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Abstract

Background: Plagiarism, in simple words meaning theft of ideas or text, is a grave scientific misconduct that is talked about frequently, however is notable in its conspicuous absence from the formal educational curriculum. Students and young researchers tend to engage in this malpractice, intentionally or unintentionally, due to various reasons.

Aim: In this review, we aim to discuss a clear concept about plagiarism from its origin to its consequences, with special considerations about its status in the COVID-19 pandemic. This lucid conceptualization will help young authors invest in original research in terms of both the idea and the script, avoiding unnecessary rejections and breach in medical ethics.

Search Strategy: An electronic search strategy was performed on MEDLINE using the following keywords: “Plagiarism” OR “Plagiarism AND reasons” OR “Plagiarism AND consequences OR retractions” OR “Plagiarism AND detection”.

Results: Of 2112 articles obtained, 36 were selected for the review. The main reasons for this malpractice were pressure for publication under a limited time frame along with a lack of training for scientific writing. The forms of plagiarism observed include intentional and unintentional, theft of ideas, copying verbatim, graphics, self-plagiarism and translational plagiarism. Use of various software are available for detection of plagiarism like iThenticate, Turnitin Feedback Studio, Grammarly etc along with careful reviewing by authors, reviewers and editors can detect this menace and help maintain originality in science. The consequences can be severe, ranging from defamation to monetary to legal action against the authors. Conducting interactive workshops on scientific writing along with promoting creativity in thought at the level of grass-root education is the key to preventing the scientific misconduct of plagiarism amongst students and young researchers.

Conclusion: Plagiarism is a serious scientific misconduct that must be discussed with students and young researchers, and its prevention is the key to fostering growth in medical science and academics.
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INTRODUCTION

"Just like the drone, most plagiarists have no skill to improve, industry to acquire or taste to select. They imprudently prefer already made honey from the hive.”

-Oscar Wilde

Scientific publications are means of communicating novel ideas and hypotheses. The originality of the idea as well as the script is the essence of scientific communication. Plagiarism is copying someone else’s work or ideas or data and projecting it like your own. It is an act of academic misconduct which may happen intentionally or ignorantly, for both published as well as unpublished material in the form of a manuscript or print or electronic media without giving due credit to the originator. It is one of the most common causes of rejection of manuscripts for publication accounting for 23% of rejections as per an article by Nature’s publishing group [1-2]. It is also one of the commonest reasons for retraction of manuscripts second only to a compromised review process [3]. There have been numerous articles discussing this topic, but our focus will be on plagiarism-history, definition, types, recognition, and its consequences, especially retractions as well as the status of plagiarism in light of the COVID-19 pandemic.

HISTORY OF PLAGIARISM

Plagiarism is not restricted to the scientific community and in fact, the original concept came from the ancient history of stealing creative ideas and artwork of artists. Most of the religious texts were authorless and were freely copied and incorporated into later works [4]. Subsequently, during times of renaissance, artists used to sign their artwork in terms of mentioning their credibility.

The Latin word "plagiarius" means "kidnapper", was first used by the Roman poet Martial who accused another poet for “kidnapping” his verses [5]. The term "plagiarius" made way into the English language in the 17th century as “Plagiany” by the author and satirist Ben Johnson to describe literary theft [6].

Gradually, it made its way into science and academia with the first article discussing plagiarism published in Science in 1896 [7]. Since then, about 11000 articles have been written about plagiarism as per Pubmed Central. But the demon of plagiarism seems far from gone.

SEARCH STRATEGY

An electronic search strategy was performed on MEDLINE as per recommendations for drafting narrative reviews [8] using the following keywords: “Plagiarism” OR “Plagiarism AND reasons” OR “Plagiarism AND consequences OR retraction” OR “Plagiarism AND detection”. Articles in language other than English were excluded (Figure 1). After an initial screening of titles and abstracts, relevant articles were retained. The qualifying full-text publications and their citations were carefully reviewed to determine whether information on the topic of interest was included.

Additional information pertaining to specific sections was obtained through an individualized search strategy: Plagiarism AND COVID-19, Plagiarism AND Prevention.

PLAGIARISM AND ACADEMIA

The academic world is a high-pressure zone and with the fundamental idea of “Publish or Perish”, students and young researchers face immense burdens for publications for better job opportunities, promotions and prosperity in the academic world. Many factors have been identified for influencing the need to plagiarize in students [9]. Some identified barriers for the prevention of the practice of plagiarism are [9-14]:

- High workload (multiple assignments in a stipulated time frame)
- Promoting wrote learning and memorization (favouring textbook material over experimental method)
- Decreasing individual practical activities (missing overt real-life experiences)
- Punishment over rewards (negative reinforcement behaviour)
- Lack of interactive sessions (teacher-student engagement)
- Lack of sessions on effective and ethical scientific communication in the academic curriculum as well as lack of awareness of the consequences. About 70% of students and young researchers had not received training regarding the same in a survey from Iran and Pakistan. Similarly, another survey from non-Anglophonic countries recommended specific training on scientific communication for young researchers as part of the curriculum.
- Lack of proficiency in the language required. A study from a leading journal of medical genetics identified plagiarism in 17% of articles with over 82% being from non-Anglophonic countries [15].

The major concern lies deep rooted in the education system which promotes memorization and spoon-feeding rather than innovation [9-10]. The education
system endorses conventional textbook learning which subconsciously expels innovative thought in young minds [16]. Further, the immense scientific information available readily on the world wide web makes replication of material easier than ever.

**FORMS OF PLAGIARISM**
According to Fishman, Plagiarism is defined as, “Use of words, ideas, or work products attributable to another identifiable person or source without attributing the work to the source from which it was obtained in a situation in which there is a legitimate expectation of original authorship in order to obtain some benefit, credit, or gain which need not be monetary” [17] (Figure 2).

Many classifications have been used to define types of plagiarism. It may be intentional or unintentional, both liable for the consequences of scientific misconduct [18]. The different attempts at classifying plagiarism are summarized in Table 1.

In the simplest form, it can be:

**Plagiarism of ideas**
Using ideas obtained from presentations, unpublished work submitted for grant applications, peer review or from students, and putting it forward as an original work.

**Plagiarism of text**
Is copying text as it is from a previously published work. Concepts from previous articles can be used with appropriate referencing, however, text and paragraphs cannot be copied even if the due reference to the original work is provided. This can be of various subtypes:
- Direct: Copying the text as it is with or without references
- Paraphragsiarism or patch writing: Copying text with replacement or change of a few words

**Plagiarism of Graphics**
Use of images or tables with or without referencing, or use of ideas in the form of an image without official permission from the source.

**Self-Plagiarism**
Use of one’s own previously published work in another paper without appropriate referencing to the original work.

**Translational Plagiarism**
Publishing the same work in different languages without the permission of the primary publisher.

Others are collusion, manipulation of citations and compound plagiarism which can face legal consequences [16,19-20].

**PLAGIARISM DETECTION**
As the internet has made it easy to plagiarize, technology has been harnessed in the detection of the same. Multiple software has been developed over the past decade for the detection of plagiarism. They’re both freely available and paid, and can be used for academic publishing by authors, editors and reviewers as well as for educational purposes by students and teachers. These checkers scan the text and match it with their database which then creates an output highlighting the parts which are similar to previously published work and give a percentage of the similarity. Many journals have adopted plagiarism checkers as part of their screening process but the defining levels vary from 15 to 80% for different journals [21,22]. The rates of papers with plagiarism vary from 6-23% as per most published data [21,23]. The cost of the software and the labour seems justified in a recent study from two radiology journals in preventing plagiarized low-quality work [24]. Some of the various software available for plagiarism detection and their properties are summarized in Table 2. Others available include viper, Plagiarisma, PlagiarismChecker, PlagTracker, DupliChecker, CopyLEaks etc.

In addition to software that merely perform text matching with a percentage of matching as output, the peer review process by editors and reviewers is irreplaceable. Some types of plagiarism like those of ideas cannot be detected by these. Further, some terminologies especially under methodology and statistical analysis is usually common with limited word liberty available. Hence, some amount of plagiarism may be acceptable.

**CONSEQUENCES**
Plagiarism contributes to academic fraud and can have serious consequences for authors and editors. It can result in a formal disciplinary action, suspension from the medical council on grounds of unethical practice and scientific misconduct, at times even blacklisting. It can result in defaming of the authors with loss of reputation in the medical community. Violation of copyright can result in legal and monetary consequences [25,26].

When faced with plagiarism before publication, the editors can simply reject the article and/or inform the authors of the same. If it has come to notice after publication, the journal may publish an erratum, apology letter, retract the article or levy a penalty on the authors [25,26].
A Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE) has been put together which lays down policies for ethical scientific writing and conduct as well as action to be taken in case of any breach [27].

Retractions
Plagiarism is one of the most common causes of retraction of papers. A study of retractions over 20 years from Iran affiliated papers identified 697 papers of which 26% were due to plagiarism [28]. Another study that focused on open access journals identified 621 retractions of which 20% were contributed by plagiarism. The majority of retractions were from China, India, Iran and USA [29]. A study from Brazil revealed plagiarism as the most common reason for retractions [30]. In recent years, more journals are actively retracting fraudulent articles which is a positive sign for the academic community and promotes genuine research [31].

PLAGIARISM AMIDST THE COVID-19 PANDEMIC
The COVID-19 pandemic has made the online method of learning of central importance. Online learning platforms have evolved dramatically to keep pace with maintaining distance learning for continuing education. So, assignments and periodic assessments were carried out digitally. Students had free access to internet resources making it easier to copy and reuse data. A study evaluated plagiarism using Turnitin checker tool on students in a semester exam during the COVID-19 pandemic and found 57%-95% similarity in the content submitted by students [32]. On a subsequent questionnaire-based survey, most of the students were aware of the concept of plagiarism but continued to do so due to language difficulties, tight deadlines and unfamiliar materials [32]. The integrative social contract theory was popularized by maintaining a symbiotic relationship between the student and the educator with a partial solution for rising plagiarism in the pandemic era. This theory states that the educator needs to be more interactive in an online learning module and shared decision making is required for assignments [33].

On the scientific literature front, multiple articles have been retracted from journals as well as preprint servers. A study identified, 46 retractions over 6 months in the latter half of 2020 of which seven were due to plagiarism. The COVID-19 pandemic was viewed as an opportunity for rapid publications as most journals had articles on COVID-19 listed as a priority for publication. This led to pressure for publishing novel ideas in a limited time which could have resulted in resorting to scientific misconduct to leapfrog in the race for publications.

PLAGIARISM PREVENTION
Prevention of theft of ideas and work is the essence of maintaining the originality of scientific writing. These can be done by organizing training and courses for young researchers to impart knowledge about what is plagiarism, means of avoiding it and the use of appropriate software to detect it. Consequences of plagiarism, as well as ethical conduct in scientific writing, are also important topics to be discussed. However, there are mixed effects of training on the attitude of students towards plagiarism with a better effect of practical courses as per a recent systematic review [34,35]. A recent study from Qatar reported a multipronged strategy consisting of incorporation of a plagiarism policy in the course website and handbook, conduction of seminars and tutorials, and incorporation of a plagiarism checker on the submission website that automatically detected plagiarism reduced its incidence from 44 to 28% [36].

The long-term solution for this deep-rooted problem lies in correcting the education system from its base by instilling the importance of creative thinking and reducing reliance on bookish learning.

The use of original ideas for research and an extensive literature search are the first steps towards avoiding plagiarism. Researchers and students must add a plagiarism check as an additional step to the proof-reading of a manuscript before submission to detect and avoid any unintentional plagiarism. Furthermore, a recent study identified the absence of a statement regarding plagiarism in 55% of journal websites with a detailed description present only in 25% of them. Thus, a detailed policy statement about plagiarism should be present on all journal websites on their home page and instructions to the authors page [37].

CONCLUSION
Plagiarism is an ethical breach in academic flourishing. The main aim is to foster original research and pay gratitude to the originator in the field. It can have serious consequences and can haunt the reputation of students and researchers in their future career. Case-based training modules with an explanation of the consequences, clear statement about plagiarism policies on university and journal websites is the key. Further, the promotion of originality in young minds right from primary school days is the eventual pillar of fostering originality of work not limited to the field of science.
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Figure 1. Methodology

Figure 2. Types, Detection, and Consequences of Plagiarism
| Types                          | Sham                                      | Illicit                                   | Verbatim Copying                                                                 | Technical tricks to deceive detection systems | Inaccurate Referencing | Tough | Ghostwriting | Recycling | Purloining |
|-------------------------------|-------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|------------------------|-------|--------------|-----------|------------|
| Example: *Betty Botter bought some butter, but she said that butter is bitter* | Betty Botter bought some bitter butter(x) | Betty Botter bought some bitter butter*   | Betty Botter bought some butter, but she said that butter is bitter             | Betty Botter bought some butter, but she said that butter is bitter* | Alexa bought some butter, but she said that butter is salty in taste Or Betty Botter butyrum aliquod emit, sed dixit butyrum amarum esse ^ | Betty Botter bought some butter, but she said that butter is bitter* | Assignment 1: Betty Botter bought some butter, but she said that butter is bitter | Assignment 2: Betty Botter bought some butter, but she said that butter is bitter | Student1: Betty Botter bought some butter, but she said that butter is bitter | Student2: Betty Botter bought some butter, but she said that butter is bitter |
| Walker's Typology (38)^^^    |                                           |                                           |                                                                                |                                               |                        |       |              |           |            |
| Mozgovoy et al. (39)^^^       |                                           |                                           |                                                                                |                                               |                        |       |              |           |            |
| Velasquez et al. (40)^^^      |                                           |                                           |                                                                                |                                               |                        |       |              |           |            |
| Foltyn:ek et al. (41)^^^      | Semantics preserving                      | Semantics preserving                      | Character preserving                                                           | Syntax preserving                              | Idea/ Semantics preserving | Ghostwriting |

*No reference mentioned, # using 0 instead of o, $ fake/false references or expired link, ^ translated into Latin, & Written by third person, ~ written without consent.

^ ^ ^ Highlighted boxes indicate types included in that classification
### Table 2: Examples of software for detecting plagiarism

| Software              | Reference database                                                                 | Method                      | Report                                      | Useful for                      | Free or Paid |
|-----------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------|
| iThenticate           | Journal articles, conference proceedings, databases, millions of webpages          | Upload/cut paste            | Similarity scores in %                      | Individuals/organizations       | Paid         |
| http://www.ithenticate.com/ |                                                                                   |                             |                                             |                                 |              |
| Turnitin Feedback Studio | Journal articles, conference proceedings, databases, millions of webpages        | Upload/cut paste for a class room setting | Similarity scores in %                      | Organizations                   | Paid         |
| https://www.turnitin.com |                                                                                   |                             |                                             |                                 |              |
| Grammarly             | Billions of webpages                                                              | Paste text                  | Report mention if plagiarism issues present or no | Individuals/organizations       | Free         |
| https://www.grammarly.com/plagiarism-checker |                                                                                            |                             |                                             |                                 |              |
| HelioBlast            | MEDLINE titles and abstracts                                                       | Paste text, limit of 1000 words | Scores, abstracts that are similar           | Individuals                     | Free         |
| https://helioblast.heliotext.com/ |                                                                                   |                             |                                             |                                 |              |
ПЛАГИАТ И ЕГО ПОСЛЕДСТВИЯ: РУКОВОДСТВО ПО ОТВЕТСТВЕННОМУ НАУЧНОМУ ПИСЬМУ

Резюме
Введение: Плагиат, простым словом означающий кражу идей или текста, является серьезным научным преступлом, о котором часто говорят, однако примечательно его явное отсутствие в формальной учебной программе. Студенты и молодые исследователи намеренно или непреднамеренно совершают эту ошибку по разным причинам. Цель: в этом обзоре мы стремимся обсудить четкую концепцию плагиата от его происхождения до его последствий, уделяя особое внимание его статусу в условиях пандемии COVID-19. Ясная концептуализация поможет молодым авторам инвестировать время и силы, идеи в оригинальные исследования, избегая отказов и нарушений медицинской этики.

Материалы и методы. Поиск научных статей был выполнен в MEDLINE по следующим ключевым словам: «Плагиат» или «Плагиат и причины» или «Плагиат и последствия» или «Плагиат и опровержения» или «Плагиат и обнаружение».

Результаты: Из 2112 полученных статей для обзора было отобрано 36. Основными причинами рассматриваемого нарушения были необходимость публикации в ограниченные сроки, а также отсутствие подготовки для написания научных работ. Наблюдаемые формы плагиата включают преднамеренный и непреднамеренный плагиат, кражу идей, дословное копирование, графику, само plagiat и переводочный plagiat. Для обнаружения плагиата используются различные программ, таких как iThenticate, Turnitin Feedback Studio, Grammarly и др., а также патентное рассмотрение авторами, редакциями и редакторами может обнаружить эту угрозу и помочь сохранить оригинальность в науке. Последствия могут быть серьезными: от клеветы до
денежных исков против авторов. Проведение интерактивных семинаров по научному письму наряду с поощрением творческого мышления на уровне массового образования является ключом к предотвращению неправомерного научного плагиата среди студентов и молодых исследователей. Вывод: Плагиат — это серьезный научный проступок, который необходимо обсуждать со студентами и молодыми исследователями, и его предотвращение является ключом к развитию медицинской науки и академических кругов.

**Ключевые слова:** COVID-19, учебная программа, высшее медицинское образование, злоупотребление служебным положением, публикационная этика, студенты
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