing: Another hijacked journal has indexed nearly 900 articles.](#)
52. [Scopus: a data manipulation tool.](#)
53. [Attention Scopus Users! Study Reveals 67 Hijacked Journals Prompting Concerns.](#)
54. [Incident 724: Purportedly AI-Generated Papers Are Alleged to Have Manipulated Scopus Rankings in Top Philosophy Journals.](#)
55. [Google Scholar Shows Bias Against Non-English Papers.](#)
56. [‘Biased’ and ‘unethical’: Journal objects to Scopus delisting.](#)
57. [Some of Google scholars coverage might be problematic.](#)
58. [Scopus indexed a journal with a fake editorial board and a sham archive.](#)
59. [Google Scholar vs. Traditional Databases: Pros and Cons for Academic Research.](#)
60. [Pros and Cons of Google Scholar.](#)
61. [Does Scopus Intentionally Allow Journals to Scam Authors? Evidences Suggest.](#)
62. [The Social Science Citation Index: A Black Box-with an Ideological Bias?.](#)
63. [The Clarivate Controversy: How CiteScore Rank Provides a Response to Arbitrary Delisting.](#)

10 Awards and Honors

1. H. Zuckerman. *Scientific Elite: Nobel Laureates in the United States*. 1977. ISBN: [9780029357606](#)
2. E. Crawford. Nobel : Always the Winners, Never the Losers, 1998. DOI: [10.1126/science.282.5392.1256](#)
3. D. Dorling. Putting Men on A Pedestal: Nobel Prizes as Superhuman Myths?, 2010. DOI: [10.1111/j.1740-9713.2010.00447.x](#)
4. R.J. Roberts. Ten Simple Rules to Win a Nobel Prize, 2015. DOI: [10.1371/journal.pcbi.1004084](#)
5. M. Barany. The Fields Medal should return to its roots, 2018. DOI: [10.1038/d41586-018-00513-8](#)
6. P. Lunnemann; M.H. Jensen; L. Jauffred. Gender bias in Nobel prizes, 2019. DOI: [10.1057/s41599-019-0256-3](#)
7. Y. Ma; D.F.M. Oliveira; T.K. Woodruff; B. Uzzi. Women who win prizes get less money and prestige, 2019. DOI: [10.1038/d41586-019-00091-3](#)
8. S.S. Kantha. Cancer research recognized (and ignored) by the Nobel prizes, 2020. DOI: [10.4103/ijc.IJC_251_20](#)
9. L.I. Meho. The gender gap in highly prestigious international research awards, 2001-2020, 2021. DOI: [10.1162/qss_a_00148](#)
10. H.-C.H. Chang; F. Fu. Elitism in mathematics and inequality, 2021. DOI: [10.1057/s41599-020-00680-y](#)
11. T.T. Le; D.S. Himmelstein; A.A. Hippen; et al. Analysis of scientific society honors reveals disparities, 2021. DOI: [10.1016/j.cels.2021.07.007](#)
12. M.A. Lichtman. Controversies in Selecting Nobel Laureates: An Historical Commentary, 2022. DOI: [10.5041/RMMJ.10479](#)
13. J.W. Jacobs; L.A. Bibb; E.S. Allen; et al. Women and non-white people among Lasker Award recipients from 1946 to 2022: cross sectional study, 2023. DOI: [10.1136/bmj-2023-074968](#)
14. M. Lagisz. Research prizes are opaque and rife with bias - it's time to shake them up, 2023. DOI: [10.1038/d41586-023-04027-w](#)
15. K. Neikirk; Z. Vue; N. Vue; et al. Disparities in Funding for Nobel Prize Awards in Medicine and Physiology Across Nationalities, Races, and Gender, 2024. DOI: [10.1002/jcp.31157](#)
16. M. Lagisz; J. Rutkowska; U. Aich; et al. "Best Paper" awards lack transparency, inclu-

- sivity, and support for Open Science, 2024. DOI: [10.1371/journal.pbio.3002715](https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pbio.3002715)
17. A.E. Hultgren; N.M.F. Patras; J. Hicks. Blinding reduces institutional prestige bias during initial review of applications for a young investigator award, 2024. DOI: [10.7554/eLife.92339](https://doi.org/10.7554/eLife.92339)
 18. A. Hopkins-Doyle; J. Chalmers; D. Toribio-Florez; A. Cichocka. Gender disparities in social and personality psychology awards from 1968 to 2021, 2024. DOI: [10.1038/s44271-024-00113-5](https://doi.org/10.1038/s44271-024-00113-5)
 19. C.S. Maldonado-Vlaar. New Perspective of the Persistent Gender and Diversity Gap in Nobel Prizes, 2025. DOI: [10.1523/JNEUROSCI.2341-24.2024](https://doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.2341-24.2024)
 20. [Nobel Prize controversies.](#)
 21. [7 Nobel Prize Scandals.](#)
 22. [The Nobel Prizes: What is the point?.](#)
 23. [Nobel Laureates Who Were Not Always Noble.](#)
 24. [The Nobel Illusion: Why the Nobel Prize in Economics Needs to be Abolished.](#)
 25. [The Problem With the Nobel Prizes.](#)
 26. [Why Nobel prizes fail 21st-century science.](#)
 27. [Do the Nobel prizes do more harm than good?.](#)
 28. [The problem with Nobel's 'rule of three'.](#)
 29. [I love math and I hate the Fields Medal.](#)
 30. [Fields Medal was never meant for 'the greatest mathematical genius'.](#)
 31. [The Errors in the Fields Medals, 1982 to S. T. Yau and 1990 to E. Witten.](#)
 32. [Men won all the science Nobels this year. There's an even bigger problem.](#)
 33. [The Nobel Prize Gender Gap Persists for One Simple Reason.](#)
 34. [The Nobel Prize Gender Gap.](#)
 35. [SySTEMic Misogyny: Why Women Do Not Win Nobel Prizes at the Same Rate as Men.](#)
 36. [Age, Gender, and the Highest Award in Mathematics.](#)
 37. [Even in mathematics, who you know may matter more than your talent.](#)
 38. [The Jewish Bias of the Nobel Prize.](#)
 39. [What? Not All Jews Are Geniuses?.](#)
 40. [A Quiet Bias Is Keeping Black Scientists from Winning Nobel Prizes.](#)
 41. [The Fields Medal Fallacy: Why this Math Prize Should Return to its Roots as a Tool for Shaping the Discipline.](#)
 42. [The Forgotten Dream of the Fields Medal.](#)

43. [Think Nobel Prizes Are Apolitical? Think Again.](#)
44. [The majority doesn't care about Nobel Prizes because the winners represent elitism.](#)
45. [The problem with Nobel prizes and the myth of the lone genius.](#)
46. [Nobel Prizes have a diversity problem even worse than the scientific fields they honor.](#)
47. [The Folly of Big Science Awards.](#)
48. [The Absurdity of the Nobel Prizes in Science.](#)
49. [Another All-male Lineup for the Science Nobels: Is It Time to Stop Caring?.](#)
50. [Access to Opportunity in the Sciences: Evidence from the Nobel Laureates.](#)
51. [The science behind winning a Nobel prize? Being a man from a wealthy family.](#)
52. [The science behind winning a Nobel prize? Being a man from a wealthy family.](#)
53. [Does science need heroes?.](#)
54. [Nobel prize winners far more likely to come from wealthy families highlighting inequality in the sciences.](#)
55. [Ig Nobel prizes reward study on why luck, not talent, leads to success.](#)
56. [Minding the gender gap in science prizes.](#)
57. [When a series of entirely reasonable decisions leads to biased outcomes: thoughts on the Waterman Award.](#)
58. [Rethinking Awards Processes.](#)
59. [Let's Abolish Academic Prizes.](#)
60. [The glut of prizes is undermining the true value of research and teaching.](#)
61. [Prizes Like The Nobel Are Unjust—And Bad For Science.](#)
62. [Why the Nobel Prize Doesn't Deserve Our Love.](#)
63. [What the Nobel Prizes Are Not.](#)
64. [The Nobel Prize Is Bad And We Should Feel Bad.](#)
65. [The Nobel Prize Is Really Annoying.](#)

11 Idolization, Fabrication and Inflation

Also see some of the previous articles in this series related to things like plagiarism and fraud of scientists (especially the famous ones); e.g. “Plagiarism” section in the first article and “Fraud, Fabrication, Cheating and Dishonesty” section in the fourth article.

1. W. Broad; N. Wade. *Betrayers of the Truth: Fraud and Deceit in the Halls of Science.* 1983. [ISBN: 9780712602433](#)
2. J. Giles. Scientists behaving badly, 2004. [DOI: 10.1038/news040301-9](#)

3. B.C. Martinson; M.S. Anderson; R. de Vries. Scientists behaving badly, 2005. DOI: [10.1038/435737a](https://doi.org/10.1038/435737a)
4. M. Brooks. Einstein's dealings with physics fraudster, 2007. DOI: [10.1016/S0262-4079\(07\)62922-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0262-4079(07)62922-4)
5. J. van Dongen. Emil Rupp, Albert Einstein and the canal ray experiments on wave-particle duality: Scientific fraud and theoretical bias, 2007. DOI: [10.48550/arXiv.0709.3099](https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.0709.3099)
6. B. Almassi. Trust in expert testimony: Eddington's 1919 eclipse expedition and the British response to general relativity, 2009. DOI: [10.1016/j.shpsb.2008.08.003](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.shpsb.2008.08.003)
7. N. Kollerstrom. *The Dark Side of Isaac Newton: Science's Greatest Fraud?* 2018. ISBN: [9781526740540](https://www.isbn-international.org/product/9781526740540)
8. R.V. Noorden; D.S. Chawla. Hundreds of extreme self-citing scientists revealed in new database, 2019. DOI: [10.1038/d41586-019-02479-7](https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-019-02479-7)
9. A.J. Abduh. Hyperprolific authors in the top 2% scientists of the world, 2022. DOI: [10.22541/au.167243694.40444786/v2](https://doi.org/10.22541/au.167243694.40444786/v2)
10. A.J. Abduh. A Critical Analysis of the World's Top 2% Most Influential Scientists: Examining the Limitations and Biases of Highly Cited Researchers Lists, 2023. DOI: [10.22541/au.167435298.80209125/v1](https://doi.org/10.22541/au.167435298.80209125/v1)
11. M. Catanzaro. Saudi universities lose highly cited researchers after payment schemes raise ethics concerns, 2023. DOI: [10.1126/science.zhs1429](https://doi.org/10.1126/science.zhs1429)
12. N. Sfetcu. Isaac Newton Vs. Robert Hooke on the Law of Universal Gravitation, 2023. DOI: [10.58679/MM39765](https://doi.org/10.58679/MM39765)
13. S.B. Xu; G. Hu. Worryingly high prevalence of retraction among top-cited researchers, 2024. DOI: [10.1038/d41586-024-03704-8](https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-024-03704-8)
14. P. Mora; S. Pilia. A proposed framework to address metric inflation in research publications, 2024. DOI: [10.1080/08989621.2024.2445280](https://doi.org/10.1080/08989621.2024.2445280)
15. F. Graham. Daily briefing: Claims of fraud plague one of the most-cited neuroscience researchers, 2024. DOI: [10.1038/d41586-024-03216-5](https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-024-03216-5)
16. B.A. Abdalla; A.M. Mustafa; F.H. Fattah; et al. Self-citation pattern among world's top 2 % of the scientists, 2025. DOI: [10.1016/j.heliyon.2025.e42471](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2025.e42471)
17. J. Briggs. *The Scientist Who Wasn't There: A true story of staggering deception.* 2025. ISBN: [9781804189726](https://www.isbn-international.org/product/9781804189726)
18. [Does science need heroes?](#).
19. [Some of The World's Most-Cited Scientists Have a Secret That's Just Been Exposed.](#)

20. The "Top 2% most influential scientists of 2020" according to Stanford.
21. Citation amnesia: Newton and Alhacen's forgotten connection.
22. Did Isaac Newton plagiarize his work from Ibn-Al Haytham?.
23. The Einstein myth: Why the cult of personality is bad for science.
24. How authentic is this list?.
25. Eddington's excused for fraud in 1919, Einstein says its okay to commit fraud.
26. December 1934: Emil Rupp's Research, Which Fooled Even Einstein, is Exposed as Fraud.
27. The Buzz Surrounding the World's Top 2% Scientists.
28. The list of the world's most-cited scientists excludes 1,000 researchers over fraudulent practices.
29. Scientists Behaving Badly.
30. Over 1,000 excluded from highly cited researcher list for 'fraud'.
31. Albert Einstein: Plagiarist of the Century?.
32. Betrayers of the Truth.
33. Histories: Einstein's convenient untruths.
34. How easy is it to fudge your scientific rank? Meet Larry, the world's most cited cat.
35. Guest Post - The Perplexing Puzzle of the Top 2% Scientists List.
36. Growing numbers of 'highly cited' turn out to be fraudsters.
37. The giants of science.
38. Among world's top researchers 10% publish at unrealistic levels, analysis finds.
39. I was scared and intimidated by the number of citations of top scientists when I used Google Scholar.
40. Stanford/Elsevier rank list: why all that glitters is not gold.
41. The More Widely Cited A Study Is, The More Likely It Is To Exaggerate, Says This Study.
42. Dozens of the world's most cited scientists stop falsely claiming to work in Saudi Arabia.
43. Hinton's Google Scholar profile keeps inflating citations for his top paper.
44. Report: The Top 2% Scientists List -A Hoax Disguised as Prestige.
45. Purr-fect Citations: How a Cat Became the World's Most Cited Academic.
46. Saudi universities suffer from purge of list of highly cited researchers.
47. The new academic bandits in town.
48. The Einstein Cult: Why Physicists Are Fundamentalists.
49. Poincare, Einstein and the Relativity: the Surprising Secret.
50. Leibniz-Newton calculus controversy.

51. [Newton-Hooke priority controversy for the inverse square law.](#)
52. [Why Was Isaac Newton Was The Later Accused Of Plagiarism.](#)
53. [Why did Issac Newton take revenge on Robert Hooke?.](#)
54. [The Rivalry Between Isaac Newton and Robert Hooke.](#)
55. [My father the fraud: Daughter reveals how key scientist in Primodos scandal built career on lies.](#)

12 Celebrity Culture

1. L.M. Krauss. [Scientists as celebrities: Bad for science or good for society?](#), 2015. DOI: [10.1177/0096340214563676](#)
2. D. Fahy. *The New Celebrity Scientists: Out of the Lab and into the Limelight*. 2015. ISBN: [9781442233423](#)
3. P.W. Walsh; D. Lehmann. [Academic Celebrity](#), 2021. DOI: [10.1007/s10767-019-09340-9](#)
4. [Scientific celebrity.](#)
5. [Are pop star scientists bad for science?.](#)
6. [Einstein and the cult of celebrity.](#)
7. [Celebrity Academics.](#)
8. [The Celebrity Scientists: A collective case study.](#)
9. [Science hype and celebrity culture make a bad pair.](#)
10. [The rise of the Super Profs: should we be worried about celebrity academics?.](#)
11. [Celebrity academics and superstar professors.](#)
12. [Do We Need Academic Celebrities?.](#)
13. [‘Lame’ celebrity academics feed ‘psychopathic careerism’.](#)
14. [Galileo was right: universities revolve around their stars.](#)
15. [I wanted to be an academic, not a ‘creative’: Notes on universities and the new capitalism.](#)
16. [A Brief History of Scientific Celebrity.](#)
17. [Review: The New Celebrity Scientists. Out of the Lab and into the Limelight.](#)
18. [Scientist or Trope? How does pop culture shape how we view scientists in the real world?.](#)

13 ORCID

1. C.B. Carter; C.F. Blanford. All authors must now supply ORCID identifiers, 2017. DOI: [10.1007/s10853-017-0919-7](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10853-017-0919-7)
2. M. Baglioni; A. Mannocci; P. Manghi; et al. Reflections on the Misuses of ORCID iDs, 2021. DOI: [10.5281/zenodo.4548308](https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.4548308)
3. J.A.T. da Silva. Abuse of ORCID's weaknesses by authors who use paper mills, 2021. DOI: [10.1007/s11192-021-03996-x](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-021-03996-x)
4. J.A.T. da Silva. Non-compliance with ethical rules caused by misuse of ORCID accounts: Implications for medical publications in the COVID-19 era, 2021. DOI: [10.1016/j.jemep.2021.100692](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jemep.2021.100692)
5. J.A.T. da Silva. A dangerous triangularization of conflicting values in academic publishing: ORCID, fake authors, and risks with the lack of criminalization of the creators of fake elements, 2021. DOI: [10.12681/eml.27238](https://doi.org/10.12681/eml.27238)
6. J.A.T. da Silva. Is Mandatory ORCID a Violation of an Author's Freedoms and Rights?, 2022. DOI: [10.1080/00987913.2021.2022395](https://doi.org/10.1080/00987913.2021.2022395)
7. J.A.T. da Silva. Discontinuity between journals' registration and submission requirements for Open Researcher and Contributor ID (ORCID), 2024. DOI: [10.1111/nae2.12061](https://doi.org/10.1111/nae2.12061)
8. F. Houghton; A. Foster. Resistance and Power in Irish Higher Education: ORCID and the Monitored University, 2024. DOI: [10.1016/j.acalib.2024.102853](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acalib.2024.102853)
9. J.A.T. da Silva; B. Yang; M. Choras. Open Researcher and Contributor IDs (ORCID) with the name 'ORCID': Risk to the integrity of the ORCID registry, 2025. DOI: [10.1177/01655515251362406](https://doi.org/10.1177/01655515251362406)
10. [ORCID: Issues and concerns about its use for academic purposes and research integrity.](#)
11. [Problems with ORCID, or Why I Don't Have an ORCID Number.](#)
12. [Problems with ORCID, or 10 reasons why I don't have an ORCID number.](#)

14 Grade Inflation

1. E. Pattison; E. Grodsky; C. Muller. Is the Sky Falling? Grade Inflation and the Signaling Power of Grades, 2013. DOI: [10.3102/0013189X13481382](https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X13481382)
2. I. Finefter-Rosenbluh; M. Levinson. What Is Wrong With Grade Inflation (if Anything)?, 2015. DOI: [10.7202/1070362ar](https://doi.org/10.7202/1070362ar)

3. F. Chowdhury. Grade Inflation: Causes, Consequences and Cure, 2018.
DOI: [10.5539/jel.v7n6p86](https://doi.org/10.5539/jel.v7n6p86)
4. M. Nordin; G. Heckley; U. Gerdtham. The impact of grade inflation on higher education enrolment and earnings, 2019. DOI: [10.1016/j.econedurev.2019.101936](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.econedurev.2019.101936)
5. Y. Cheng; D. Kong. Are female teachers more likely to practice grade inflation? Evidence from China, 2023. DOI: [10.1016/j.chieco.2023.101987](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chieco.2023.101987)
6. E. Karadag; I.T. Dortyol. Evidence of grade inflation in bachelor of business administration degrees in Turkey for the period from 2002 to 2022, 2024.
DOI: [10.1057/s41599-024-02868-y](https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-024-02868-y)
7. Y. Kiziltas. An important problem we need to face in schools: Inflated grades and grade inflation, 2024. DOI: [10.1111/ejed.12744](https://doi.org/10.1111/ejed.12744)
8. E. Tamir. Who cares about grade inflation? The role of institutional policy in regulating course grades in higher education, 2025. DOI: [10.1080/02602938.2025.2572031](https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2025.2572031)
9. C.N. Radavoi; C. Quadrelli; P. Collins. Moral Responsibility for Grade Inflation: Where Does It Lie?, 2025. DOI: [10.1007/s10805-025-09627-x](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10805-025-09627-x)
10. [Grade inflation.](#)
11. [Universities told to end ‘spiralling’ grade inflation.](#)
12. [The Impact of Unexplained Grade Inflation on Top Grades in UK Universities.](#)
13. [The great university con: how the British degree lost its value.](#)
14. [Grade inflation: a clear and present danger.](#)
15. [Universities to be fined for awarding too many top degrees.](#)
16. [Is grade inflation a worldwide trend?.](#)
17. [Grade inflation: The biggest threat to academic standards and university credibility.](#)
18. [What’s your degree worth? UoM grade inflation revealed.](#)
19. [Explaining "unexplained" grade inflation in the UK’s universities.](#)
20. [A Decade of Grade Inflation boosted by the COVID-19 pandemic - An Empirical Analysis of a Top European University.](#)
21. [Is grade inflation running wild?.](#)
22. [The Perverse Consequences of the Easy A.](#)
23. [Grade Inflation ... Why It’s a Nightmare.](#)
24. [To Counter Grade Inflation, We Need To Change The Way We Teach.](#)
25. [‘Soul-Crushing’: Students Slam Harvard’s Grade Inflation Report.](#)
26. [Maintaining the credibility of degrees.](#)
27. [Harvard says it’s been giving too many A grades to students.](#)

28. [Grade inflation: how certain subjects fuel rise in firsts.](#)
29. [Problems caused by grade inflation.](#)
30. [Grade inflation: what can universities do about it?.](#)
31. [Universities must not allow a ‘decade of grade inflation to be baked into the system’.](#)
32. [‘The customer is always right’: why some uni teachers give higher grades than students deserve.](#)
33. ["Unexplained" grade inflation in 2024.](#)
34. [OfS issues warning after finding evidence of grade inflation.](#)
35. [University grade inflation starts to drop, but half of top grades still unexplained.](#)
36. [How universities are turning the corner on grade inflation.](#)
37. [Top marks fall by a fifth at some universities amid grade deflation.](#)

15 Evaluating and Quantifying Credit

1. T. Tschardt; M.E. Hochberg; T.A. Rand; et al. Author Sequence and Credit for Contributions in Multiauthored Publications, 2007. DOI: [10.1371/journal.pbio.0050018](https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pbio.0050018)
2. M. Schreiber. A modification of the h -index: The h_m -index accounts for multi-authored manuscripts, 2008. DOI: [10.1016/j.joi.2008.05.001](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joi.2008.05.001)
3. M. Schreiber. To share the fame in a fair way, h_m modifies h for multi-authored manuscripts, 2008. DOI: [10.1088/1367-2630/10/4/040201](https://doi.org/10.1088/1367-2630/10/4/040201)
4. N.T. Hagen. Harmonic Allocation of Authorship Credit: Source-Level Correction of Bibliometric Bias Assures Accurate Publication and Citation Analysis, 2008. DOI: [10.1371/journal.pone.0004021](https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0004021)
5. G. Prathap. The fractional and harmonic p -indices for multiple authorship, 2010. DOI: [10.1007/s11192-010-0257-x](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-010-0257-x)
6. S. Galam. Tailor based allocations for multiple authorship: a fractional gh -index, 2011. DOI: [10.1007/s11192-011-0447-1](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-011-0447-1)
7. X.Z. Liu; H. Fang. Modifying h -index by allocating credit of multi-authored papers whose author names rank based on contribution, 2012. DOI: [10.1016/j.joi.2012.05.002](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joi.2012.05.002)
8. G. Abramo; C.A. D’Angelo; F. Rosati. The importance of accounting for the number of co-authors and their order when assessing research performance at the individual level in the life sciences, 2013. DOI: [10.1016/j.joi.2012.11.003](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joi.2012.11.003)
9. E. Shaffer. Too many authors spoil the credit, 2014. DOI: [10.1155/2014/381676](https://doi.org/10.1155/2014/381676)
10. L. de Mesnard. Attributing credit to coauthors in academic publishing: The $1/n$ rule,

- parallelization, and team bonuses, 2017. DOI: [10.1016/j.ejor.2017.01.009](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejor.2017.01.009)
11. L. Bornmann; A. Osorio. The value and credits of n-authors publications, 2018. DOI: [10.48550/arXiv.1805.10521](https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.1805.10521)
 12. V. Vavrycuk. Fair ranking of researchers and research teams, 2018. DOI: [10.1371/journal.pone.0195509](https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0195509)
 13. A. Tietze; S. Galam; P. Hofmann. Crediting multi-authored papers to single authors, 2019. DOI: [10.1016/j.physa.2020.124652](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physa.2020.124652)
 14. G. Prathap. Fractionalization of h -index for multiple authorship - an impact-based interpretation conserving counts, 2020. DOI: [10.18520/cs/v118/i6/961-965](https://doi.org/10.18520/cs/v118/i6/961-965)
 15. H.A. Jain; R. Chandra. Research impact evaluation based on effective authorship contribution sensitivity: h-leadership index, 2025. DOI: [10.48550/arXiv.2503.18236](https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2503.18236)
 16. [Guidance on metrics for papers with many authors.](#)
 17. [Does number of secondary authors decrease the credit of first author?.](#)
 18. [Almost Always Unequal: Co-Authors' Contributions to Scientific Publications.](#)
 19. [Is it fair to "count" publications with several collaborators just the same as single-author publications?.](#)

16 Fake Qualifications

See some of our previous articles of this series (e.g. section “Credential, Admission and Test Frauds” in the fourth article).

17 Miscellaneous

1. L.L. Lange; P.A. Frensch. Gaining scientific recognition by position: Does editorship increase citation rates?, 1999. DOI: [10.1007/BF02458490](https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02458490)
2. D.S. Greenberg. *Science, Money, and Politics: Political Triumph and Ethical Erosion*. 2001. ISBN: [9780226306346](https://www.amazon.com/dp/9780226306346)
3. M. Callahan; R.L. Wears; E. Weber. Journal Prestige, Publication Bias, and Other Characteristics Associated With Citation of Published Studies in Peer-Reviewed Journals, 2002. DOI: [10.1001/jama.287.21.2847](https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.287.21.2847)
4. D. Zhao. Dispelling the Myths Behind First-author Citation Counts, 2007. DOI: [10.1002/meet.14504301194](https://doi.org/10.1002/meet.14504301194)

5. J. Grant. *Corrupted Science: Fraud, Ideology and Politics in Science*. 2007. ISBN: [9781904332732](#)
6. M. Errami; H. Garner. A tale of two citations, 2008. DOI: [10.1038/451397a](#)
7. N.A. Trikalinos; E. Evangelou; J.P.A. Ioannidis. Falsified papers in high-impact journals were slow to retract and indistinguishable from nonfraudulent papers, 2008. DOI: [10.1016/j.jclinepi.2007.11.019](#)
8. V. Lariviere; Y. Gingras; E. Archambault. The decline in the concentration of citations, 1900-2007, 2009. DOI: [10.1002/asi.21011](#)
9. G.J. Borjas; K.B. Doran. Prizes and Productivity: How Winning the Fields Medal Affects Scientific Output, 2015. Source: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/24735983>
10. U. Sandstrom; P. van den Besselaar. Quantity and/or Quality? The Importance of Publishing Many Papers, 2016. DOI: [10.1371/journal.pone.0166149](#)
11. R. Benedictus; F. Miedema; M.W.J. Ferguson. Fewer numbers, better science, 2016. DOI: [10.1038/538453a](#)
12. A. Agarwal; D. Durairajanayagam; S. Tatagari; et al. Bibliometrics: tracking research impact by selecting the appropriate metrics, 2016. DOI: [10.4103/1008-682X.171582](#)
13. R. Miranda; E. Garcia-Carpintero. Overcitation and overrepresentation of review papers in the most cited papers, 2018. DOI: [10.1016/j.joi.2018.08.006](#)
14. M. Hosseini; M.P. Eve; B. Gordijn; C. Neylon. MyCites: a proposal to mark and report inaccurate citations in scholarly publications, 2020. DOI: [10.1186/s41073-020-00099-8](#)
15. L.I. Meho. Highly prestigious international academic awards and their impact on university rankings, 2020. DOI: [10.1162/qss_a_00045](#)
16. C. Woolston. Impact factor abandoned by Dutch university in hiring and promotion decisions, 2021. DOI: [10.1038/d41586-021-01759-5](#)
17. M.J. McCabe; C.M. Snyder. Cite unseen: Theory and evidence on the effect of open access on cites to academic articles across the quality spectrum, 2021. DOI: [10.1002/mde.3353](#)
18. D. Mills; A. Branford; K. Inouye; et al. "Fake" Journals and the Fragility of Authenticity: Citation Indexes, "Predatory" Publishing, and the African Research Ecosystem, 2021. DOI: [10.1080/13696815.2020.1864304](#)
19. J.A.T. da Silva; Q.-H. Vuong. The right to refuse unwanted citations: rethinking the culture of science around the citation, 2021. DOI: [10.1007/s11192-021-03960-9](#)
20. M.A. Oviedo-Garcia. Journal citation reports and the definition of a predatory journal: The case of the Multidisciplinary Digital Publishing Institute (MDPI), 2021. DOI: [10.1093/reseval/rvab020](#)

21. J.A.T. da Silva; A. Al-Khatib. How do Clarivate Analytics and Publons propose to fortify peer review in the COVID-19 era?, 2021. DOI: [10.1016/j.jtumed.2021.01.008](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jtumed.2021.01.008)
22. P. van der Wouden; G. van der Heijden; H. Shemesh; P. van den Besselaar. Evidence and consequences of academic drift in the field of dental research: A bibliometric analysis 2000-2015, 2022. DOI: [10.1038/s41405-022-00093-w](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41405-022-00093-w)
23. L. Ante. The relationship between readability and scientific impact: Evidence from emerging technology discourses, 2022. DOI: [10.1016/j.joi.2022.101252](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joi.2022.101252)
24. L. Xu; K. Ding; Y. Lin. Do negative citations reduce the impact of cited papers?, 2022. DOI: [10.1007/s11192-021-04214-4](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-021-04214-4)
25. E. Raff. Does the Market of Citations Reward Reproducible Work?, 2022. DOI: [10.48550/arXiv.2204.03829](https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2204.03829)
26. M. Thelwall; K. Kousha; M. Abdoli; et al. Why are coauthored academic articles more cited: Higher quality or larger audience?, 2023. DOI: [10.1002/asi.24755](https://doi.org/10.1002/asi.24755)
27. N. Lawson. What citation tests really tell us about bias in academic publishing, 2023. DOI: [10.1016/j.euroecorev.2023.104534](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.euroecorev.2023.104534)
28. D.S. Chawla. Researchers who agree to manipulate citations are more likely to get their papers published, 2023. DOI: [10.1038/d41586-023-01532-w](https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-023-01532-w)
29. B.S.L. Barrantes; S. Dalton; D. Andre. Bibliometrics Methods in Detecting Citations to Questionable Journals, 2023. DOI: [10.1016/j.acalib.2023.102749](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acalib.2023.102749)
30. A. Agarwal; M. Arafa; T. Avidor-Reiss; et al. Citation Errors in Scientific Research and Publications: Causes, Consequences, and Remedies, 2023. DOI: [10.5534/wjmh.230001](https://doi.org/10.5534/wjmh.230001)
31. A.J. Abduh. Characteristics of highly cited papers in Environmental sciences: Trends and authors, 2023. DOI: [10.22541/au.167285993.34031383/v1](https://doi.org/10.22541/au.167285993.34031383/v1)
32. D.E. Wright. Five problems plaguing publishing in the life sciences-and one common cause, 2024. DOI: [10.1002/1873-3468.15018](https://doi.org/10.1002/1873-3468.15018)
33. L.I. Meho; E.A. Akl. Using Bibliometrics to Detect Unconventional Authorship Practices and Examine Their Impact on Global Research Metrics, 2019-2023, 2024. DOI: [10.48550/arXiv.2407.18331](https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2407.18331)
34. S.-J. Kim. Explosive increase and decrease in articles, citations, impact factor, and immediacy index during the COVID-19 pandemic: a bibliometric study, 2024. DOI: [10.6087/kcse.334](https://doi.org/10.6087/kcse.334)
35. S. Macdonald. The Scandal of Academic Publishing, 2025. DOI: [10.1007/s12109-025-10042-8](https://doi.org/10.1007/s12109-025-10042-8)
36. R. Vishwakarma; S. Banerjee. Billions at Stake: How Self-Citation Adjusted Metrics Can Transform Equitable Research Funding, 2025. DOI: [10.48550/arXiv.2504.20081](https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2504.20081)

37. V. Ismailov. Metrics over Merit: The Hidden Costs of Citation Impact in Research, 2025. DOI: [10.1007/s00283-025-10444-8](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00283-025-10444-8)
38. P. Subramanian; R. Soundararajan; J. Makol. Building Credibility with Comprehensive Citation Practices Authors, 2025. DOI: [10.1055/s-0044-1796641](https://doi.org/10.1055/s-0044-1796641)
39. Beyond Predatory Publishing: Additional Questionable Offers in Scholarly Publishing.
40. Are 90% of academic papers really never cited? Reviewing the literature on academic citations.
41. Not So Many Uncited Papers, Actually.
42. Can It Really Be True That Half of Academic Papers Are Never Read?.
43. Academics Write Papers Arguing Over How Many People Read (And Cite) Their Papers.
44. Female scientists are considerably more likely to be mistakenly cited as if they were males than vice versa.
45. What's wrong with academia?.
46. All academic metrics are flawed, but some are useful.
47. New Global Research Report from the Institute for Scientific Information examines impact of multi-authorship on citations.
48. Studies With Shorter Titles Are Cited More Often.
49. Hindawi Garbage Sorting System, Based on Citations.
50. Less 'prestigious' journals can contain more diverse research, by citing them we can shape a more just politics of citation.
51. Chemistry researchers cite their own work the most.
52. High Prices and Market Power of Academic Publishing Reduce Article Citations.
53. The mystery of the phantom reference.
54. The "phantom reference:" How a made-up article got almost 400 citations.
55. Review articles cause "dramatic loss" in citations for original research.
56. Citations to questionable journals threaten research integrity: bibliometrics as a key actor in the detection.
57. Improper Legitimization of Hijacked Journals Through Citations.
58. Poor citation practices are a form of academic self-harm in the humanities and social sciences.
59. Case analyses of fraudulent citation in scientific and technical journals and suggestions on editing work.
60. The Impact of Incorrect Citations in Academic Work.
61. 'Academic Urban Legends'.

62. Poor citation practices are continuing to harm the humanities and social sciences.
63. Inaccurate citation, citation cartels, fake citations, citation of retracted papers: why research integrity needs citation integrity.
64. Poor citation practices undermine scientific credibility, so apply these principles.
65. Academic citation scams and data manipulation in research.
66. Fake papers are contaminating the world's scientific literature, fueling a corrupt industry and slowing legitimate lifesaving medical research.
67. Revisiting: Turning a Critical Eye on Reference Lists.
68. Any explanation for fake references other than AI?.
69. Scopus Discontinues Thousands of Journals: A Warning for Researchers.
70. Exclusion of Journals from Web of Science causes a Stir.
71. Clarivate's Action Against eLife and DORA's Response: A Case for Reflection.
72. High-profile indexing service punishes 20 journals, issues unusual warning about five others.
73. Why Academic Scholarship on Israel and Palestine Threatens Western Elites.
74. Research Degrees That Fit You Best!.
75. 1 in 7 scientific papers is fake, suggests study that author calls 'wildly nonsystematic'.
76. The Black Market for Fake Science Is Growing Faster Than Legitimate Research, Study Warns.
77. If there really is more fraud being done by prominent scientists than there was in the past, why? Here's a theory.
78. The Myth of Delayed Recognition.
79. Research findings that are probably wrong cited far more than robust ones, study finds.
80. How Junk Citations Have Discredited the Academy.
81. Careless citations don't just spread scientific myths - they can make them stronger.
82. Citation Counts in Psychological Science After the Bubble Burst.
83. Citation Bubble About to Burst?.
84. Purr-fect Citations: How a Cat Became the World's Most Cited Academic.
85. Over 400 Scientific Papers Have Cited a 'Phantom' Reference That Never Existed.
86. Norway university committee recommends probe into the country's most productive researcher.
87. The Dangers of Pop-Cultural Perceptions of Quantum Mechanics and the Rise of Pseudoscientific Ideas.
88. Pop-science: Facts or fiction? Friend or foe?.