Useless

> "Not everything that is published deserves to be read — or done."

Definition

Useless refers to any academic or clinical content that **fails to offer applicable knowledge, actionable insight, or meaningful contribution** to understanding, decision-making, or patient care.

In essence: **it fills pages, not minds**.

Hallmarks

- **Theory without practice** – Elaborate models or reviews with no real-world implications
- **Repetition of known facts** – Adds nothing new to the field; rewords the obvious
- **Abstract admiration** – Describes a promising idea with no mechanism, data, or plan
- **Unreadable or inapplicable** – So dense, vague, or narrow it becomes irrelevant even to specialists

In Scientific Literature

A **useless paper** may:

- Conclude with "further studies are needed" without specifying what, why, or how
- Present a "review" that is neither critical nor focused
- Discuss hypothetical technologies not yet validated in any model
- Be published only to increase the author's h-index, not the reader's understanding

In Neurosurgery

Examples include:

- Reviews on brain tumors that never mention surgical indications
- Articles on AI tools that were never tested on clinical datasets
- Protocols so idealized they collapse in real-world settings

⚠ Consequences

- Wastes clinician time and journal space
- Pollutes literature with noise over signal
- Inflates CVs but not patient outcomes

- Contributes to academic theater, not evidence-based medicine

🔍 How to Detect It

Ask:

- "Does this change anything I do, understand, or teach?"
- "Is there any result or framework I could actually use?"
- "Would anything be lost if this article had never been published?"

If the answer is **no** — it's **useless**.

🔗 Related Concepts

- epistemological_fluff
- uncritical
- academic_theater

From:
https://neurosurgerywiki.com/wiki/ - **Neurosurgery Wiki**

Permanent link:
https://neurosurgerywiki.com/wiki/doku.php?id=useless

Last update: **2025/06/16 16:11**