

From: **Dr Sivakamavalli SDC** <sivakamavalli.sdc@saveetha.com>

Date: Tue, Feb 4, 2025 at 11:17 AM

Subject: Re: Media Request: Recent retractions

To: Avery Orrall <avery@retractionwatch.com>

Hello Avery Orrall

The recent decision to retract an article solely because its authors did not disclose their use of a Large Language Model (LLM) is highly troubling. The rationale behind this action lacks transparency, fairness, and a solid foundation. There is no definitive evidence and the lack of a clear standard for detecting LLM-written content makes the retraction appear arbitrary. Moreover, the work in question was a letter or commentary rather than a full research article, with no instances of data fabrication, plagiarism, or breaches of journal policy. If journals begin retracting publications simply over undisclosed AI assistance, the boundaries between acceptable and unacceptable practices become increasingly unclear. Retractions are meant for serious misconduct—fabricated data, plagiarism, or harmful misinformation—not procedural oversights that do not impact the scientific record. This approach raises concerns about bias, as it could unfairly target certain authors. When retractions shift from upholding integrity to gatekeeping, they risk deterring meaningful scholarship and stifling academic debate. We urge journals and platforms like PubPeer to focus on genuine misconduct—such as fraud, misinformation, or fabricated findings—rather than minor technical infractions. Instead of penalising productive researchers, attention should be directed toward systemic challenges in scholarly publishing. Above all, it is crucial to develop clear, consistent guidelines governing the use of AI in academic writing. Penalising authors retroactively for actions never explicitly defined as violations only fosters confusion and undermines trust in the peer-review process. I am completely disagreeing with this action. Unfortunately, somebody has written about being due to professional jealousy. What is the point of retracting commentaries? What kind of content did they find fault in? I understand my article has not been individually retracted; instead, it was the whole journal that appears to be under scrutiny. I am not aware of what is happening with the journal. It is a Q1 Reputed Journal. We trusted the process and submitted our articles / commentaries. I had submitted, peer reviewed by the editor, all my commentaries without any comments immediately accepted, but to my surprise they were piled up together and published in TOTO. I don't see anything alarming in this.

Thanks