Retracted randomized trials attributed to super-retractors and top-cited scientists with multiple retractions: secondary analysis of the VITALITY retrospective cohort

Chunwei Lyu, MSc[1]

Minoo Matbouriahi, MSc[1]

Florian Naudet, MD, PhD[2, 3]

John P.A. Ioannidis[4,5,6,7]

Ioana Alina Cristea, PhD[1,4]

[1] Department of General Psychology, University of Padova, Italy

[2] Univ Rennes, CHU Rennes, Inserm, Centre d'investigation clinique de Rennes (CIC1414), service de pharmacologie clinique, Institut de recherche en santé, environnement et travail (Irset), UMR S 1085, EHESP, 35000, Rennes, France

[3] Institut Universitaire de France (IUF), 1 rue Descartes, 75231 Paris cedex 5, France

[4] Meta-Research Innovation Center at Stanford (METRICS), Stanford University, Stanford, CA, US

[5] Stanford Prevention Research Center, Department of Medicine, Stanford University School of Medicine, Stanford, CA, US;

[6] Department of Epidemiology & Population Health, Stanford University School of Medicine, Stanford, CA, US;

[7]Department of Biomedical Data Science, Stanford University School of Medicine, Stanford, CA, US.

Word-count: 1191 words (not including tables and references)

Correspondence to:

Ioana Alina Cristea, Department of General Psychology, Via Venezia 8, 35138, Padova, Italy

E-mail: ioanaalina.cristea@unipd.it,

Phone: +39049827659

Key points

Question: What is the contribution of the authors with most retractions ("super-retractors") and of those top-cited with multiple retractions to the retracted randomized clinical trials literature?

Findings: Six super-retractors, representing two fields of medicine, co-authored one fifth of all retracted trials, while 18 top-cited scientists with over 10 retractions co-authored a quarter of them. Articles co-authored by super-retractors or by top-cited scientists with multiple retractions were published and retracted earlier, took longer to retract and accumulated more citations.

Meaning: Retracted clinical trials are disproportionately associated with a small number of influential authors, often co-authors and concentrated across few subfields of medicine and countries.

Abstract

Importance: Multiple retractions from the same author often uncover issues affecting their entire work, such as having systematically altered or fabricated data.

Objectives: Evaluate the contribution of authors with most retractions ("super-retractors") and top-cited scientists with multiple retractions to the retracted clinical trial literature.

Design: Retrospective cohort study, linking an openly available cohort (VITALITY) of 1330 retracted randomized clinical trials (RCTs) to three lists of scientists: super-retractors, totaling most retractions in the Retraction Watch Leaderboard, and top-cited scientists, over the entire career or in the most recent single year, who accumulated 10 or more retractions not due to editor/publisher errors. The VITALITY cohort was updated up to November 2024. The three author lists were updated in August 2025.

Participants: 30 super-retractors, 163 career-long and 174 single-year scientists totaling 10 or more retractions.

Main outcomes: Authorship and characteristics of retracted RCTs (publication and retraction year, time between publication and retraction, number of citations).

Results: 6/30 super-retractors, representing two subfields of medicine (Anesthesiology and Endocrinology & Metabolism), co-authored 290/1330 retracted RCTs (22%). 18/163 career-long top-cited scientists with at least 10 retractions, representing 10 fields, co-authored 327/1330 trials (25%), 275 (84%) of which were also co-authored by a super-retractor**.** 7/174 single-year top-cited scientists with at least 10 retractions co-authored 50 retracted trials; all of them were also among the career-long top-cited scientists with at least 10 retractions. Articles with super-retractors authors vs not were published earlier (median (IQR)= 2000 (1997-2005) vs 2020

(2014-2022)); retracted earlier (median (IQR)= 2013 (2012-2019) vs 2023 (2018.5-2023)); had a longer lag between publication and retraction, (median (IQR)= 5111 (3560-6820) vs 482 (330-1119) days); and accrued more citations (median (IQR)= 21 (12-42) vs 5 (1-19)). Results were similar when comparing retracted articles coming from top-cited scientists with at least 10 retractions versus other articles.

Conclusions and relevance: A small number of influential authors, often co-authors and concentrated across few fields of medicine and countries, account for a significant proportion of retracted clinical trials. Concentration in some subfields and countries may reflect either systemic problems in these subfields and countries or better sensitization towards detecting fraud.

Introduction

Retracted randomized controlled trials (RCTs) have an enduring and multiplicative impact of the evidence ecosystem, by distorting findings of systematic reviews and meta-analyses[1,2], which then percolate into clinical practice guidelines[1]. Previous research has described super-retractors, scientists who have amassed numerous retractions[3,4]. Similarly, recent work examined influential, highly cited scientists with retractions not due to publisher/journal error[5]. Some of them had over 10 retractions. Multiple retractions from the same author often uncover issues affecting an author's entire work, e.g. systematically altered or fabricated data. However, there are no estimations of the contribution of super-retractors or top-cited authors with multiple retractions to the retracted RCT literature. We aimed to quantify this contribution, using a previously published and openly available complete cohort of retracted RCTs[1] (VITALITY).

Methods

The study is a retrospective cohort study and STROBE reporting guidelines[6] were followed. The VITALITY cohort includes 1330 RCTs with notification of retraction, identified from the Retraction Watch (RW) (updated November 5th 2024). No restrictions were placed for reasons for retraction or other characteristics. References and study characteristics are openly available (https://osf.io/7eazq/). We linked the VITALITY cohort with three groups of authors with multiple retractions.

Group 1 came from the RW Leaderboard (https://retractionwatch.com/the-retraction-watch-leaderboard/), August 26th 2025 update, and includes 30 researchers with highest number of retractions (range, 33 to 221).

The two other author groups came from the science-wide author databases of standardized citation indicators (https://elsevier.digitalcommonsdata.com/datasets/btchxktzyw/8), August 2025 update: scientists that are top-cited over their career (career-long, Group 2) and in 2024 (single recent-year, Group 3). Top-cited was defined[7] as being among the 100000 scientists or in the top-2% percentile among authors in the same subfield by a composite of standardized values of citation indicators.[8]. In the science-wide author databases, retractions are only counted if not due to publisher/journal error and if the paper was not replaced by a revised version. We selected scientists from the career-long and respectively single-year cohorts who amassed at least 10 such retractions (n=163 scientists in Group 2, n=174 in Group 3).

References in the publicly available VITALITY dataset include truncated authors lists, so one author (CL) extracted the full reference including all authors for each retracted RCT, using the available DOI. Subsequently, for each complete reference, two researchers (CL and MM) checked all the names in Groups 1, 2 and 3 and noted whether any researchers had been involved as authors. From the VITALITY dataset, we compiled characteristics of retracted trials, namely publication and retraction dates (month-date-year), from which we calculated the length (days) from publication to retraction. One researcher (CL) independently extracted number of citations from Scopus between as of November 21, 2025.

Results are presented descriptively as counts, proportions and confidence intervals (CIs) calculated with the binomial exact method, and medians and interquartile ranges (IQR). We

Results:

Fifteen/163 scientists in Group 2 and 8/174 in Group 3 were also super-retractors (Group 1).

Of 30 super-retractors, six (Table 1) had co-authored 290 of the 1330 retracted RCTs (22%). 52/290 (18%) papers had been co-authored by more than one super-retractor. The 6 super-retractors belonged to two subfields (Anesthesiology (n=3) and Endocrinology & Metabolism (n=3)) and all but one were affiliated with Japanese institutions. Retracted RCTs represented between 3% and 79% of all their retracted articles. For 3 super-retractors, over half of their retracted papers were RCTs.

Eighteen of the 163 career-long top-cited scientists with at least 10 retractions (eTable 1) co-authored 327/1330 retracted trials (25%). Five of these authors were also super-retractors. The 18 top-cited scientists covered 10 subfields, but many concentrated on Anesthesiology (n=4 authors) and Cardiovascular System & Hematology (n=4). They represented 8 countries, with most in Japan (n=7) and the US (n=4). 7/18 had co-authored only a single retracted trial while for another 7 retracted RCTs represented half of their retracted papers. Overall, 275/327 retracted RCTs (84%) involved a super-retractor.

Seven out of 174 single-year top-cited scientists with at least 10 retractions (eTable 2) co-authored 50 /1330 retracted trials (4%). All 7 authors were also among the career-long top-cited. Three authors had co-authored a single retracted trial, while for 4 authors retracted RCTs represented over half of their retracted papers. None of the authors themselves was on the RW leaderboard, but 14 out of 50 (28%) retracted RCTs were co-authored with a super-retractor (Kei Saitoh).

As displayed in Table 2, retracted RCT articles with super-retractor authors were published earlier, median (IQR) of 2000 (1997-2005) vs 2020 (2014-2022) ($p<.00001$ by Wilcoxon rank-sum test); retracted earlier, median (IQR) of 2013 (2012-2019) vs 2023 (2018.5-2023) ($p<.00001$); had a higher lag between publication and retraction, median days (IQR) of 5111 (3560-6820) vs 482 (330-1119) ($p<.00001$); and amassed more citations, median (IQR) of 21 (12-42) vs 5 (1-19) ($p<.00001$), than retracted RCT articles without super-retractor authors. Similarly, retracted articles published by career-long top-cited scientists with at least 10 retractions were published earlier, median (IQR)= 2001 (1998-2007) versus 2021 (2014-2022) ($p<.00001$ by Wilcoxon rank-sum test); retracted earlier median (IQR)= 2014 (2012-2020) versus 2023 (2019-2023) ($p<.00001$); had a longer lag between retraction and publication, median days (IQR)= 4748 (2708-5872) vs 469 (325-1058) ($p<.00001$); and more citations, median (IQR)= 24 (14-47) vs 4 (1-16) ($p<.00001$) than other retracted RCT articles. Results were similar for articles published by single-year top-cited scientists versus other retracted RCT articles (Table 2).

Discussion

Six super-retractors, representing two fields of medicine, account for one fifth of all retracted randomized trials. Similarly, 18 top-cited scientists with over 10 retractions account for a quarter of all retracted RCTs. All but 1 of the super-retractors involved in retracted RCTs were also among the top-cited over their career. There was a large overlap between retracted trials attributed to super-retractors and those attributed to career-long highly cited scientists who amassed at least 10 retractions.

Retracted RCT articles co-authored by super-retractors or by top-cited scientists with multiple retractions were published and retracted earlier, took longer to retract and accumulated

more citations than retracted RCT articles not involving such authors. The work of super-retractors has been thoroughly scrutinized, with an analysis from 2019[9] indicated that only 9% of the papers eligible for retraction remained not retracted. Conversely, the work of top-cited scientists with many retracted publications has received less attention; additional papers by these authors may deserve scrutiny.

Notably, several authors with many retractions were top-cited for their career-long citation impact, but only a minority of them continued to be top-cited in the most recent single year. This may reflect reputational loss and decline in citations to their publication corpus. Moreover, concentration in some subfields and countries may reflect either systemic problems in these subfields and countries or better sensitization towards detecting fraud.

One important limitation is that retractions represent only a fraction of the fraudulent literature. Some authors with few retracted papers may accumulate more retractions in the future, changing the profiles emerging in our current data. Recent proposals[10] to examine the collected body of evidence coming from an author or author group suspected of misconduct might uncover other super-retractors. The disproportionate role of super-retractors and top-cited authors with multiple retractions, their interconnections as expressed by co-authorships, and the narrow concentration across few fields of medicine may point to leads to help unravel fraudulent literature at scale.

Data sharing statement.

The VITALITY cohort (https://osf.io/7eazq/), the science-wide author database of standardized citation indexes ((https://elsevier.digitalcommonsdata.com/datasets/btchxktzyw/8) and the Retraction Watch Leaderboard (https://retractionwatch.com/the-retraction-watch-leaderboard/) are publicly available. The linked datasets and additional extracted variables will be made publicly available on Zenodo after publication (10.5281/zenodo.17693525)

Conflict of Interest Disclosures: No conflicts of interest.

Funding

Chunwei Lyu is funded by the China Scholarship Council (award number 202410710001). Minoo Matbouriahi is supported by the doctoral network MSCA-DN SHARE-CTD (HORIZON-MSCA-2022-DN-01, grant agreement 101120360), funded by the EU. Florian Naudet received funding from the French National Research Agency, the French Ministry of Health, and the French Ministry of Research and is a work package leader in the OSIRIS project (Open Science to Increase Reproducibility in Science) and for the doctoral network MSCA-DN SHARE-CTD (HORIZON-MSCA-2022-DN-01, grant agreement 101120360), funded by the EU. John P. A. Ioannidis is supported by an unrestricted gift from Sue and Bob O'Donnell to Stanford University. Ioana Alina Cristea is supported by a European Research Council (ERC) Starting Grant DECOMPOSE (grant agreement: 101042701, https://cordis.europa.eu/project/id/101042701), funded by the European Union (EU) and by the doctoral network MSCA-DN SHARE-CTD (HORIZON-MSCA-2022-DN-01, grant agreement 101120360), funded by the EU.

Role of the Funder/Sponsor The funders had no role in the study design, data collection and analysis, decision to publish, or preparation of the manuscript.

References

1. Xu C, Fan S, Tian Y, et al. Investigating the impact of trial retractions on the healthcare evidence ecosystem (VITALITY Study I): retrospective cohort study. *BMJ*. 2025;389:e082068. doi:10.1136/bmj-2024-082068
2. Graña Possamai C, Cabanac G, Perrodeau E, Ghosn L, Ravaud P, Boutron I. Inclusion of Retracted Studies in Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses of Interventions: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *JAMA Intern Med*. Jun 1 2025;185(6):702–709. doi:10.1001/jamainternmed.2025.0256
3. Wise J. Boldt: the great pretender. *BMJ : British Medical Journal*. 2013;346:f1738. doi:10.1136/bmj.f1738
4. Kupferschmidt K. Researcher at the center of an epic fraud remains an enigma to those who exposed him. Science: Science; 2018.
5. Ioannidis JPA, Pezzullo AM, Cristiano A, Boccia S, Baas J. Linking citation and retraction data reveals the demographics of scientific retractions among highly cited authors. *PLOS Biology*. 2025;23(1):e3002999. doi:10.1371/journal.pbio.3002999
6. von Elm E, Altman DG, Egger M, Pocock SJ, Gøtzsche PC, Vandenbroucke JP. The Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE) statement: guidelines for reporting observational studies. *Ann Intern Med*. Oct 16 2007;147(8):573–7. doi:10.7326/0003-4819-147-8-200710160-00010
7. Ioannidis JPA, Baas J, Klavans R, Boyack KW. A standardized citation metrics author database annotated for scientific field. *PLOS Biology*. 2019;17(8):e3000384. doi:10.1371/journal.pbio.3000384
8. Ioannidis JPA, Klavans R, Boyack KW. Multiple Citation Indicators and Their Composite across Scientific Disciplines. *PLOS Biology*. 2016;14(7):e1002501. doi:10.1371/journal.pbio.1002501
9. McHugh UM, Yentis SM. An analysis of retractions of papers authored by Scott Reuben, Joachim Boldt and Yoshitaka Fujii. *Anaesthesia*. 2019;74(1):17–21. doi:https://doi.org/10.1111/anae.14414
10. Nielsen J, Bordewijk EM, Gurrin LC, et al. Assessing the scientific integrity of the collected work of one author or author group. *J Clin Epidemiol*. Apr 2025;180:111603. doi:10.1016/j.jclinepi.2024.111603

Table 1. Retracted randomized trials authored by known super-retractors

Super-retractor	Subfield	Country	RCTs as 1st author	RCTs as co-author	Total retracted RCTs	Total retracted articles[b]	% retracted RCTs vs articles (95% CI)
Joachim Boldt	Anesthesiology	DE	72	47	119	221	54 (47– 61)
Yoshitaka Fujii	Anesthesiology	JP	111	10	121	172	70 (63 –77)
Yoshihiro Sato	Endocrinology & Metabolism	JP	26	4	30	124	24 (17 – 33)
Hironobu Ueshima	Anesthesiology	JP	3	1	4	124	3 (1 – 8)
Jun Iwamoto	Endocrinology & Metabolism	JP	5	19	24	91	26 (18 – 37)
Yuhji Saitoh	Anesthesiology	JP	20	24	44	56	79 (66 – 88)

Note.
CI, confidence interval; DE, Germany; JP, Japan; RCT, randomized controlled trials; %, proportion
[a] According to the updated science-wide author databases of standardized citation indexes
[b]According to the Retraction Watch Database, list updated August 25th 2025

Table 2. Characteristics of retracted randomized trials involving super-retractors, career-long and single-year top-cited scientists with at least 10 retractions versus trials not involving them

	Article, Count (%)	Publication year, median (IQR)	p-value[a]	Retraction year, median (IQR)	p-value	Time (days) to retraction, median (IQR)	p-value	Citations, median (IQR)[b,c]	p-value
Super-retractor	290 (22%)	2000 (1997-2005)	<.00001	2013 (2012-2019)	<.00001	5111 (3560-6820)	<.00001	21 (12-42)	<.00001
No super-retractor	1040 (78%)	2020 (2014-2022)		2023 (2018.5-2023)		482 (330-1119)		5 (1-19)	
Top-cited career-long ≥ 10 retractions	327 (25%)	2001 (1998-2007)	<.00001	2014 (2012-2020)	<.00001	4748 (2708-5872)	<.00001	24 (14-47)	<.00001
No top-cited career-long ≥ 10 retractions	1003 (75%)	2021 (2014-2022)		2023 (2019-2023)		469 (325-1058)		4 (1-16)	
Top-cited single-year ≥ 10 retractions	50 (4%)	2010 (2005-2015)	<.00001	2017 (2016-2022)	0.049	2557.5 (1597-4718)	<.00001	38 (18-65)	<.00001
No top-cited single-year ≥ 10 retractions	1280 (96%)	2018 (2008-2022)		2022 (2015-2023)		611 (358-2504)		7 (2-24)	
Total	1330	2017 (2007-2022)		2022 (2015-2023)		637.5 (362-2690)		13 (4-42)	

Note. IQR, interquartile range
[a] Calculated with the Wilcoxon rank-sum test
[b] Citations counts were extracted from Scopus
[c] For 12 trials, number of citations was not available