



2025

KARNATAKA RADIOLOGY EDUCATION PROGRAM

CLINICAL RESEARCH – BRIDGING IMAGING & INNOVATION

SESSION – 9 – PREDATORY PUBLICATION



DR MUNIRAJU MARALAKUNTE

MBBS, MDRD (PGIMER), MBA (HHSM, BITS-PILANI)

REVIEWER-BMJ JOURNALS

ASSISTANT PROFESSOR

DEPTT. OF RADIOLOGY

SMSIMSR, CHIKKABALLAPUR



PREDATORY JOURNAL

✓ **PREDATORY JOURNALS** ARE EXPLOITATIVE

ACADEMIC PUBLICATIONS THAT CHARGE FEES TO
AUTHORS WITHOUT PROVIDING LEGITIMATE
EDITORIAL AND PUBLISHING SERVICES.

✓ THEY OFTEN LACK PROPER PEER REVIEW AND
TRANSPARENCY, UNDERMINING THE QUALITY AND
CREDIBILITY OF THE RESEARCH THEY PUBLISH.



Predatory Journals

IMPORTANCE OF IDENTIFYING PREDATORY JOURNALS

✓ PRESERVING RESEARCH INTEGRITY

- ✓ PUBLISHING IN PREDATORY JOURNALS CAN COMPROMISE THE INTEGRITY OF RESEARCH FINDINGS.

✓ PROTECTING RESEARCHERS' REPUTATION

- ✓ RESEARCHERS' REPUTATIONS CAN BE SEVERELY DAMAGED IF THEIR WORK IS ASSOCIATED WITH PREDATORY JOURNALS.

✓ ENSURING PATIENT SAFETY

- ✓ PREDATORY JOURNALS MAY PUBLISH LOW-QUALITY OR MISLEADING RESEARCH, POSING RISKS TO PATIENT SAFETY AND TREATMENT OUTCOMES.

✓ RESOURCE ALLOCATION

- ✓ PUBLISHING IN A PREDATORY JOURNAL CAN RESULT IN WASTED RESOURCES AND MISSED OPPORTUNITIES FOR RECOGNITION AND CAREER ADVANCEMENT.

✓ BUILDING TRUST

IDENTIFYING AND AVOIDING PREDATORY JOURNALS HELPS MAINTAIN THE TRUST AND CREDIBILITY OF THE SCIENTIFIC LITERATURE IN RADIOLOGY.

TASK– CASE STUDIES EXAMPLES OF PREDATORY PUBLICATION

✓ CASE STUDY 1: MISLEADING RESULTS

- ✓ A RESEARCHER SUBMITTED A STUDY ON A NEW IMAGING TECHNIQUE TO A JOURNAL THAT APPEARED REPUTABLE. THE JOURNAL ACCEPTED THE PAPER WITHIN THREE DAYS AND PUBLISHED IT WITHOUT ANY PEER REVIEW.
- ✓ **OUTCOME:** THE PUBLISHED RESULTS CONTAINED SIGNIFICANT ERRORS THAT WENT UNNOTICED, LEADING TO OTHER RESEARCHERS CITING AND USING THE FLAWED TECHNIQUE.

✓ CASE STUDY 2: UNRELIABLE RESEARCH

- ✓ A TEAM OF RADIOLOGISTS PUBLISHED A STUDY ON THE EFFECTIVENESS OF A NEW RADIOLOGICAL PROCEDURE IN A PREDATORY JOURNAL. THE JOURNAL'S EDITORIAL BOARD LACKED EXPERTS IN RADIOLOGY, AND THE PEER REVIEW PROCESS WAS NON-EXISTENT.
- ✓ **OUTCOME:** THE STUDY'S FINDINGS WERE LATER FOUND TO BE UNRELIABLE, CAUSING CONFUSION AND SKEPTICISM IN THE RADIOLOGY COMMUNITY.