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The pressure to publish for academic progression or criteria to appear for examinations regulated by governing bodies forced one to practice scientific misconducts such as data fabrication, falsifications, and redundant publication, ultimately leading to retraction of articles from journals. Such practice can be minimized by conducting workshops on “publication ethics” to the new researchers.
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I suggest to give brief note on scientific misconduct in the introduction which is a main reason for retraction of articles
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Some form of misconducts such as data fabrication, falsifications, and redundant publication, can be detailed in the introduction, before explaining the reason for retraction. Reasons for unethical practice of scientific misconduct can be discussed under discussion section.
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