If one scholar plagiarizes another, but everybody keeps quiet, did it really happen?

Bartlett & Smallwood, 2004 [12]

Plagiarism is the claim of authorship of a work, which is actually created by someone else.

In Oxford English Dictionary the noun “Plagiarism” is defined as “…the practice of taking someone else’s work or ideas and passing them off as one’s own.” [6]

The term has a Latin origin. For the first time in the 1st century the Latin word plagiarius used to denote someone stealing someone else’s work, pioneered by Roman poet Martial, who complained that another poet had “kidnapped his verses.”

This use of the word was introduced into English in 1601 by dramatist Ben Jonson, to describe as a plagiarie someone guilty of literary theft.[1]

It means presenting the idea from an existing source as a new and original use of the work created by another without mention of the originator; perform literary theft and academic dishonesty. Plagiarism includes copying and use of passages and ideas from text, books, books, articles, Internet sources without proper citation. [1, 2]

Although plagiarism is literary theft, it is not criminalized, but it poses a serious ethical issues both in academics and in the arts and industry.

At the core of the problem lies the ambiguity in the definitions and rules. The concept of plagiarism as theft does not exist in the legal sense. “Plagiarism” is not mentioned in any current statute, either criminal or civil. [10, 7] Some cases can be treated as unfair competition or violation of the doctrine of moral rights. [7]

Science is a field that is not amenable to regulation, and quantitative and qualitative evaluation criteria of science are fuzzy. It is possible that only one discovery can be sufficient to demonstrate the global significance of a researcher or 200 publications may remain invisible and repetitive foreign ideas. But humanity is seeking to count unnumerable things. It builds plans, seeks norms, sets criteria established scientometric indicators.

On the other hand, now no scientist exists who has begun in their field from scratch, he always builds upon and summarizes existing knowledge and determines the line of agreement or disagreement on it. However, the basic knowledge of any issue is not the copying of others’ ideas and achievements, but an overall critical assessment of available knowledge, including elements of summarizing and making conclusions in a particular direction. In this context, even the overview publications should not formally aggregate the available knowledge, but creatively reevaluate and justify the direction chosen by the author.

Morality in the science and academic ethics has a long history. In the past, scientists were encyclopedians and worked alone. They had limited capabilities to share and discuss the issues on which they worked. Their struggle was focused more towards recognition of the newly discovered truth. The problems related to morality and ethics arose with the formation of scientific communities and forming of relationships between community members - teamwork, work in competition or intellectual theft. So in the U.S. and Western Europe the rules of research ethics are no longer wishful thinking, and the state or institutional programs developed rules and procedures for monitoring and sanctions. Systematic violations of scientific ethics, according to Doctor of chemical sciences in the U.S., Lazarin Lazarov idea: publications without a real contribution; republishing of published data; "fragmentation" of publications or assembly of a new publication from previous their and not only their own such, publishing short and full versions, misrepresentation or non – publishing a part of the data that are not subject to a predetermined conclusion; forced joint authorship, conflict of interest in reviewing, improper citation (intentionally or accidentally) and others.

Scientists are working under great physical, mental, emotional and intellectual stress, often without any material benefit [5].

Scientists around the world most often live modestly, they do not appear in the top lists of the rich people in the world. I would like to join Violeta Tsakova and her “heretical idea” - researchers should take an oath like doctors, lawyers and military with which to devote their lives to knowledge for the purpose of human progress [5]. And because researchers put their heart and soul, devoting days and sometimes nights, often depriving themselves of weekends and holidays, taking away their personal time and family time without having to strive for material gain that is why theft in scientific fields is a moral crime. The development of the World Wide Web gave inexhaustible sources of information and at the same time increased the temptations to present foreign ideas as your own. Phenomenon "Copy-Paste" escalated has led to the creation of a number of specialized software aimed to verify the authenticity of the texts and the accuracy of the citations. The copying and pasting of paragraphs or even entire essays can now be done with just a few mouse clicks. The academic honesty and integrity is facing new challenges more than ever.

The availability of the textual material in electronic format and free data access facilitates plagiarism.

But what are the reasons that lead to the escalation of the problem? Why do scientists deceive?

• The myth that everything on the Internet is public domain and can be copied quickly without problem and without citation.

• Have to publish or perish! This maxim is the "driving force" for swarming publications. In some countries, like Germany, there are more financial bonuses for more productive scientists and financial benefits for the productive departments (measured as number of publications per person).

• The term scientometrics, which essentially tries to put the quantitative criteria in terms of number of publications or monographs, scientific production in general, but at the same time, is unable to establish uniform criteria for quality assessment. This approach raises the amount to a cult.

• Besides that, the number of publications and monographs are important and criteria such as the number of publications with first authorship, number of citations, journal ranking (impact factor), number of publications with at least 10 citations in the last 5 years (hc) and others. All these are responsible for phenomenons like “ Forced joint authorship ” and "Ghostwriter" which will be discussed below.
Identification of plagiarism is further complicated by fact that each of the above key factors can be combined with other ones and this creates a set of possible scenarios of plagiarism.

Here is nearly full list of possible scenarios, starting with the worst case [9]:

**Sources Not Cited**

1) "The Ghost Writer" - The writer turns in another's work, word-for-word, as his or her own.

2) "The Photocopy" – The writer copies significant portions of text straight from a single source, without alteration.

3) "The Potluck Paper"- The writer tries to disguise plagiarism by copying from several different sources, tweaking the sentences to make them fit together while retaining most of the original phrasing.

4) "The Poor Disguise" - Although the writer has retained the essential content of the source, he or she has altered the paper's appearance slightly by changing key words and phrases.

5) "The Labor of Laziness"- The writer takes the time to paraphrase most of the paper from other sources and make it all fit together, instead of spending the same effort on original work.

6) "The Self-Stealer"- The writer "borrows" generously from his or her previous work, violating policies concerning the expectation of originality adopted by most academic institutions.

"The Self-Stealer" can be

- Duplicate publication- Publication of same papers with similar content that has already published.
- Salami publications- Publishing several papers out of results of a single study.
- Text recycling- Publishing the same work in different journals/languages.

**Sources Cited (but still plagiarized!)**

1) "The Forgotten Footnote" - The writer mentions an author's name for a source, but neglects to include specific information on the location of the material referenced. This often masks other forms of plagiarism by obscuring source locations.

2) "The Misinformer" - The writer provides inaccurate information regarding the sources, making it impossible to find them.

3) "The Too-Perfect Paraphrase" - The writer properly cites a source, but neglects to put in quotation marks text that has been copied word-for-word, or closes to it. Despite of attributing the basic ideas to the source, the writer is falsely claiming original presentation and interpretation of the information.

4) "The Resourceful Citer" - The writer properly cites all sources, paraphrasing and using quotations appropriately.

The catch? The paper contains almost no original work! It is sometimes difficult to spot this form of plagiarism because it looks like any other well-researched document.

5) "The Perfect Crime" - Well, we all know it doesn’t exist. In this case, the writer properly quotes and cites sources in some places, but goes on to paraphrase other arguments from those sources without citation. This way, the writer tries to pass off the paraphrased material as his or her own analysis of the cited material.

Another form of plagiarism is contrafaction. The term derives from contrafaction, crm. law. Counterfeiting, imitating. In the French law contrafaction (contrefacon) is the illegal reprinting of a book for which the author or his assignee has a copyright, to the prejudice of the latter [10]. In other words: using the creation of the writer of the original work without their permission and without repaying them for the utilization.

The most hidden and virtually impossible to be proven are the most common forms of intellectual theft in the scientific community – ‘Forced joint authorship’ and ‘Ghostwriter’, that’s why we will additionally focus on these phenomenon [5, 14].

Joint author is a writer who collaborates with others in writing something, but “Forced Joint Authorship” is defined as: Inclusion as a co-writer the name of a person who has not been part of the creative process due to this person’s higher position.

The similarity with plagiarism is that both include the usurping of intellectual property. The difference is, that the Forced Joint Authorship is done with the knowledge and consent of the original author. This consent is however the result of power abuse by the other ‘cowriter’.

Why when we talk about plagiarism, we mean mostly students? Often professors are those who start plagiarism in academia. Why Professors - seemingly respectable people - are tempted to pose as someone else's feathers? Volker Ribble calls for two reasons: First, the lack of their own ideas and intellectual potential. In science, as in fact, 'you exist until you have new ideas'. Secondly, it is an effort. The professor does not have enough time to invest in writing, summarizing, in editing, layout, in statistics, in communication with publishers upon meeting the conditions set by the publishers, in response to the reviewers and remains nothing, he write off yourself or puts his name at the head of the publications of the work of his assistants instead.

In many countries take action against plagiarism. Ombudsmen at the German Research Community (DFG - Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft) Ulrike Bayzigel (Ulrike Beisiegel) monitor compliance with scientific ethics. She explains plagiarism in the scientific environment in Germany and more financial pressure. "The fact that the budgets of universities in Germany distributed by the so-called " incentive principle " explains Bayzigel. - Say medical faculties are guaranteed 70 percent of the funding, while the remaining 30 faculty must earn additional points so, among other things, are awarded and publications [4]. Therefore, the more Professors' publications, the more points and, respectively, the more money for the department.

**Bitter science: write down and shut up!**

Often victims of sluggishness or vanity of professors are exactly young students. The concept of "Ghostwriter"- that is, writing speeches, articles and books for the other person and, unfortunately, this phenomenon is very familiar in the scientific community.

The career of graduate students and young scientists in most cases depends on the goodwill and support of the supervisor or the director of the institute, and a showdown is undesirable. Therefore, upon receiving a request to the young „indentured Intellect", has to write to the authorities in silence, while remaining invisible to readers.

**World Wide Web put another global problem - the growing number of open access journals and unclear criteria for publishing in them**

In 2013 , John Bohannon, a correspondent for Science Magazine, published an interesting study on the quality of peer review in online free accessed scientific journals, which drew worldwide attention to the growing problem. With the help of a professional team he sent scientific manuscript with fictional data and unscientific results and conclusions to 304 journals . After reviewing such publication had to be rejected. In more than half of the scientific journals, however, the article was accepted for publication having mainly editorial remarks [8].

In recent years, the growth of on-line journals with open access in global Internet space cause anxiety in worldwide scientific community.

Uneasiness is mainly related to the quality of peer evaluation of the published articles. The Scientific publications should be reviewed anonymously by at least two reviewers in the same field. More critical attitude is need for the publications and more
thorough acquaintance with the evidence presented in support of evidence submitted and conclusions.

Editorial Board of Mintage Journal of Pharmaceutical and Medical Sciences is committed to enhancing the vigilance in the fight against plagiarism in research papers. The journal applies different strategies - criticism towards the submitted publications, requirement for precise formulation of the methods used, clear tabular and graphical presentation of results and formulation of conclusions and the implementation of stringent rules for the citation sources. These guarantees of quality should encourage the scientists to publish in Mintage Journal of Pharmaceutical and Medical Sciences.

Mintage Journals follows also publication policy of free access with a very minimal charge by the authors and no charge for readers. Our ‘free access policy’ is not a policy of not-evaluation criteria, but the opposite. We know that there are hundreds of publishers and journals and that some of the publications that have been rejected by us, will be adopted by other journals. Mintage Journals declare compliance with scientific ethics. Ethical Guidelines for Authors Submitting Manuscripts to the MJPMS stipulates that ‘The Mintage Journal of pharmaceutical and medical sciences follows highest standards of publication ethics and takes all possible measures against any publication malpractices. All authors submitting their works to the Mintage journal of pharmaceutical and medical sciences for publication as original articles attest that the submitted works represent their authors’ contributions and have not been plagiarized or copied in whole or in part from other works.’

The journal has its own database of the world’s leading specialists in the field of pharmaceutical and medical sciences from various institutes and research centers worldwide who place in bet his scientific reputation for the quality of refereed publications. The Mintage journal of pharmaceutical and medical sciences follows objective and fair double-blind peer-review of the submitted for publication works and prevents any actual or potential conflict of interests between the editorial and review personnel and the reviewed material. The peer review of each article concentrates on objective and technical concerns to determine whether the research has been sufficiently well conceived, well executed, and well described to justify inclusion in the scientific evidence.

In 2014 Mintage Journals began its third successful year. For this relatively short period (since 2012) the citations and indexing of journal articles published is rising, which is the objective proof of the high level of scientific publications. Journal rating is rising, too.

In conclusion could be said that violations of research ethics and unscrupulous publications should be acknowledged as a problem of the modern science. Plagiarism is a disease in modern academia. Should not be afraid of reviewers! The reviewers are the corrective! They should responsibly and conscientiously to carry out their community service in the name of the quality of research.

The more referees referenced to the articles, the more advice and recommendations are given and weaknesses are identified and eliminated, and the rating of each publication, and from there of the journal would increase.
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