

Scientific Parasitism With The History Of Newton In A Parallel Universe.

Juan Sebastián Gómez-Jeria, PhD

Free Researcher, Glowing Neurons Group, Santiago, Chile.

Abstract

This article presents my critical reflections on one of the most deleterious phenomena in scientific research: parasitism. It meticulously examines and dissects the multifaceted manifestations of scientific parasitism, ranging from its individual behavioral patterns to the comprehensive institutional infiltration and subversion. The text delineates sophisticated methodologies for detecting and counteracting the pernicious activities of these academic predators. The intricate relationship between retracted scholarly publications and parasitic academic conduct is comprehensively analyzed and elucidated.

Keywords: Scientific parasitism, retracted articles, Isaac Newton, scientific creativity.

Date of Submission: 21-10-2025

Date of Acceptance: 31-10-2025

I. Introduction

The number of retractions issued for research articles in 2023 has passed 10,000 (Nature report). In 2022, the figure topped 4,000. The criminal activity of authors and co-authors of retracted articles is insufficient to fully explain the magnitude of such phenomena. In this article, we present several critical reflections and hypotheses concerning this complex academic occurrence.

Originally, a *parasitos* was the selected partner of the divinity and at the same time a civil servant of a municipality and an prominent citizen of a community. Later it became the name of the tolerated, but not invited eater during a guest meal. He had to pay for his meal with excitement of the guests, adulation, maintenance art and humiliations.

In our Universe, Isaac Newton's notes found in the Vellum manuscript were most likely subsequently expanded into the *Philosophiae naturalis principia mathematica*. Despite some questionable attitudes, it is undeniable that Newton remains one of the most authentic European geniuses.

The story we wish to recount is that of an Isaac Newton who lived in a parallel universe to our own. There, Newton publicly informs the entire population about the brilliant inspiration he experienced while resting beneath a tree and witnessing a falling apple. He additionally declares his intention to publish the results of said inspiration. In less time than it takes a rooster to crow, he is summoned to the High Tribunal of the Peacocks, where the following demands are communicated to him: Lord Ducon, lord of all lands in the area, which included the land where the famous tree stood, demanded to appear in the article as the principal author by virtue of his ownership status. Mr. Thecow, to whom the exploitation rights of the land had been granted, demanded to appear as a co-author of the work, arguing that if he had not authorized Mr. Newton to rest under the tree, nothing would have been discovered. Mr. Apple, the gardener, requested to appear as a co-author, alleging that if he had not planted the tree, nothing would have been discovered. Miss Apple requested to appear as a co-author, arguing that if she had not chosen an apple tree to plant, nothing would have been discovered. Mr. Noone requested to appear as a co-author, claiming that the day before he had collected the apples from the tree but, due to an inspiration, had left only one. And that had enabled the discovery. Mr. Crabtree requested to appear as a co-author, alleging that he had sold the tree, the fundamental cause of the discovery. Mr. Grocer requested to appear as a co-author, arguing that he had sold the fertilizer for the tree.

The High Tribunal of the Peacocks ruled that the arguments of all claimants were valid, therefore ordering the inclusion of all of them, arranged in alphabetical order using the first letter of their surname, with Lord Ducon as the principal author. Since its appearance, this article is cited as the work of Ducon et al. Here I comment of some aspects of what I call scientific parasitism (Gómez-Jeria, 2023).

The Good Scientist and the Originality of Research.

A truly creative and innovative scientist is distinguished by possessing a constellation of intellectual and personal qualities that go far beyond mere technical capability. Curiosity represents the fundamental core of their intellectual nature, an insatiable passion for understanding the mysteries of the universe that constantly drives them to formulate questions that challenge established paradigms. This curiosity is intimately intertwined with an

open-mindedness that rejects the conventional limits of knowledge, allowing them to explore uncharted intellectual territories with extraordinary conceptual courage. The ability to establish unusual connections between seemingly distant fields constitutes another neuralgic element of their creativity, enabling them to build conceptual bridges where others only perceive disciplinary abysses. Their divergent thinking capacitates them to visualize original solutions, breaking down scientific problems from perspectives radically different from traditional approaches.

Intellectual resilience plays a determinant role, understood as the capacity to persist in the face of failure, transforming obstacles into opportunities for discovery and considering each failed experimentation not as a defeat, but as another step in the complex traverse of knowledge. Cognitive humility proves equally crucial, manifesting as a permanent disposition to question one's own hypotheses, recognize the provisional nature of scientific knowledge, and maintain an attitude of radical openness toward new evidence that might refute preconceived theories. Interdisciplinarity becomes its most powerful methodological tool, profoundly comprehending that genuine innovation frequently emerges in the interstices between different disciplines, where specialized knowledge melts and reconfigures itself, generating new comprehensive paradigms. Its imagination is not limited to established frameworks, but operates as a conceptual laboratory where the most audacious ideas can be experienced without a priori restrictions. ***The passion for knowledge manifests not as a cold intellectual exercise, but as an almost mystical experience of connection with the fundamental mysteries of reality, where each discovery represents a threshold of amazement and revelation.*** The capacity for abstraction allows navigation between the concrete and the speculative, constructing complex mental models that anticipate realities not yet experimentally verified. Its investigative ethics is sustained by a profound commitment to truth, understood not as a definitive state, but as a dynamic process of permanent conceptual construction and deconstruction. Intuition, far from being an irrational element, is configured as a sophisticated mechanism of information processing that permits cognitive leaps apparently inexplicable but fundamented in a profound and multidimensional understanding of the studied phenomena.

The immersion in the most refined artistic expressions constitutes an extraordinarily rich breeding ground for the development of scientific creativity, establishing truly extraordinary neuronal connections that transcend the conventional frontiers of knowledge. Literature, when authentically sublime, operates as a sophisticated mental gymnasium that exercises the capacity for abstraction, analogical imagination, and the comprehension of complex structures. A scientist traversing the pages of Borges, for example, is not merely reading, but training their brain to perform seemingly impossible conceptual leaps, developing an intellectual flexibility that will be absolutely crucial in frontier research. Music, for its part, represents a profoundly subtle mathematical language that allows the scientific brain to comprehend patterns, symmetries, and architectures of thought that go beyond the merely numeric. A mathematician who understands Bach not only knows chords, but perceives structures of extraordinary complexity that can be directly translated into revolutionary theoretical models. Visual arts, with their capacity to represent the invisible, train the researcher in the visualization of abstract phenomena, in understanding dimensions not perceived by primary senses. A scientist whose sensibility has been refined by Hieronymus Bosch or Michelangelo will be capable of imagining universes with an incomparable conceptual depth. Poetry, with its linguistic condensation and metaphorical capacity, represents a supreme training for conceptual synthesis, teaching the scientist that knowledge is not accumulated data, but complex and surprising relationships between apparently distant concepts. ***Thus, scientific creativity does not emerge from methodological emptiness, but from a cultivated sensibility, from an intelligence that has been trained to see beyond the evident, to establish unexpected connections and to imagine what still exists only as a remote possibility on the horizon of human knowledge.***

The publication of routine research by a creative and innovative scientist represents a fundamental and strategic aspect of their professional development that should not be underestimated or interpreted as a contradiction of their innovative nature. Systematic and methodical scientific production constitutes the fundamental scaffolding upon which great discoveries are built, configuring itself as a space of methodological refinement and knowledge consolidation. A truly innovative scientist understands that creativity does not oppose rigor, but is nourished by it, comprehending that each routine publication represents an opportunity to perfect techniques, validate protocols, and contribute to the collective corpus of scientific knowledge. These seemingly conventional investigations allow them to remain connected with the pulse of their discipline, identifying conceptual and methodological interstices that could eventually become fertile grounds for future disruptive explorations. Systematic publication also functions as a mechanism of academic legitimation, generating the necessary credibility for their most audacious proposals to be eventually considered seriously by the scientific community. Meticulousness in routine research demonstrates their capacity to transit between radical innovation and systematic work, evidencing an intellectual maturity that does not despise any dimension of scientific endeavor. Far from representing a limitation, these publications are configured as exercises of conceptual and methodological precision that nourish their creative capacity, allowing them to understand the most subtle nuances of their field of study and develop a sophisticated intuition that can subsequently be applied in their most original

investigations. ***Routine publication thus transforms into a space of intellectual training, where each datum, each method, each apparently minor conclusion contributes to constructing the conceptual scaffolding that will eventually sustain their most significant contributions.***

The scientist who solely dedicates themselves to producing routine research represents a profoundly problematic intellectual paradigm that threatens the true essence of scientific progress. Their labor is configured as a bureaucratic exercise of knowledge, where research transforms into a mere administrative procedure devoid of genuine passion for discovery. Methodological routine becomes a straitjacket that paralyzes creativity, reducing science to a mechanical production of data lacking any transformative capacity. This type of researcher operates as an academic automaton, reproducing established schemas without ever questioning the epistemological foundations of their work, perpetuating a system that rewards mediocrity over innovation.

The total absence of creativity implies a deeply dangerous scientific stagnation. Each publication becomes an exercise in intellectual redundancy that adds no real value to knowledge, but simply repeats what is already known under slight statistical or methodological variations. Their work represents a burden for scientific advancement, occupying spaces in academic publications that could be used by truly transformative research. Curiosity, that fundamental motor of scientific discovery, is conspicuously absent, replaced by a bureaucratic and entirely dispassionate approach to knowledge.

Routine scientism additionally generates a perverse effect in academic evaluation systems, where the quantity of publications prevails over their quality and real impact. Thus, a vicious circle is created that incentivizes empty production, rewarding not innovative knowledge, but merely the capacity to generate documents that comply with the formal requirements of scientific publications. ***This researcher becomes a mere data manager, a technician without capacity for profound interpretation, who reduces science to a statistical exercise devoid of any philosophical and transformative dimension.***

Extreme specialization without interdisciplinary openness ultimately generates fragmented and sterile knowledge. By renouncing creativity, this scientist also renounces the possibility of establishing novel connections between different fields of knowledge, limiting themselves to an absolutely reductionist vision of reality. Their work resembles an archival task more than a genuine exploration of the mysteries of knowledge, perpetuating existing paradigms instead of challenging and expanding them.

The absence of intellectual risk becomes their primary characteristic. While innovative scientists build bridges between the known and the imaginable, these routine researchers anchor themselves in the established, fearful of any proposal that minimally challenges the current conceptual frameworks. Their contribution to human knowledge becomes practically null, constituting more of an obstacle than a driver of scientific progress.

This scientific approach represents a fundamental betrayal of the very spirit of research, which should be characterized by amazement, permanent curiosity, and the will to question the apparently unquestionable. Science cannot be reduced to a mere administrative exercise, but must be configured as an intellectual adventure capable of transforming our understanding of reality.

Some articles are like wineskins filled with wind but containing the minimum minimorum that allows them to navigate the tempestuous sea of Academia, trying to reach some 'island' (i.e., journal) that will receive them. The Q1 island is especially coveted (Q1 means ranking among the top 25% of journals in the same field).

Scientific parasitism.

Scientific parasitism represents a complex and profoundly corrosive phenomenon that penetrates academic structures like an institutional cancer, gradually destroying the integrity of knowledge. The forms of parasitism unfold as a sophisticated network of power relationships that transcend mere scientific production to become true mechanisms of manipulation and personal benefit.

The authorship of articles constitutes one of the most evident spaces of this intellectual parasitism. Principal investigators who include their names as primary authors in publications where their contribution is minimal or practically nonexistent represent a form of academic predation. They use the work of doctoral students, postdoctoral researchers, and fellows as mere tools to increase their scientific production indices, appropriating the intellectual effort of researchers in training who are completely dependent on their endorsement and recognition.

Academic appointments transform into another fertile ground for parasitism. Networks of complicity among professors allow the advancement of individuals who do not necessarily possess the required academic merits, but have instead cultivated relationships of reciprocity and favor exchange. These nomination systems are based on criteria of friendship, regional kinship, political militancy, or belonging to certain power groups, systematically displacing genuine scientific merit.

The formation of academic mafias represents perhaps the most sophisticated manifestation of this parasitism. These groups operate as true power structures that control resources, publications, appointments, and research lines in specific areas of knowledge. Their members mutually protect each other, generate exclusion

mechanisms for external researchers, and use their influence to direct funds, scholarships, projects, and recognitions towards their immediate circle (including students).

Scientific commissions become privileged spaces for the reproduction of these parasitic mechanisms. Researchers use their membership in evaluation committees, editorial boards, thesis tribunals, and funding organisms to generate personal or group benefits. Evaluation transforms into a power instrument where research lines can be rewarded or punished, certain groups can be favored, and the development of proposals that threaten their status quo can be obstructed.

The use of laboratories as spaces for reproducing these parasitic dynamics proves particularly perverse. Laboratory directors can convert these spaces into veritable feudal domains where students and junior researchers become captive labor. The possibility of obtaining academic degrees, publications, or funding depends directly on their capacity for submission to the power dynamics established by the group leader.

The reproduction of these parasitic schemes is sustained through sophisticated mechanisms of recognition and prestige. Researchers participating in these networks mutually feed each other, generating cross-citations, recommendations, appointments, and recognitions that construct an image of academic excellence completely disconnected from actual scientific production.

Scientific parasitism does not limit itself to direct material benefits, but also operates in the symbolic terrain. The construction of prestige transforms into an economy where recognition is exchanged like a currency, generating closed circuits of mutual legitimation that systematically exclude discordant voices or innovative proposals that might threaten established power equilibriums.

The most serious consequence of these parasitic dynamics is the destruction of scientific creativity. Innovation is systematically obstructed, young researchers are forced to reproduce existing schemes instead of developing original perspectives, and knowledge ultimately becomes subordinated to institutional power and reproduction logics.

Scientific parasitism thus represents much more than an ethical problem: it constitutes a true institutional pathology that threatens the very foundations of knowledge production, transforming science from a space of exploration and discovery into a mechanism for reproducing privileges and power relations.

Total Power Takeover.

The total appropriation of an academic structure by a mafia represents a scenario of intellectual and institutional devastation that transcends mere corruption to become a systemic mechanism of knowledge destruction. When a power group manages to completely colonize a faculty, a process of degradation is triggered that affects every dimension of academic production, transforming the institution into an instrument for reproducing particular interests absolutely disconnected from the original purposes of higher education.

The first fundamental consequence is the radical destruction of meritocracy. Selection, hiring, and promotion processes become completely disconnected from academic criteria, reduced to mechanisms of loyalty and submission. New researchers and professors are not selected for their intellectual capacity, but for their willingness to integrate into established complicity networks. This process generates a progressive degeneration of academic quality, where mediocrity becomes the norm and critical thinking is systematically eliminated.

Scientific production becomes an exercise in absolute simulation. Publications cease to be spaces for knowledge generation and transform into instruments of legitimation for the dominant group. A fundamental distortion of research processes occurs, where projects are designed not to explore new frontiers of knowledge, but to maintain and reproduce existing power structures. Research is emptied of content, becoming a mere bureaucratic procedure that allows justifying resource allocations and maintaining appearances of academic activity.

Students become the primary victims of this colonization process. Their training is reduced to indoctrination in the dominant group's logic, losing any possibility of critical intellectual development. Study plans are designed to reinforce the paradigms of the group in power, systematically eliminating any perspective that might question their hegemony. Education becomes a process of reproducing existing power structures, where original thinking is punished and submission is rewarded.

Evaluation mechanisms are completely perverted. Thesis tribunals, accreditation processes, and academic promotion systems transform into spaces for reproducing power networks. External researchers who do not participate in these dynamics are systematically excluded, generating a process of intellectual isolation that ultimately sterilizes any possibility of academic renewal.

The distribution of resources becomes an instrument of control and manipulation. Research projects, funds, spaces, and equipment are assigned not based on their scientific potential, but as mechanisms of reward and punishment within power networks. A system of academic clientelism is generated where loyalty to the group becomes the only valid currency of exchange.

The ethical dimension of research is completely destroyed. The search for truth, a fundamental principle of scientific activity, is replaced by the reproduction of the dominant group's interests. Researchers transform into managers of a prefabricated truth, renouncing the possibility of questioning, exploring, and discovering.

The effects of this mafia-like colonization transcend the faculty's limits, impacting the entire university structure and even broader social development. A process of institutional degradation is generated that contaminates the mechanisms of knowledge production, professional training, and research, compromising the intellectual development possibilities of entire generations.

The final consequence is the conversion of the university from a space of knowledge production and critical thinking into an instrument for reproducing power relations. The academic institution loses its fundamental meaning, transforming into a bureaucratic mechanism emptied of any genuine intellectual content, where the appearance of academic activity conceals a systematic process of destroying knowledge and critical thinking.

Authorship in Articles.

The illegitimate appearance in scientific article authorship represents a complex phenomenon of intellectual corruption that undermines the ethical foundations of academic production. The forms of authorship manipulation unfold as sophisticated strategies of intellectual appropriation that transcend the simple signing of a document to become true mechanisms of academic power and manipulation.

Academic gifting constitutes one of the most widespread forms of illegitimate authorship. Senior researchers include their name in publications where their contribution is practically nonexistent, using their position of power to appear as primary authors. This practice is sustained by reciprocity networks where researchers exchange academic favors, converting the signature on an article into a currency negotiated beyond real scientific merits.

The academic ghost represents another particularly perverse form of illegitimate appearance. These are researchers completely absent from the research process who nevertheless sign articles, using their institutional position to validate works in which they have not participated in any way. These ghost authors operate as true intellectual parasites, adding their name to publications as a mechanism of curriculum enhancement without making any substantive contribution.

Power dynamics within laboratories generate sophisticated forms of forced author inclusion. Research group directors can systematically include their name in publications made by doctoral students or junior researchers, directly appropriating the intellectual work of those who depend on their supervision. This practice is sustained by asymmetric power relationships where the possibility of obtaining degrees, funding, or recognition depends on accepting these appropriation dynamics.

The negotiation of authorship becomes an academic market where names are exchanged as if they were merchandise. Researchers develop complex negotiation strategies where the inclusion of certain authors is previously agreed upon, independent of their real contribution to the article. These practices generate true exchange circuits where the signature on an article transforms into a currency negotiated beyond traditional scientific criteria.

Authorship by intimidation represents a particularly perverse modality where researchers with greater institutional power include their name through direct or indirect pressure mechanisms. Students and junior researchers find themselves forced to include names of senior researchers who have not participated in the research, under the threat of compromising their academic development possibilities.

Complicity networks among researchers allow the development of sophisticated mechanisms of illegitimate authorship appearance. Research groups mutually protect each other, generating systems of cross-citation and recognition where the signature on an article functions as a mechanism of academic power reproduction. These networks operate as true intellectual mafias that control the mechanisms of knowledge production and legitimation.

The proliferation of these practices generates a process of profound degradation of scientific integrity. Authorship ceases to be a recognition of intellectual contribution to transform into an instrument of manipulation and control. Scientific articles lose their original sense of communicating discoveries to become mere instruments of reproducing power relations within the academic structure.

The final consequence of these dynamics is the destruction of the fundamental principles of scientific production. The search for truth, the recognition of intellectual merit, and transparency in knowledge production are systematically compromised by these practices of illegitimate appropriation that corrode the structures of academic research from within.

The image of one or two human primates producing new scientific knowledge encircled by a group of hyenas ordered by categories devouring 'co-authorships' seems unpleasant but is sometimes true.

Detection of the Parasite and the Parasitic Structure.

The detection of the academic parasite represents a complex process that requires a multidimensional and strategic approach, where systematic observation, critical analysis, and rigorous evaluation mechanisms are configured as fundamental tools for identifying and neutralizing these institutional degradation dynamics.

The first detection strategy involves a microscopic analysis of the suspicious researcher's scientific production. The disproportion between the number of publications and the real depth of contributions, the existence of redundant publications, the repetition of methodological schemes without substantive innovation, and the presence of ghost authors constitute warning signals that reveal potential parasitic mechanisms. The construction of detailed bibliometric profiles allows identifying behavioral patterns that deviate from genuine scientific production dynamics.

Peer evaluation mechanisms emerge as crucial instruments for detection. The formation of independent evaluation committees, integrated by researchers from different institutions and with protections against existing power networks, allows for critical analyses that transcend local complicity dynamics. These committees must be designed to perform deep evaluations that do not limit themselves to formal criteria, but analyze the substance and originality of scientific contributions.

The construction of institutional transparency systems is configured as a fundamental tool. The implementation of detailed public registration mechanisms of each researcher's contributions, specifying specific roles, concrete contributions, and participation levels in each project, generates a visibility system that makes traditional academic parasitism mechanisms difficult. These records must be accessible and auditable by the scientific community as a whole.

The implementation of protected complaint systems is crucial. The creation of institutional mechanisms that guarantee anonymity and protection for researchers denouncing parasitic practices allows breaking the circles of silence and complicity that sustain these dynamics. These systems must be designed to actively protect complainants from any type of academic or labor retaliation.

Regarding intervention strategies, the neutralization of the academic parasite requires a surgical approach combining institutional, legal, and academic dimensions. The first line of action involves the construction of exhaustive documentary evidence that conclusively demonstrates parasitic practices. ***These proofs must be sufficiently solid to resist any attempt at challenge or corporate defense.***

Sanctions must be designed as mechanisms that transcend mere punitive measures to become instruments of institutional transformation. Temporary or definitive suspension of academic credentials, disqualification from holding leadership or supervisory positions, and elimination of previously granted recognitions are configured as fundamental tools. These sanctions must have an exemplary character that discourages the reproduction of these practices in other academic spaces.

The reconstruction of affected institutional spaces is fundamental. The intervention cannot be limited to eliminating the parasite, but must generate active mechanisms of academic integrity reconstruction. This implies processes of research team renewal, implementation of new evaluation protocols, and generation of institutional cultures that reward originality and merit over existing power networks.

The pedagogical dimension emerges as a central instrument of transformation. The training of new generations of researchers in ethical principles of scientific production, the visibility of these parasitic practices, and the construction of an academic culture based on transparency and merit are configured as fundamental tools to prevent the reproduction of these dynamics in the future.

The struggle against academic parasitism cannot be understood as an individual elimination process, but as a systemic transformation of knowledge production structures. It requires a collective commitment from the scientific community to generate self-regulation mechanisms that protect the fundamental integrity of academic research.

The detection of total capture of an academic structure represents an extraordinarily complex challenge that requires a multidimensional and strategic analysis of various levels of institutional degradation. The approach involves developing external evaluation mechanisms that transcend the limits of the captured institution, generating observation systems capable of revealing systemic patterns of academic corruption.

Institutional capture indicators unfold as a constellation of signals that reveal the depth of degradation. Absolute homogeneity in academic selection and promotion processes represents the first symptom of a completely colonized structure. When all appointments, from junior positions to leadership roles, respond to a single selection pattern based on loyalty criteria rather than merit, a scenario of total institutional capture is configured.

Scientific production transforms into a revealing indicator. A completely captured faculty will show specific characteristics: total absence of original publications, systematic reproduction of predetermined research lines, elimination of any critical or innovative perspective, and a publication profile that responds more to legitimization strategies than to genuine knowledge generation processes. Homogeneity in research lines, absence

of internal debates, and uncritical reproduction of established paradigms reveal the existence of a completely controlled academic structure.

External evaluation mechanisms are configured as fundamental detection instruments. The formation of independent international committees, integrated by researchers of recognized trajectory without connections to the analyzed institution, allows for deep evaluations that transcend local power dynamics. These committees must have unrestricted access to all institutional documentation, including selection records, research projects, financing systems, and decision-making mechanisms.

The traceability of resources emerges as another crucial dimension of analysis. Institutional capture invariably generates resource allocation mechanisms that respond to power reproduction logics rather than academic criteria. Detailed analysis of financing systems, research fund distribution, and resource allocation mechanisms can reveal systemic manipulation patterns.

The observation of researcher training circuits allows revealing the depth of capture. When doctoral programs and junior researcher training have transformed into mechanisms of reproducing existing power structures, eliminating any possibility of critical thinking or original development, a scenario of total academic colonization is configured.

Intervention mechanisms must be designed as surgical strategies of institutional reconstruction. The intervention cannot be limited to individual removal, but requires a systemic transformation of power structures. This implies comprehensive renewal processes that include reorganization of selection systems, implementation of transparent evaluation mechanisms, and construction of new institutional cultures.

The legal dimension is configured as a complementary intervention instrument. Exhaustive documentation of capture practices, generation of reports evidencing institutional degradation dynamics, and eventual judicialization of academic corruption processes represent fundamental tools for transformation.

Reconstruction requires a long-term commitment that transcends the mere removal of involved actors. It is necessary to generate mechanisms for training new generations of researchers, build institutional cultures based on transparency and merit, and develop evaluation systems that protect the fundamental integrity of academic production.

The detection and neutralization of a completely captured academic structure represents a challenge that goes beyond traditional institutional intervention mechanisms. It requires a profound understanding of power dynamics, a radical ethical commitment, and the capacity to generate systemic transformations that reconstruct the very possibility of critical and independent knowledge production.

Retracted articles.

The retracted article represents a profound symptom of the pathologies that can develop in the scientific ecosystem, revealing the most complex tensions between academic integrity and the multiple pressures experienced by contemporary researchers. ***Retraction emerges as a purification mechanism that exposes scientific degradation processes, manifesting the multiple dimensions of intellectual corruption that can contaminate knowledge production.***

The reasons for the production of a retracted article unfold as a complex map of motivations that go beyond the simple deliberate intention of falsifying information. Excessive ego represents one of the fundamental motors of this phenomenon. Researchers absolutely convinced of the validity of their hypotheses may manipulate data, force results, or construct entirely artificial scientific narratives to confirm their preconceived theoretical constructions. The need for personal validation thus transforms into a mechanism of scientific integrity destruction.

Institutional pressure to publish constitutes another determining factor. Contemporary academic evaluation systems have constructed veritable knowledge production devices where quantity prevails over quality. Researchers find themselves subjected to compulsive production dynamics that generate conducive spaces for data fabrication, statistical manipulation, and the construction of completely artificial scientific narratives.

Academic parasitism finds in retracted articles one of its most sophisticated reproduction mechanisms. The possibility of generating publications that appear scientifically solid, but actually respond to legitimization strategies of certain power groups, transforms into an instrument of manipulation of knowledge production circuits. Retracted articles reveal the interstices where academic power can construct fictitious truths completely disconnected from the fundamental principles of scientific research.

The modalities of retraction unfold as a complex spectrum ranging from deliberate manipulation to involuntary methodological error. Direct data fabrication represents the most radical extreme of this phenomenon, where researchers construct entirely artificial scientific narratives. Statistical manipulation, biased information selection, elimination of data that do not confirm the initial hypothesis, and forced interpretation of results are subtle mechanisms of questionable knowledge production. The psychological dimension of the researcher producing a retracted article is particularly complex. The need for recognition, fierce academic competition,

pressure to obtain funding, and the construction of a professional identity based on knowledge production create pressures that can push competent researchers to develop scientific manipulation strategies.

Retracted article detection mechanisms have become progressively more sophisticated. Peer verification systems, complex statistical analyses, data manipulation detection tools, and specialized databases tracking retractions allow for increasingly rigorous control systems. However, the capacity for questionable knowledge production seems to remain one step ahead of control mechanisms.

Retraction represents more than a simple scientific correction. Retraction is a symptom of the deepest issues affecting contemporary knowledge production systems. Retraction reveals the tensions between the pursuit of scientific truth and the power structures within academic institutions.

The blaming of students and junior researchers represents one of the most perverse manifestations of academic parasitism in the context of retracted articles. This responsibility transfer mechanism is configured as a strategy of institutional power preservation where senior researchers use researchers in training as scapegoats for systematically developed fraudulent practices.

The mechanisms of this blame process unfold as sophisticated institutional manipulation strategies. The principal investigators, who are the true architects of fraudulent research, use their position of power to construct narratives where errors, manipulations, and falsifications are presented as a result of the inexperience, lack of skill, or methodological rigor of junior researchers. The power asymmetry allows for generating stories where the doctoral student or postdoctoral researcher becomes the sole responsible party for practices that actually respond to systematic dynamics of spurious knowledge production.

The structural vulnerability of emerging researchers creates the perfect breeding ground for responsibility transfer strategies. Subject to absolutely asymmetrical academic dependency relationships, these researchers are compelled to accept narratives that cast them as the sole responsible parties for scientific manipulation processes that actually stem from far more complex power structures. Their ability to continue their academic career, obtain references, secure funding, or defend their thesis depends directly on their capacity to accept these narratives of blame.

The damage inflicted transcends the specific case of retraction. The construction of these narratives generates mechanisms of professional destruction that can completely compromise the academic trajectories of emerging researchers. The stigmatization produced by blame can practically eliminate future professional development opportunities, transforming retraction into a device of academic exclusion.

Senior researchers employ these strategies not merely as mechanisms of personal preservation, but as instruments for reproducing existing power structures. The culpabilization of junior researchers functions as a warning to the entire academic community, revealing the control and subjugation mechanisms operating within knowledge production spaces.

The ultimate consequence of retracted articles extends beyond the simple invalidation of a specific document. It generates a profound erosion of trust in scientific production mechanisms, establishing suspicion as a permanent principle of knowledge evaluation. Each retracted article represents a blow to the credibility of the scientific system as a whole, exposing the deepest limitations of contemporary knowledge production apparatuses.

I extend gratitude to the numerous students, former students, and former colleagues who provided me with valuable information about specific cases I conceptualized and various ideas to be included herein.

References

- [1]. Gómez-Jeria, J. S. (2023). Lies, Forgeries And Integrity In Scientific Research. *Modern Journal Of Social Sciences And Humanities*, 18, 106-109.