WebLog Journal of Medical Sciences

Mini Review
Published: 18 Apr, 2026

Journal Publication Integrity Issues: Preserving Academic Communication's Credibility: An Overview

*Nnodim Johnkennedy**

Department of Medical Laboratory Science, Imo State University, Owerri, Nigeria

Abstract

The credibility of science and the advancement of knowledge depend on scholarly publishing's integrity. Trust is the foundation of the whole publication process, from data collection and article drafting to peer review and editorial decision-making. However, a number of integrity issues threaten the validity of academic writing in many emerging research systems, including Nigeria. The main categories of misbehavior in journal publication are thoroughly examined in this work, including authorship disputes, conflicts of interest, predatory publishing, data fabrication, plagiarism, and peer review manipulation. The structural roots of these issues are also examined, and tactical solutions to restore academic communication's ethical norms are proposed.

Keywords: Journal Publication; Integrity Issues; Academic Communication

OPEN ACCESS

Correspondence:
Nnodim Johnkennedy, Department of Medical Laboratory Science, Imo State University, Owerri, Nigeria, Tel: 08181366290; E-mail: johnkennedy23@yahoo.com

Received Date: *31 Mar 2026*
Accepted Date: *16 Apr 2026*
Published Date: *18 Apr 2026*

Citation:
Nnodim Johnkennedy. Journal Publication Integrity Issues: Preserving Academic Communication's Credibility: An Overview. WebLog J Med Sci. wjms.2026.d1801. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.19765113

Introduction

Scholarly publishing is often seen as the driving force behind scientific advancement. Knowledge is verified, preserved, and shared by peer-reviewed journals with both academic and non-academic audiences. This method is only credible because of trust. Readers have confidence that the results released are novel, founded on sound techniques, produced in an ethical manner, and presented truthfully. Writers trust journals to conduct rigorous and equitable peer review, and editors trust that authors submit authentic work [1].

The integrity of the entire academic system is compromised if any link in this chain is compromised. Integrity problems in journal publication have become more noticeable in the development of research environments, driven by systemic pressures, insufficient regulatory frameworks, and the widespread "publish or perish" mentality around the world. In addition to harming individual researchers, these issues alter the global scientific record [2].

In the publishing industry, plagiarism is one of the most prevalent forms of misconduct. It involves paraphrasing in a way that makes it difficult to identify the original sources as well as explicitly copying words, concepts, or data without providing credit. Just as harmful is self-plagiarism, which occurs when writers use significant portions of their own previously published work without disclosing it to others.

These methods artificially inflate academic productivity and distort the originality of knowledge. Additionally, it reduces confidence in institutional research evaluation procedures. Although plagiarism detection technologies have improved monitoring, enforcement remains patchy, particularly in low-resource publication contexts with limited editor availability [4].

Both data falsification (altering or selectively reporting data) and data fabrication (making up results) are extremely significant integrity violations. This type of negative behavior is frequently brought on by pressure to succeed professionally, fear of failing, competition for research grants and academic promotion, and reward systems that prioritize publication volume over quality [5].

The consequences are extensive. Inaccurate data can endanger public health, particularly in the clinical, pharmaceutical, and environmental sciences, and result in incorrect findings in subsequent research and policy decisions.

Despite being the ethical foundation of academic publishing, peer review is increasingly vulnerable to abuse. Two prevalent methods of cheating are editors fast-tracking manuscripts from friends or colleagues and authors utilizing fictitious email addresses to supply false reviewers. Examine procedures that are superficial or nonexistent [6].

Peer review becomes a symbolic rite rather than a practical means of ensuring quality in journals with lax regulations, allowing fraudulent or subpar research to enter the scientific record [7].

Predatory journals are actually a form of institutionalized integrity loss. These sites accept almost any submission, demand a high fee for publication, and do little to no peer review. They exploit young researchers, particularly in developing countries, and spread false, unverified information throughout the academic community. As a result, it becomes increasingly difficult to distinguish between academic fraud and legitimate science [8].

However, authorship ethics are frequently violated in a number of ways, including Gift authorship, which lists senior academics for their prestige rather than their achievements, Ghost authorship, which omits valid contributions, and Disputes over authorship order and credit. These kinds of behaviors undermine the moral foundation of scientific authorship by undermining intellectual integrity and altering the way participants are held accountable in collaborative research [9]. Conflicts of interest also arise when decisions regarding what to publish are influenced by institutional, financial, or personal relationships. Ignoring these problems jeopardizes scientific objectivity and editorial neutrality. Clear governance is usually replaced by editorial bias in systems with insufficient regulations, which reduces the trustworthiness of publications [10].

Integrity issues don't occur spontaneously. They highlight more significant issues with the system, such as the overemphasis on publication numbers for career progression and promotions and the lack of adequate training in research ethics. Integrity issues include insufficient funding for editorial professionalism and a lack of national misbehavior monitoring organizations. Misbehavior becomes a rational survival strategy when systems incentivize production without evaluating its quality [11].

Postgraduate and early-career academic programs should incorporate required instruction on research and publication ethics. To investigate misconduct, universities and research institutions should establish independent research integrity bureaus. It can really become clearer by implementing open peer review procedures and reviewer accountability systems. Instead of focusing on publication volume, academic evaluation systems should prioritize scientific impact, reproducibility, and societal significance [12]. National accreditation systems for reliable journals can promote ethical publishing and protect researchers from dishonest sources.

Conclusion

Integrity is a moral culture rather than only a technical component of academic publishing. Journals stop being locations to discover the truth and instead become places to store data when ethical discipline is lacking. We require more than merely official regulations and technology instruments to restore integrity to academic systems like Nigeria's. The way that we value, instruct, and incentivize research must be totally transformed. A dishonest journal may still publish articles, but it is unable to produce knowledge. And without knowledge, science is impossible.

References

1. Resnik D.B and Shamoo A.E. *Ethics of scientific research: An international perspective*. London: Routledge. 2017.
2. Krejcie R.V and Morgan D.W. 'Determining sample size for research activities', Educational and Psychological Measurement, 1970, 30(3), pp. 607–610.
3. Haynes S.N, Richard D and Kubany E.S. 'Content validity in psychological assessment', Psychological Assessment, 1995, 7(3), pp. 238–247.
4. Shamseer L, Moher D, Maduekwe O, Turner L, Barbour V, Burch R, Clark J, Galipeau J, Roberts J and Shea B.J. 'Potential predatory and legitimate biomedical journals: Can you tell the difference?', BMC Medicine, 2017, 15, 28.
5. Mulligan A, Hall L and Raphael E. 'Peer review in a changing world', Learned Publishing, 2013, 26(1), pp. 1–11.
6. Ross-Hellauer T. 'What is open peer review? A systematic review', F1000Research, 2017, 6, 588.
7. Resnik D.B and Elmore S.A. 'Ensuring the quality, fairness, and integrity of journal peer review', Science and Engineering Ethics, 2016, 22, pp. 169–188.
8. Gasparyan A.Y, Ayvazyan L, Blackmore H and Kitas G.D. 'Writing a narrative biomedical review: Considerations for authors, peer reviewers, and editors', Rheumatology International, 2017, 32(11), pp. 2807–2817.
9. Siler K, Lee K and Bero L. 'Measuring the effectiveness of peer review', Science Advances, 2015, 1(6), e1400238.
10. Wislar J.S, Flanagin A, Fontanarosa P.B and DeAngelis C.D. 'Honorary and ghost authorship in high-impact biomedical journals: A cross-sectional survey', BMJ, 2011, 343, d6128.
11. Smith R. 'Peer review: A flawed process at the heart of science and journals', Journal of the Royal Society of Medicine, 2006, 99(4), pp. 178–182.
12. Teixeira da Silva J.A. 'Open post-publication peer review', Scientometrics, 2020, 122, pp. 1–10.