

1 **A survey on retracted articles in the field of health sciences from 2001 to 2022 from Iran**

2 Parisa Soltani, DDS, MS

3 Department of Oral and Maxillofacial Radiology, Dental Implants Research Center, Dental

4 Research Institute, School of Dentistry, Isfahan University of Medical Sciences, Isfahan, Iran

5 Department of Neurosciences, Reproductive and Odontostomatological Sciences, University

6 of Naples “Federico II”, Naples, Italy

7 Email: parissltn@gmail.com

8 Shakiba Sadeghizade

9 Student Research committee, School of Dentistry, Isfahan University of Medical Sciences,

10 Isfahan, Iran

11 Email: Shakibasadeghizade2000@gmail.com

12 Mohammad Hossein Nikbakht

13 Student Research committee, School of Dentistry, Isfahan University of Medical Sciences,

14 Isfahan, Iran

15 Email: mh.nikbakht78@gmail.com

16 Arghavan Malaz

17 Student Research committee, School of Dentistry, Isfahan University of Medical Sciences,

18 Isfahan, Iran

19 Email: arghavan.malaz@gmail.com

20 Corresponding Author:

21 Arghavan Malaz

22 Email: arghavan.malaz@gmail.com

23 Phone: +98-9369702513

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39 **A survey on retracted articles in the field of health sciences from 2001 to 2022 from Iran**

40 **Abstract**

41 **Background:** Retraction is the process of correcting literature and warning readers of
42 publications that contain such serious flaws or erroneous data. A variety of reasons may
43 lead to retraction of published articles.

44 **Objectives:** This study aimed to investigate the characteristics of retracted articles from Iran
45 in the field of health sciences.

46 **Design:** Retrospective study

47 **Setting:** This study was conducted on retracted articles in the field of health published by
48 authors affiliated with Iranian organizations from 2001 to 2022. The Retraction Watch
49 Database was used to extract the information from these articles. The following information
50 was extracted: journal name, article type, institutions, country(s), date published, date
51 retracted, authors number, and reasons for retraction. This data was evaluated using
52 descriptive statistics.

53 **Results:** Between 2001 and 2022, our search identified 348 retracted articles. The highest
54 number of retractions belongs to Diagnostic Pathology and Tumor Biology journals. The
55 highest numbers of retractions belong to 2016 and 2020, respectively. The highest number
56 of retracted articles were published in 2015 and 2018, respectively. Different types of
57 articles have been assigned different percentages: Research article (52.9%), clinical study
58 (29.9%), conference abstract/paper (5.2%), review article (4.6%), case report (3.7%), and
59 others (3.7%). The main reasons that led to retraction were investigation by
60 journal/publisher, fake peer review, and concerns/issues about data. Malaysia, Bahrein, and

61 India had the most cooperation with Iran in the retracted articles. The mean time between
62 publication and retraction was 2.44 years and ranged between less than a year and 16
63 years. Institutions with the highest record of retraction are Kashan University of Medical
64 Sciences, Shaheed Beheshti University of Medical Sciences, and Tabriz University of Medical
65 Sciences.

66 **Conclusions:** Investigation by journal/publisher, fake peer review, and concerns/issues
67 about data were the most common reasons for retraction. The results of this study indicate
68 that more attention is required from research ethics authorities in order to protect the
69 integrity of published research.

70 **Keyword:** Retracted publication, Iran, Ethics, Plagiarism, Retraction reasons

71 Strengths and Limitations: This study examines a long period of time and is entirely in the
72 field of public health. It is possible that the site we used does not include all journals.

73 **Word count:** 837

74 **Background**

75 Retraction is the process of correcting the published literature that contains serious flaws or
76 erroneous data. Unreliable data can be the result of honest error or research misconduct
77 (1).

78 Occasionally, authors try to exploit the academic publishing system to publish articles that
79 would otherwise not be accepted for publication. As such, they aim to achieve undeserved
80 success for a variety of reasons, such as career advancement, greater satisfaction, and
81 gaining credibility or respect in the scientific community, among other reasons. These days,
82 millions of authors are trying to publish their works, and the research and success of many

83 of them have raised expectations for scientists. What would have constituted a major
84 achievement in terms of the number of articles published twenty years ago is now hardly
85 considered the minimum, or even less than the minimum, for scientific achievement. Some
86 researchers eventually succumb to social or academic pressures and choose an unethical
87 path (2).

88 A published article that is later proven not worth publishing may be invalidated for certain
89 reasons. Retraction should be issued with caution and only for appropriate cases.
90 Committee On Publication Ethics (COPE) suggests that journal editors should consider
91 retracting an article in one of the following situations: (a) the editors have evidence that the
92 findings are unreliable, either as a result of misconduct or an honest mistake; (b) the same
93 findings have already been published and this fact has not been properly addressed (e.g. by
94 obtaining permission or providing a reference; (c) plagiarizes another published article; (d)
95 the article is based on unethical research. According to these COPE guidelines, an article can
96 be disqualified due to "honest errors," "misattribution," "data manipulation," "poor data
97 management" (such as the author's inability to produce data to support his conclusions),
98 "academic plagiarism" (including plagiarism from oneself), "duplication of text" or "non-
99 disclosure of conflicts of interest" should be invalidated (3).

100 Previous articles investigated the characteristics of retracted articles from other sources
101 such as Scopus and PubMed until 2019 (2). This study aimed to investigate the
102 characteristics of retracted articles from Iran in the field of health sciences from 2001 to
103 2022.

104 **Setting**

105 This study was approved by the Research Ethics Committee of Isfahan University of medical
106 sciences (IR.MUI.RESEARCH.REC.1402.127).

107 This study cross-sectional was conducted on the retracted articles in the field of health
108 sciences that were published by authors affiliated with Iranian organizations from 2001 to
109 2022. The Retraction Watch Database was used to extract the information of these articles
110 (4). Iran and health sciences filters have been applied to search on this database.

111 The following information was extracted from the retrieved records:

- 112 • Journal name
- 113 • Article type
- 114 • Institutions
- 115 • Country(s)
- 116 • Date published
- 117 • Date retracted
- 118 • Authors number
- 119 • Reasons

120 The data was entered into SPSS (version 26, IBM Statistics, NY, USA) and descriptive
121 statistics were used.

122 **Results**

123 Between January 2001 and December 2022, our search identified 348 retracted articles.

124 Table 1 demonstrates different information about journals with the highest number of
125 retracted articles including the number of retracted articles, CiteScore, impact factor, H-

126 index, and subject category. The highest number of retractions belongs to Diagnostic
127 Pathology followed by Tumor Biology.

128 Figure 1 shows the number of retracted articles based on publication year and retraction
129 year. The highest numbers of retractions were finalized in 2016 and 2020 with 77 and 60
130 retractions, respectively. The most retracted articles were published in 2015 and 2018 with
131 58 and 48 articles, respectively.

132 Research articles (52.9%) and clinical studies (29.9%) were the most commonly retracted
133 types of articles (Figure 2).

134 The main reasons which led to retraction are investigation by journal/publisher, fake peer
135 review, and concerns /issues about data (Table 2).

136 Figure 3 shows the countries with most cooperation with Iran. According to the chart,
137 Malaysia, Bahrein and India shows the highest number.

138 Figure 4 shows the frequency of retracted articles based on their time lag (the period of
139 time between retraction and publication year). The mean \pm SD time lag was 2.44 ± 2.81 years
140 and ranged between less than a year and 16 years.

141 The institutions with the highest number of retracted papers are Kashan University of
142 Medical Sciences, Shaheed Beheshti University of Medical Sciences, and Tabriz University of
143 Medical Sciences (Table 3).

144 **Discussion**

145 The most retracted articles belonged to the Diagnostic Pathology journal. All these 23
146 articles were retracted in 2016 which were published between 2013 and 2015 mainly
147 because of concerns/issues about authorship, false/forged authorship, fake peer review,

148 investigation by journal/publisher, misconduct by author, and plagiarism of text. The Tumor
149 Biology journal approximately had the same results but the reasons for retraction differ.
150 Biological Trace Element Research journal had the next rank with 13 retracted papers
151 published between 2015-2019 which were retracted between 2017-2021 mostly because of
152 concerns about data investigated by the company/institution. Iranian Red Crescent Medical
153 Journal had 11 retracted articles in 2016 which were published in 2015 and 2016. The
154 reasons for the retraction of articles from this journal were criminal proceeding for,
155 false/forged authorship, fake peer review, the investigation by company/institution,
156 investigation by journal/publisher, misconduct - official investigation/finding, and
157 misconduct by author.

158 Mansourzadeh et al. (5) reviewed Iranian retracted publications published in PubMed up to
159 December 2017. They discovered 164 articles which were mostly published in Diagnostic
160 Pathology, Tumor Biology, and Iranian Red Crescent Medical Journal. They indicated that
161 the mean lag time between publication and retraction was 20.8 months, ranging from less
162 than a month to 8.4 years. These articles were mostly retracted because of these reasons;
163 Authorship issues, plagiarism, redundant publication, no reason reported, overlap,
164 misconduct, and honest error. In that study, Islamic Azad University and Tehran University
165 of Medical Sciences had the highest number of retracted publications with 31 and 25
166 articles, respectively. Among these retracted articles, 142 publications were indexed in Web
167 of Science and 161 in Scopus. They performed a citation analysis on 68 retracted
168 publications indexed in Scopus between 2001 and 2013. These publications have received
169 789 citations (Citation per publication=11.6). Interestingly, 259 citations were identified
170 after the retraction notice.

171 Masoomi et al. (6) in a study in 2018 estimated the percentage of retracted articles in Iran
172 to be 0.1%. Although this percentage has increased compared to previous years, it is still a
173 small percentage. But considering that these errors in publication can lead to wrong ethical
174 judgments from organizations and countries, we suggest that more attention should be paid
175 to reduce the retraction rate.

176 Ghorbi et al. (2) analyzed 343 Scopus-indexed articles which were retracted between 2001-
177 2019. In their analysis, most articles were retracted from 2010 to 2016. The average time lag
178 was 591 days after publication. Tumor Biology and Diagnostic Pathology had the highest
179 number of retractions both of which are open-access journals. This study indicated that
180 these articles were mostly retracted because of fake peer reviews, plagiarism, and duplicate
181 publication. They reported that Islamic Azad University, University of Tehran, and
182 Baqiyatallah University of Medical Sciences had the highest number of retractions. It seems
183 that the second-highest retractions belong to Islamic Azad University (7).

184 **Conclusions**

185 Publication of erroneous material and their subsequent retraction may result in important
186 negative consequences including the loss of trust in scientific publications, induction of
187 flawed information into further analyses and reviews, and misleading the academic
188 community, among other problems. Due to the information above, ethics should be
189 considered a more important issue in the process of conducting research projects and
190 drafting the resultant articles. The fact that a noticeable number of articles that are written
191 and even cited will be retracted shows a need for stronger filtration before their publication.
192 We suggest that researchers, academic institutions, and journal editors and reviewers set
193 higher standards while conducting research and clinical studies.

194 **List of abbreviations**

195 Committee On Publication Ethics (COPE)

196 **Declarations:**

197 Ethics approval and consent to participate: This study was approved by the Research Ethics

198 Committee of Isfahan University of medical sciences (IR.MUI.RESEARCH.REC.1402.127).

199 Consent for publication: Not applicable

200 Availability of data and materials: The datasets used and/or analyzed during the current

201 study are available from the corresponding author on reasonable request.

202 Competing interests: The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

203 Funding: This work was supported by Isfahan University of Medical Sciences.

204 Author Contributions: ShS, MN and AM search the database and collected the data. ShS,

205 MN and AM wrote the manuscript. PS helped with writing the manuscript and scientific

206 editing. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

207 Acknowledgments: This study was supported by the Isfahan University of Medical Sciences,

208 Iran.

209 **References:**

210 1. Kleinert S; Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE). COPE's retraction guidelines. Lancet.

211 2009;374(9705):1876-7.

212 2. Ghorbi A, Fazeli-Varzaneh M, Ghaderi-Azad E, Ausloos M, Kozak M. Retracted papers by

213 Iranian authors: causes, journals, time lags, affiliations, collaborations. Scientometrics.

214 2021;126(9):7351-71.

- 215 3. Wager E, Barbour V, Yentis S, Kleinert S. Retractions: guidance from the Committee on
216 Publication Ethics (COPE). *Croat Med J.* 2009;50(6):532-5.
- 217 4. The Retraction Watch Database. [Last accessed on 2022 December 28]. Available
218 from: <http://retractiondatabase.org/RetractionSearch.aspx>
- 219 5. Mansourzadeh MJ, Ghazimirsaeid J, Motamedi N, Najafi A, Abdullahi Abubakar A,
220 Dehdarirad H. A Survey of Iranian Retracted Publications Indexed in PubMed. *Iran J Public*
221 *Health.* 2021;50(1):188-194.
- 222 6. Masoomi R, Amanollahi A. Why Iranian biomedical articles are retracted?. *The Journal of*
223 *Medical Education and Development.* 2018;13(2):87-100.
- 224 7. Ghorbi, A., Fahimifar, S. Aspects and Collaboration Patterns of Retracted Papers as
225 Evidence of Research Misconduct in Iran and Foreign countries. *Scientometrics Research*
226 *Journal,* 2020; 6(11): 149-172.
- 227
- 228
- 229

Table 1. Top 20 journal information based on number of retracted articles

Journal name	Number of retracted articles	Cite Score	IF	H-index	Subject category
Diagnostic Pathology	23	4	3.196	55	General Medicine

					Pathology
					Forensic Medicine
					Basic Sciences
					General Medicine
Tumor Biology	17	6	3.65	92	Oncology
Journal of Fundamental and Applied Sciences	16	-	1.12	-	-
					General Medicine
					Inorganic Chemistry
Biological Trace Element Research	13	6.1	4.081	88	Biochemistry
					Endocrinology and Metabolism
					Clinical
					Biochemistry
Iranian Red Crescent Medical Journal	11	-	0.436	-	General Medicine
Cochrane Database of	8	11.874	11.874	292	General Medicine

Systematic Reviews					Pharmacology
					Nursing and Midwifery
					General Medicine
Perfusion	7	2.9	1.581	46	Cardiology
					Radiology & Nuclear Imaging
					Nuclear Medicine
					Radiotherapy
The Journal of Nutrition	8	6.5	4.735	276	Nutrition
					General Medicine
					Biophysics & Medical Physics
International Journal of Nanomedicine	5	10.9	7.033	145	Pharmacology
					Organic Chemistry
					Nanotechnology
PLoS One	4	5.6	3.752	367	General Medicine
					Genetics

					Biochemistry
					Biology
Archives of Iranian Medicine	4	3.2	3.138	54	General Medicine
					General Medicine
					Pharmacology
Artificial Cells, Nanomedicine, and Biotechnology	4	13.6	6.355	57	Pharmaceutical Science
					Biotechnology
					Biomedical Engineering
					Nanotechnology
Iranian Journal of Allergy, Asthma, and Immunology	4	2.1	1.57	28	Immunology & Allergy
Journal of Food Safety	4	4	2.449	47	Parasitology
					Microbiology
Journal of Parasitic Diseases	4	2	-	24	Parasitology

Probiotics and Antimicrobial Proteins	4	7.9	5.265	36	Microbiology Biology
Science of The Total Environment	4	14.1	10.754	275	Environmental Health
Scientific Reports	4	6.9	4.997	242	-
The American Journal of Clinical Nutrition	4	10.6	8.472	351	Nutrition
The Journal of Sexual Medicine	4	5.3	3.937	123	Urology Obstetrics & Gynecology
Other 167 journals	196	-	-	-	-
Total	348	-	-	-	-

230

231

232

Table 2. Reasons led to retraction

	n	%
Investigation by Journal/Publisher	94	27/01

Fake Peer Review	75	21/55
Concerns /Issues About Data	72	20/69
Concerns/Issues About Authorship	58	16/67
Investigation by Company/Institution	54	15/52
Duplication of Article	46	13/22
Misconduct by Author	46	13/22
False/Forged Authorship	42	12/07
Notice - Limited or No Information	38	10/92
Plagiarism of Text	35	10/06
Withdrawal	27	7/76
Unreliable Results	24	6/90
Plagiarism of Article	24	6/90
Concerns/Issues About Results	23	6/61
Withdrawn to Publish in Different Journal	16	4/60
Original Data not Provided	15	4/31
Duplication of Image	14	4/02
Ethical Violations by Author	14	4/02
Date of 1/Other Unknown	13	3/74

Misconduct - Official	12	3/45
Investigation/Finding	12	3/45
Euphemisms for Plagiarism	12	3/45
Error in Methods	12	3/45
Upgrade/Update of Prior Notice	11	3/16
Concerns/Issues about Referencing/Attributions	11	3/16
Breach of Policy by Author	11	3/16
Criminal Proceedings	11	3/16
Lack of IRB/IACUC Approval	10	2/87
Error in Data	9	2/59
Author Unresponsive	8	2/30
Error in Results and/or Conclusions	8	2/30
Error in Analyses	8	2/30
Lack of Approval from Author	8	2/30
Withdrawn (out of date)	7	2/01
Duplicate Publication through Error by Journal/Publisher	7	2/01
Euphemisms for Duplication	7	2/01

Objections by Third Party	6	1/72
Concerns/Issues About Image	5	1/44
Objections by Author(s)	5	1/44
Retract and Replace	5	1/44
Investigation by Third Party	5	1/44
Duplication of Text	5	1/44
Unreliable Data	5	1/44
Duplication of Data	5	1/44
Error by Journal/Publisher	5	1/44
Plagiarism of Data	5	1/44
Copyright Claims	3	0/86
Error in Text	3	0/86
Lack of Approval from Company/Institution	3	0/86
Miscommunication by Authors	3	0/86
Notice - Unable to Access via current resources	2	0/57
Plagiarism of Image	2	0/57
Bias Issues or Lack of Balance	2	0/57
Concerns/Issues about Third Party Involvement	2	0/57

Error in Materials (General)	2	0/57
Plagiarism of Article Taken from Dissertation/Thesis	1	0/29
Nonpayment of Fees/Refusal to Pay	1	0/29
Temporary Removal	1	0/29
False Affiliation	1	0/29
Informed/Patient Consent - None/Withdrawn	1	0/29
Miscommunication by Journal/Publisher	1	0/29
Falsification/Fabrication of Image	1	0/29
Manipulation of Images	1	0/29
Paper Mill	1	0/29

233

Table 3. Universities with highest number of retracted articles

University	Number of Retracted Articles
Kashan university of medical sciences	37
Shaheed Beheshti University of Medical Sciences	35


Tabriz university of medical sciences	23
---------------------------------------	----

Tehran university of medical sciences	21
---------------------------------------	----

Islamic Azad university	19
-------------------------	----


Isfahan university of medical sciences	19
--	----

234



235


236 Figure 1. The number of retracted articles based on publication year and retraction year



237

238 Figure 2. Different types of retracted articles based on quantity


239



240


241 Figure 3. Top countries cooperated with Iran which led to retraction

242




243


244 Figure 4. Frequency of retracted articles based on their time lag



<i>C. diphtheriae</i>	Diphtheria exotoxin
<i>C. jeikeium</i>	Antibiotic resistance
<i>C. urealyticum</i>	Antibiotic resistance; urease production
<i>C. pseudotuberculosis</i>	Diphtheria exotoxin; phospholipase D
<i>C. ulcerans</i>	Diphtheria exotoxin; phospholipase D

Article type





pub_ret

