Retracted article

- Using a syringe as tubular retractor and working channel in minimally invasive cranial and spinal neurosurgery
- Right Cerebellomedullary Cistern Epidermoid: Microsurgical Resection Via Far Lateral Transcondylar Approach: 2-Dimensional Operative Video
- Bolt gun injury to central forehead, sagittal sinus and frontal lobes: A case report
- RETRACTED: Zhang et al. Shikonin Inhibits the Migration and Invasion of Human Glioblastoma Cells by Targeting Phosphorylated beta-Catenin and Phosphorylated PI3K/Akt: A Potential Mechanism for the Anti-Glioma Efficacy of a Traditional Chinese Herbal Medicine. Int. J. Mol. Sci. 2015, 16, 23823-23848
- Retraction notice to "Current knowledge of antisense long non-coding RNA in the occurrence and prognosis of skull base tumors" [Heliyon 10 (2024) e35960]
- Retraction Note: HADHA promotes glioma progression by accelerating MDM2-mediated p53 ubiquitination
- Complex Single-Stage Juvenile Nasopharyngeal Angiofibroma Resection: A Hybrid Pediatric Endoscopic Endonasal and Transmaxillary Approach
- Minimally Invasive and Cost-Effective Access to Deep-Seated Intracranial Lesions Using 19F Peel-Away Sheath Introducer and "Dynamic" Retraction: Technical Note and a Case Series

---

A retraction note is an official statement published by a journal to inform readers that a previously published article has been formally withdrawn from the scientific record. This is usually due to significant issues such as:

Research misconduct (e.g., fabrication, falsification, plagiarism)

Honest errors that invalidate the findings

Ethical violations (e.g., lack of informed consent, undisclosed conflicts of interest)

Duplicate publication or authorship disputes

The retraction note typically:

Identifies the retracted article (title, authors, publication details)

Explains the reason for the retraction

Clarifies who initiated the retraction (authors, editors, or publisher)

Its purpose is to maintain the integrity of the scientific literature by alerting readers that the findings in the retracted work should no longer be considered reliable.

A retracted article is a previously published research paper that has been officially withdrawn from

the scientific record by the publisher or authors. This withdrawal, or retraction, typically occurs when the integrity, accuracy, or ethical compliance of the article is called into question. Retractions are meant to correct errors or prevent further dissemination of unreliable or unethical research findings.

Common Reasons for Retraction

Plagiarism: Unattributed copying of other authors' work.

Fabrication or Falsification: Deliberate manipulation or invention of data.

Ethical Violations: Issues like unethical study conduct, lack of informed consent, or conflicts of interest.

Errors in Data or Analysis: Substantial mistakes that undermine the conclusions.

Duplicate Publication: Republishing the same findings in multiple journals.

Authorship Disputes: Cases where the correct authors were not credited or included without consent.

Characteristics of a Retracted Article:

Typically marked as “Retracted” in the journal and databases like PubMed.

Accompanied by a retraction notice explaining the reasons for the withdrawal.

The original article may remain accessible for transparency, often labeled to clearly indicate its retracted status.

Retraction serves as an essential mechanism in scholarly publishing to maintain the integrity of the scientific literature.

The Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE) defines article retraction as a mechanism for correcting the academic literature by alerting readers to publications that contain flawed or erroneous data [1)].

https://retractionwatch.com/

A retraction is a public statement made about an earlier statement that withdraws, cancels, refutes, or reverses the original statement or ceases and desists from publishing the original statement. The retraction may be initiated by the editors of a journal, or by the author(s) of the papers (or their institution). Retractions may or may not be accompanied by the author's further explanation as to how the original statement came to be made and/or what subsequent events, discoveries, or experiences led to the subsequent retraction. They are also in some cases accompanied by apologies for the previous error and/or expressions of gratitude to persons who disclosed the error to the author.

As the volume of scientific publications increases, the rate of retraction of published papers is also likely to increase. In the present study, we report the characteristics of retracted papers from clinical

neurosurgery and allied clinical and basic science specialties.

Methods: Retracted papers were identified using two separate search strategies on PubMed. Attributes of the retracted papers were collected from PubMed and the Retraction Watch database. The reasons for retraction were analyzed. The factors that correlated with time to retraction were identified. Detailed citation analysis for the retracted papers was performed. The retraction rates for neurosurgery journals were computed.

Results: A total of 191 retractions were identified; 55% pertained to clinical neurosurgery. The most common reasons for retraction were plagiarism, duplication, and compromised peer review. The countries associated with the highest number of retractions were China, USA, and Japan. The full text of the retraction notice was not available for 11% of the papers. A median of 50% of all citations received by the papers occurred after retraction. The factors that correlated with a longer time to retraction included basic science category, the number of collaborating departments, and the H-index of the journal. The overall rate of retractions in neurosurgery journals was 0.037%.

The retraction notice needs to be freely available on all search engines. Plagiarism checks and reference checks prior to publication of papers (to ensure no retracted papers have been cited) must be mandatory. Mandatory data deposition would help overcome issues with data and results [2].

Reasons

Retractions of published scientific studies occur for a variety of different reasons that range from academic fraud to honest mistakes made in data analysis or presentation [3].

Articles are retracted for a myriad of reasons, and while there has been an overall increase in the number of retracted publications since the 1950s, there was an upsurge between 1990 and 2006.

Whether this increase can be attributed to a decline in the integrity of science, an increase in the visibility and accessibility of published papers, or advances in computing power and statistical methods are not entirely clear [4] [5].

The aim a review of Wang et al. was to assess the chronological trend, reasons, research type/design, and country of origin of retracted neurosurgical publications.

Two independent reviewers searched the EMBASE and MEDLINE databases using neurosurgical keywords for retracted articles from 1995 to 2016. Archives of retracted articles (retractionwatch.com) and the independent websites of neurosurgical journals were also searched. Data including the journal, impact factor, reason for retraction, country of origin, and citations were extracted.

A total of 98 studies were included for data extraction. Journal impact factor ranged from 0.57 to 35.03. Most studies (61) were retracted within the last 5 years. The most common reason for retraction was because of a duplicated publication found elsewhere (26), followed closely by plagiarism (22), or presenting fraudulent data (14). Other reasons included scientific errors/mistakes, author misattribution, and compromised peer review. Articles originated from several different countries and some were widely cited.

Retractions of neurosurgical publications are increasing significantly, mostly due to issues of academic integrity, including duplicate publishing and plagiarism. Implementation of more transparent data sharing repositories, a thorough screening of data prior to manuscript submission, as well as additional educational programs for new researchers, may help mitigate these issues moving forward [6].

A detailed review of all 2,047 biomedical and life-science research articles indexed by PubMed as retracted on May 3, 2012 revealed that only 21.3% of retractions were attributable to error. In contrast, 67.4% of retractions were attributable to misconduct, including fraud or suspected fraud (43.4%), duplicate publication (14.2%), and plagiarism (9.8%). Incomplete, uninformative or misleading retraction announcements have led to a previous underestimation of the role of fraud in the ongoing retraction epidemic. The percentage of scientific articles retracted because of fraud has increased ~10-fold since 1975. Retractions exhibit distinctive temporal and geographic patterns that may reveal underlying causes [7].

Goals

The overall goal of the retraction process is to enforce academic integrity in scientific research and prevent the dissemination of erroneous or flawed data for the interests of readers, collaborators, and investigators who may otherwise cite these works. In 2009, the Committee on Publication and Ethics (COPE) published guidelines for journal editors regarding when certain articles should be considered for retraction. Among the reasons listed were plagiarism, the performance of unethical research, if findings were previous published elsewhere, or if there was clear evidence that the presented findings are unreliable, be it because of deliberate misconduct or honest experimental error [8]

Country of Origin

Article Retraction by Country.

Articles

Donnally CJ 3rd, Kalakoti P, Buskard ANL, Butler AJ, Madhavan K, Nanda A, Pugely AJ, Gjolaj JP. Inpatient Outcomes After Elective Lumbar Spinal Fusion for Patients with Human Immunodeficiency Virus in the Absence of Acquired Immunodeficiency Syndrome. World Neurosurg. 2018 Aug;116:e913-e920. doi: 10.1016/j.wneu.2018.05.128. Epub 2018 May 28. Retraction in: World Neurosurg. 2024 Oct 15:S1878-8750(24)01637-1. doi: 10.1016/j.wneu.2024.09.088. PMID: 29852306.

Effects of SDF-1/CXCR4 on the Repair of Traumatic Brain Injury in Rats by Mediating Bone Marrow-Derived Mesenchymal Stem Cells

References

1)
Wager E, Barbour V, Yentis S, Kleinert S; COPE Council. Retractions: Guidance from the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE). London: Committee on Publishing Ethics 2009. Available from URL: https://publicationethics.org/files/u661/ Retractions_COPE_gline_final_3_Sept_09__2_.pdf (accessed August 2019).
2)
Madhugiri VS, Nagella AB, Uppar AM. An analysis of retractions in neurosurgery and allied clinical and basic science specialties. Acta Neurochir (Wien). 2020 Oct 16:1–12. doi: 10.1007/s00701-020-04615-z. Epub ahead of print. PMID: 33064200; PMCID: PMC7562691.
3)
Moylan EC, Kowalczuk MK. Why articles are retracted: a retrospective cross-sectional study of retraction notices at BioMed Central. BMJ Open. 2016;6:e012047.
4)
Cokol M, Ozbay F, Rodriguez-Esteban R. Retraction rates are on the rise. EMBO Rep 2008; DOI: https://doi.org/10.1038/sj.embor. 7401143.
5)
Carlisle JB. Data fabrication and other reasons for non-random sampling in 5087 randomised, controlled trials in anaesthetic and general medical journals. Anaesthesia 2017; 72: 944-52.
6)
Wang J, Ku J, Alotaibi NM, Rutka JT. Retraction of Neurosurgical Publications: A Systematic Review. World Neurosurg. 2017 Apr 12. pii: S1878-8750(17)30509-0. doi: 10.1016/j.wneu.2017.04.014. [Epub ahead of print] Review. PubMed PMID: 28412480.
7)
Fang FC, Steen RG, Casadevall A. Misconduct accounts for the majority of retracted scientific publications. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A. 2012 Oct 16;109(42):17028-33. doi: 10.1073/pnas.1212247109. Epub 2012 Oct 1. Erratum in: Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A. 2013 Jan 15;110(3):1137. PubMed PMID: 23027971; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC3479492.
8)
Wager E, Barbour V, Yentis S, Kleinert S. Committee on Publication Ethics Retraction Guidelines [Internet]. London: Committee on Publishing Ethics; 2009.