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What is retraction?

“Retraction is a mechanism for correcting the literature and alerting readers to articles that contain such seriously flawed or erroneous content or data that their findings and conclusions cannot be relied upon.”

What is retraction?

“Retraction is a mechanism for correcting the literature and alerting readers to articles that contain such seriously flawed or erroneous content or data that their findings and conclusions cannot be relied upon.”

“Prompt retraction should minimise the number of researchers who cite the erroneous work, act on its findings, or draw incorrect conclusions such as from ‘double counting’ redundant publications in meta-analyses or similar instances.”

https://doi.org/10.24318/cope.2019.1.4
Continued citation of retracted papers

Two COVID-19 articles that were retracted less than a month after they were published have over 900 citations each.

*Science* magazine examined 200 of the post-retraction citations to these papers and concluded that over half inappropriately cited the retracted articles.

Many scientists citing two scandalous COVID-19 papers ignore their retractions

By Charles Piller | Jan. 15, 2021, 8:00 AM

https://doi.org/10.1126/science.abg5806
Few authors show awareness of retraction

94% of post-retraction citations in PubMed Central do not show awareness of the retraction

Tzu-Kun Hsiao & Jodi Schneider. Continued Use of Retracted Papers- Temporal Trends in Citations and (Lack of) Awareness of Retractions Shown in Citation Contexts in Biomedicine. In *Quantitative Science Studies* https://doi.org/10.1162/qss_a_00155
Few authors show awareness of retraction

94% of post-retraction citations in PubMed Central do not show awareness of the retraction

Examples:

- A clinico-histopathologic study in rabbits confirmed that PRP treatment can achieve a faster wound healing rate [retracted cite].
- However, to date, only one human study has demonstrated an induction of SIRT1 mRNA level in PBMCs [retracted cite].
Few authors show awareness of retraction

- 94% of post-retraction citations in PubMed Central do not show awareness of the retraction
- No differences in where retracted papers are cited, before vs. after retraction

Tzu-Kun Hsiao & Jodi Schneider. Continued Use of Retracted Papers- Temporal Trends in Citations and (Lack of) Awareness of Retractions Shown in Citation Contexts in Biomedicine. In Quantitative Science Studies https://doi.org/10.1162/qss_a_00155
RISRS2020: Reducing the Inadvertent Spread of Retracted Science

A stakeholder consultation & environment scan

- 47 interviews of stakeholders in the scientific publishing ecosystem.
- ~70 participants in a 3-part online workshop to interact, react, and reflect in real-time on the problem retractions pose and possible solutions.
- Literature review of empirical research about retraction
- Citation analysis of retracted research

Reducing the Inadvertent Spread of Retracted Science
https://infoqualitylab.org/projects/risrs2020/

Jodi Schneider
jodi@illinois.edu
RISRS2020 Recommendations

1. Develop a systematic cross-industry approach to ensure the public availability of consistent, standardized, interoperable, and timely information about retractions.

2. Recommend a taxonomy of retraction categories/classifications and corresponding retraction metadata that can be adopted by all stakeholders.

3. Develop best practices for coordinating the retraction process to enable timely, fair, unbiased outcomes.

4. Educate stakeholders about publication correction processes including retraction and about pre- and post-publication stewardship of the scholarly record.

Jodi Schneider
jodi@illinois.edu
NISO Voting Members Approve Work on Recommended Practice for Retracted Research

September 22, 2021 - The National Information Standards Organization (NISO) today announced that its proposed work item for a Communication of Retractions, Removals, and Expressions of Concern (CORREC) Recommended Practice has been approved by NISO Voting Members.

Retracted research is published work that is withdrawn, removed, or otherwise invalidated from the scientific and scholarly record. Although relatively rare, retracted research—including unsupported or fabricated data, fundamental errors, and unreplicable results—can be inadvertently propagated within the digital scholarly record through citations. The CORREC Recommended Practice is intended to help address this problem, by clearly identifying parties involved in the retraction process, along with their responsibilities, actions, notifications, and the metadata necessary to communicate retracted research.

CORREC is an output of both the recent Sloan Foundation-funded project, Reducing the Inadvertent Spread of Retracted Science (RISRS) and the 2021 NISO Plus conference, where this topic was
NISO Voting Members Approve Work on Recommended Practice for Retracted Research

September 22, 2021 - The National Information Standards Organization (NISO) today announced that its proposed work item for a Communication of Retractions, Removals, and Expressions of Concern (CORREC) Recommended Practice has been approved by NISO Voting Members.

For more information about the Working Group, or to volunteer to participate, please contact the NISO Office at nisohq@niso.org.

CORREC is an output of both the recent Sloan Foundation-funded project, Reducing the Inadvertent Spread of Retracted Science (RISRS) and the 2021 NISO Plus conference, where this topic was discussed extensively.
Why we should not introduce a “removal” retraction category

A summary and commentary of RISRS’s subcommittee on retraction taxonomies

Daniele Fanelli
The RISRS sub-committee

Recommend a taxonomy of retraction categories/classifications and corresponding retraction metadata that can be adopted by all stakeholders. It recommended a simplification of existing categories:

- Correction
- Expression of Concern
- Retraction with Replacement
- Retraction
- Withdrawal

- But dissent on introducing a 6th category, “removal”.

Why?
FIGURE 1 Flow chart illustrating how each amendment type may be identified by answers to at most four factual questions. These questions and answers summarize the dimensions and conditions described in Table 1 and in the text.
Arguments for/against a “removal” in the report

For: Those articles that contain content that seriously violates ethical norms and standards, such as individuals’ rights to privacy, are determined to cause high-level national or international security risks, or that perpetuate harmful inequities, such as racism cannot simply be retracted and allow the original article, even with retraction labeling or watermark, to remain accessible.

Against: [...] The term “removal” represents a new category of retraction, which it is not the task of this committee to determine. [...] Determining new forms of retractions and new ethical norms around retraction is a task for professional society and ethics committees (e.g., COPE, CSE) and, where such new norms and retraction types to be introduced, the present taxonomy could be easily expanded to include a new term.

But IMO we really shouldn’t have any kind of removal in science.
Scholars are increasingly under attack

See also report by Foundation for Individual Rights in Education 2021, thefire.org
“Non-epistemic” retractions already occur

- Bruce Gilley, Political Science, Portland State University, 2017. His paper, *The Case for Colonialism*, was retracted after academics initiated a petition calling to retract, signed by thousands, and then both Gilley and the journal editor received what they considered to be credible death threats.

- Stephen Gliske, a neuroscientist at University of Michigan, published a paper presenting *a new theory of the development of gender dysphoria*. It offended trans activists and their academic allies, who launched a retraction petition that was ultimately successful.

- Ted Hill, Math professor, Georgia Tech, wrote a paper offering an *evolutionary explanation for the male variability hypothesis* (the idea that human males are more variable than human females on many attributes). It was accepted for publication at a journal; this evoked protests and outrage, which had the effect of pressuring the accepting journal to “unaccept” the article. He then had it accepted at another journal, which evoked more outrage (the manifest substance of which involved the process by which the paper was accepted), and it was again unaccepted.

  (Stevens, Jussim, Honeycutt 2020, Societies 10:82)

Who draws the line and where, between legitimate but controversial scholarship and “perpetuating harmful stereotypes”?
2) Proof that values, opinions and sensitivities change (and will continue doing so)
3) Scientific articles have documentary value beyond their scientific value
4) Even if “removed”, the article will never actually “disappear”, but become evidence of conspiracy

In summary:
1) Editors who wish to “cancel” an article already have means to do so.
2) A formal “removal” category would:
   a) invite arbitrary use
   b) formalize scientific “book burning”
   c) without achieving it practically

email@danielefanelli.com
Geoffrey Bilder
Is CrossMark star-crossed?

What we've learned from trying to get publishers to do the same thing the same way.
The Crossmark button gives readers quick and easy access to the current status of an item of content, including any corrections, retractions, or updates to that record.
CROSSREF ANNOUNCES CROSSCHECK PLAGIARISM DETECTION SERVICE

Earlier this week CrossRef announced an agreement with iParadigms, LLC to launch the CrossCheck service to aid in verifying the originality of scholarly content. Following on the success of CrossRef’s recent pilot of CrossCheck, the service is scheduled to go live in June.

CrossRef is partnering with iParadigms, LLC to offer our members the opportunity to verify the originality of works submitted for publication using the iThenticate service to check against a vast database of proprietary as well as open web content. Until now, there was no automated way to check submissions against previous publications because the published literature had not been indexed and “text fingerprinted” for this purpose. The CrossCheck database will include the full-text journals of leading academic publishers, and is expected to grow very rapidly over the coming months as CrossRef member publishers sign up for the service.

CrossCheck will be available to all CrossRef members who opt to contribute their content to the database. For more information, see the press release. Or contact CrossRef’s new product manager, Gabe Boucher, at gboucher@crossref.org.
Product Recall
Important

Oxford Handbook of General and Adult Nursing

We have been advised that this title contains errors. Would any customers who have purchased this title please return it for a full refund.
Clicking on the VRR logo should enable an automatic update of the VRR metadata associated with a document and should alert the user to any critical changes in the document’s status. For example:
CrossMark™ Update Identification Service Launches to Alert Readers to Changes in Scholarly Content

27 April, Lynnfield, MA USA—CrossRef today launched the CrossMark update identification service. The CrossMark system will alert researchers to important changes that may occur to published scholarly content and will highlight important publication record information. The CrossMark service has been piloted by several CrossRef member publishers for the past year.

“Finding update and corrections for scholarly documents can be a frustrating business for researchers, especially in an environment where content is available from so many channels,” said CrossRef Executive Director Ed Pentz. “Scholarly publishers routinely note changes to their content, but how this is done varies from publisher to publisher, which can make them difficult to locate. Before CrossMark, researchers had no way to tell if any changes had occurred to a PDF that they had downloaded months earlier. Now by simply clicking a single, recognizable logo, any reader can have access to this important information.”

Clicking on the CrossMark logo launches a pop-up box that provides status information, for example, that the document is up to date, or that it has a correction, update, retraction, or other change that could affect the interpretation or crediting of the work. It also provides a permanent link, via the CrossRef Digital Object Identifier (DOI) to both the publisher-maintained version of the content and the update.

Sample CrossMark Status Tab
Similarity Check (née CrossCheck) WG started
Jan 2007

CrossMark WG (née Version of Record Record) started
Jul 2007

Similarity Check (née CrossCheck) announced
Apr 2008

CrossMark launches
Apr 2012

Crossmark fees removed
Jan 2020

0.14% of Crossref DOIs have Crossmark update information
Sep 2021

61% of Crossref DOIs indexed for Similarity Check
Sep 2021
- Similarity Check (née CrossCheck) WG started
  Jan 2007

- CrossMark WG (née Version of Record Record) started
  Jul 2007

- Similarity Check (née CrossCheck) announced
  Apr 2008

- CrossMark launches
  Apr 2012

- Crossmark fees removed
  Jan 2020

- 0.14% of Crossref DOIs have Crossmark update information
  Sep 2021

- 81% of Crossref DOIs indexed for Similarity Check
  Sep 2021
All Events

- Similarity Check (née CrossCheck) WG started
  - Jan 2007
- CrossMark WG (née Version of Record Record) started
  - Jul 2007
- Similarity Check (née CrossCheck) announced
  - Apr 2008
- CrossMark launches
  - Apr 2012
- Crossmark fees removed
  - Jan 2020
- 0.14% of Crossref DOIs have Crossmark update information
  - Sep 2021
- 61% of Crossref DOIs indexed for Similarity Check
  - Sep 2021
What happened here?
What happened here?

Why such different results?
What happened between 2008 and 2012?
We argued.
About the scale of the problem
About the stigma
About the name of the service
About the design of the logo
But mostly...
About recommended practice
About the taxonomy
Editors and journals have a duty to keep the scholarly record sound and free from fraudulent or incorrect data.

Links should set up between the notice and the paper it refers to.

Corrections should be in “citable form”

[notices should only be issues] “to correct errors that affect the content of a paper, that may influence the interpretation of the work or its repetition, or that incorrectly attribute credit for the work.”

Removals should be avoided except in special circumstances.

Replacements should be avoided altogether.
Which brings us back to the taxonomy…
We eventually gave up.
We decided to not enforce a taxonomy and to see what emerged.
With predictable results.
https://api.crossref.org/works?facet=update-type:25

"correction": 93241,
"erratum": 45810,
"new_version": 22666,
"retraction": 6619,
"new_edition": 5747,
"corrigendum": 2389,
"withdrawal": 1944,
"addendum": 819,
"expression_of_concern": 312,
"clarification": 307,
"err": 228,
"removal": 144,
"publisher-note": 56,
"article": 55,
"corrected": 54,
"corrected-article": 38,
"Erratum": 18,
"comment": 13,
"Corrigendum": 9,
"unknown": 8,
"note-discuss": 8,
"contributed-paper": 8,
"expression-of-concern": 6,
"Retraction": 4,
"invited-article": 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>term</th>
<th>count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>correction</td>
<td>93241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>erratum</td>
<td>45810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>new_version</td>
<td>22666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>retraction</td>
<td>6619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>new_edition</td>
<td>5747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>corrigendum</td>
<td>2389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>withdrawal</td>
<td>1944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>addendum</td>
<td>819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expression_of_concern</td>
<td>312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clarification</td>
<td>307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>err</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>removal</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>publisher-note</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>article</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>corrected</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>corrected-article</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erratum</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>comment</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrigendum</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>note-discuss</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>contributed-paper</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expression-of-concern</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retraction</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>invited-article</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Registered CrossMark update types as of September 2021

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>term</th>
<th>count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>correction</td>
<td>93241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>erratum</td>
<td>45810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>new_version</td>
<td>22666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>retraction</strong></td>
<td>6619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>new_edition</td>
<td>5747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>corrigendum</td>
<td>2389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>withdrawal</td>
<td>1944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>addendum</td>
<td>819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expression_of_concern</td>
<td>312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clarification</td>
<td>307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>err</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>removal</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>publisher-note</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>article</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>corrected</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>corrected-article</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erratum</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>comment</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrigendum</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>note-discuss</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>contributed-paper</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expression-of-concern</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Retraction</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>invited-article</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>term</td>
<td>count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>correction</td>
<td>93241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>erratum</td>
<td>45810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>new_version</td>
<td>22666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>retraction</td>
<td>6619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>new_edition</td>
<td>5747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>corrigendum</td>
<td>2389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>withdrawal</td>
<td>1944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>addendum</td>
<td>819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expression_of_concern</td>
<td>312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clarification</td>
<td>307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>err</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>removal</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>publisher-note</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>article</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>corrected</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>corrected-article</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erratum</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>comment</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrigendum</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>note-discuss</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>contributed-paper</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expression-of-concern</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retraction</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>invited-article</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
addendum (noun; plural addenda) an item of additional material added at the end of a book or document, typically in order to correct, clarify, or supplement something.

erratum (noun; plural errata) an error in printing or writing.

retraction (noun) 1 an error in printing or writing.

withdraw (verb) 1 remove or take away (something) from a particular place or position

correct (verb) put right (an error or fault): the Council issued a statement correcting some points in the press reports.

mark the errors in (a written or printed text)
And so in 2014, we standardised.
• addendum
• clarification
• correction
• corrigendum
• erratum
• expression_of_concern
• newEdition
• new_version
• partial_retraction
• removal
• retraction
• withdrawal
Why such different results?
What happened here?

Why such different results?
Stigma needs to be addressed
What have we learned?
Publisher workflows treat corrections/retraction on an ad-hoc basis.
We should focus on machine actionability instead of UX.
Required metadata should include a summary.
Corrections to the scholarly literature should be open.
Keep the taxonomy simple.
• correction (combine errata & corrigenda)
• retraction
  • expression of concern
  • partial retraction
  • self retraction
• removal
Do not charge extra for doing something that you consider to be best practice.
We we can harness the community to make the stigma of not reporting retractions greater than the stigma of reporting them (HT RetractionWatch)
And some personal observations
The retraction notification problem will not be solved until we address liability issues.
The root of the problem of publication misconduct fraud is the use of publications as a proxy for productivity and the resulting publication pressure.
Thanks

Geoffrey Bilder
Director of Technology & Research
@gbilder
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS?
THANK YOU