

Понедельник, 7 апреля 2025, 3:55 +03:00 от

Dear Dr Gladkova

I hope you are well and will understand the unsolicited nature of this email.

I was concerned to see the World of Media journal had published the following article in Issue 1, 2025: Verma, A., Singh, P., Sharma, A., & Dang, T. (2025). Monitoring the development of community radio: A comprehensive bibliometric analysis (2000– 2024). World of Media. Journal of Russian Media and Journalism Studies, 1, pp. 28–53. DOI: 10.30547/worldofmedia.1.2025.2

My concern stemmed from the fact that I had previously reviewed this article for The Journal of Radio & Audio Media (September 2024) and had flagged a number of extremely serious concerns with the article. I had contacted the editor of that journal Tony DeMars to raise my concerns (which I elaborate on below) and the reviewing process was halted, and the article was expunged from the journal's system.

I note one word in the title was changed between the article being identified as containing serious flaws and fabricated references and being expunged by The Journal of Radio & Audio Media and it appearing in the World of Media journal – that word was originally progression but it was changed to development in the title of the article that was published recently.

Comparing the original manuscript submitted to The Journal of Radio & Audio Media and the article published in World of Media it appears little if anything has changed in it (non-existent references, flawed erroneous references and claims persist) and it may be a

case of the authors deciding to submit it to another journal after they had been told why it was expunged from The Journal of Radio & Audio Media's system.

In brief here are my main concerns about this article:

- This article provides a number of signs that point to the possibility it may have been written by AI. There are a number of indications of that would lead a reader to consider this may be the case including the following sentence which is highly problematic and this appears out of context given the subject of the article (i.e it makes no sense and has no relationship to the research the authors say they have undertaken): "A community of writers who have collaborated on pieces concerning virtual reality, augmented reality, and the metaverse." I had to read this sentence several times. This is an article about community radio research, which has nothing to do with augmented reality and virtual reality— at least these technologies are not yet being used in community radio. I am sure this will happen one day but no, not yet. This is a red flag indicating the possibility the article may have been written in part or full by AI.
- The article contains serious factual errors including non-existent references (at least half of the references are fabricated i.e. non-existent or seriously incorrect). For example, this reference attributes an article to me that simply does not exist and neither does the journal in which they have claimed this article appears: Ewart, J. (2017). The impact of digital convergence on community radio engagement. *Media Studies Journal*, 20(3), pp. 211–228. I have written nothing about community radio since 2012, the article referred to does not exist.
- I have listed other non-existent and seriously flawed references (i.e. incorrect authors, authors omitted from the references, non-existent journals etc) in my full review which I undertook for the Journal of Radio & Audio Media before I contacted the journal editor directly due to the serious nature of my concerns with the article. I have copied that full review below.
- I am sure other scholars whose names are in the article's list of references will have major concerns about the incorrect citation of their publications and the citation of publications attributed to them that do not exist.
- There are also some serious flaws in the article's use of Scopus as it typically does not include humanities and arts publications which is how much community radio research is categorised.

The reviewing and publication process is crucial in any journal and part of the approach to ensuring integrity for all other academic authors, which is why I am writing to you. If this article remains available with these serious flaws, future researchers may cite it and the false references it contains without realising that it is erroneous.

In the best interests of academia and the World of Media journal, it may be prudent to withdraw it from publication while your journal undertakes an investigation into the matter.

I look forward to hearing from you about the next steps.

Yours sincerely,

Professor Jacqueline Ewart,
Griffith University. Australia.
Professor of Communication.

Here is my review for the Journal of Radio & Audio Media

Monitoring the Progression of Community Radio: A Comprehensive Bibliometric Analysis (2000-2024)

Note to the editor:

I have some significant concerns about the academic integrity of this article. I wonder if it was written using AI because there are so many factual errors in it that it is shocking to think an academic would submit it. I have identified fake/non-existent references including one attributed to me which I have not written and which does not exist. I have outlined my concerns. I am convinced they have used AI to write parts or all of it.

Comments to the Authors

There are two main areas where this article is significantly lacking. The first is in its use of Scopus as the source of bibliometric data and the second is in a series of errors of fact that for me bring the authenticity, veracity and quality of this article into serious question.

I also have some serious doubts as to whether the author/s have actually read any of the articles they discuss – this is evidence by major flaws in the discussion of the content of those articles and I will return to that later in this review.

I do not write the preceding sentences lightly and while I am not accusing the author/s of anything there is enough evidence in this article to question many aspects of it. I reject this article for these reasons and suggest that the author might want to use a source that actually captures the depth and breadth of community radio research and read the articles rather than making assumptions based on their titles as to their contents.

Let me begin by pointing out the serious limitations of Scopus. While the author/s have a section on the limitations of Scopus, its use is inherently flawed. Given the focus of this article is on community radio, wherein the majority of academics researching this area are from the communication, sociology and humanities fields and who take qualitative approaches rather than quantitative approaches to research, the use of Scopus is a problem. For example Tennant (2020) rightly points out (in a comment piece of the same title) that Web of Science and Scopus are no global databases of knowledge. He points out some of the major flaws including the inherent biases in these databases against scholars in the Global South, non-English research and research in the humanities, arts and social sciences. (REF Tennant, J. P. (2020). Web of Science and Scopus are not global databases of knowledge. *European Science Editing*, 46, e51987.)

Other scholars have been highly critical of the use of Scopus for the type of work that the author/s have undertaken. I won't cover all of that literature here but I will direct the author/s to another piece, by Martín-Martín, A., Thelwall, M., Orduna-Malea, E., & Delgado López-Cózar, E. (2021), in which they wrote the following about Google Scholar (GS) and pointed out the flaws of Scopus:

“Despite its known errors and limitations, which are consequence of its automated approach to document indexing (Delgado López-Cózar, Robinson-García, & Torres-Salinas, 2014; Jacsó, 2010), GS has been shown to be reliable and to have good coverage of disciplines and languages, especially in the Humanities and Social Sciences, where WoS and Scopus are known to be weak (Chavarro, Ràfols, & Tang, 2018; Mongeon & Paul-Hus, 2016; van Leeuwen, Moed, Tijssen, Visser, & Van Raan, 2001). Analyses of the coverage of GS, WoS, and Scopus across disciplines have compared the numbers of publications indexed or their average citation counts for samples of documents, authors, or journals, finding that GS consistently returned higher numbers of publications and citations (Harzing, 2013; Harzing & Alakangas, 2016; Mingers & Lipitakis, 2010; Prins, Costas, van Leeuwen, & Wouters, 2016). Citation counts from a range of different sources have been shown to correlate positively with GS citation counts at various levels of aggregation (Amara & Landry, 2012; De Groote & Raszewski, 2012; Delgado López-Cózar, Orduna-Malea, & Martín-Martín, 2018; Kousha & Thelwall, 2007; Martín-Martín, Orduna-Malea, & Delgado López-Cózar, 2018; Meho & Yang, 2007; Minasny, Hartemink, McBratney, & Jang, 2013; Moed, Bar-Ilan, & Halevi, 2016; Pauly & Stergiou, 2005; Rahimi & Chandrakumar, 2014; Wildgaard, 2015). See the supplementary materials Delgado López-Cózar et al. (2018), Orduña-Malea, Martín-Martín, Ayllón, & Delgado López-Cózar (2016), and Halevi, Moed, & Bar-Ilan (2017) for discussions of the wider strengths and weaknesses of GS.” (Article title: Google Scholar, Microsoft Academic, Scopus, Dimensions, Web of Science, and OpenCitations' COCI: a multidisciplinary comparison of coverage via citations. *Scientometrics*, 126(1), 871-906.). Given the extreme limitations of Scopus I feel the method is flawed in this study. Additionally, I do not think anyone's interests are served by undertaking “a productivity analysis”. The commodification of research is a wicked problem, it is economics gone mad. It would have been more useful to label this a frequency analysis of authors.

SERIOUS ERRORS OF FACT

There are serious errors of fact in the article. In fact, I got to the point that I could not invest any additional time checking references, some of which are fake i.e. non-existent for example Ewart, J. (2017). The impact of digital convergence on community radio engagement. *Media Studies Journal*, 20(3), 211–228, does not exist. I am bemused by this reference and looked everywhere for it including searching for the journal by name, no journal with this title, looked at the author's Google Scholar profile and no article by this title listed. It appears this author has not written anything on community radio since 2012.

Then there is an article cited as Foxwell, K. (2017). Sounds like a whisper: Australian Community Broadcasting hosts a quiet revolution. *Westminster Papers in Communication and Culture*, 5(1), which also contains errors including missing co-authors (Jacqui Ewart, Susan Forde and Michael Meadows), the wrong year of publication (correct year is 2008 if the author had bothered to locate the actual article

rather than relying on incorrect information on the web).

Cottle, S. (2013). *Global crisis reporting: Journalism in the global age*. Open University Press – correct year of publication is 2009.

Couldry, N. (2010). *Why voice matters: Culture and politics after neoliberalism*. Why Voice Matters, pp. 1–184. This is a book but the reference does not have publisher details.

Some of the references to journal articles lack page numbers.

There are numerous references that DO NOT EXIST making me think AI has played a part in this. There are also references with errors. Here are some:

The author/s write “the academic journal “Fox 1, Community Radio’s Amplification of Communication for Social Change” (2019) by scholar Backhaus B” – this is not a journal article, it is in fact a review of a book (a book review) by Backhaus – the book is written by Fox and the review appeared in the *Journal of Alternative and Community Media*. The review was published in 2020 not 2019 – that was the year the book was published.

So the claims the author then makes about this “article” which is a review being a study are highly erroneous.

I could not find this reference: Carpentier, N., et al. (2017). *Community media as communicative figurations: Contextualizing a changing communication landscape*. Palgrave Macmillan.

This reference does not contain the full journal name: Carpentier, N., Lie, R., & Servaes, J. (2003). *Community media: Muting the democratic media discourse?* *Continuum*, 17(1), 51-68.

This article does not appear to exist, neither does the journal: Meadows, M., & Forde, S. (2016). *Community radio and social empowerment*. *Journal of Community Communication*, 12(3), 210–225.

Missing information from this reference: Rodriguez, C. (2001). *Fissures in the mediascape: An international study of citizens’ media*. (No Title).

This article does not appear to exist, I have searched the journal for it and there is no article in that journal and I have checked the authors’ professional pages to no avail.

Tacchi, J., & Foxwell, K. (2014). *Digital transformations and community radio*. *Information, Communication & Society*, 17(7), 917–935.

Other errors of fact in the article include writing that the *Journal of Alternative and Community Media* is the “most authoritative source” on community radio research. Well it is one source but not the most authoritative source – this is posed as a statement of fact without reference.

The following sentence is highly problematic and again this appears out of context raising the possibility this article or parts of it were written by AI:

“A community of writers who have collaborated on pieces concerning virtual reality, augmented reality, and the metaverse.”

Seriously, I had to read this sentence several times as it was mind boggling. This is an article about community radio research, which has pretty well nothing to do with augmented reality, virtual reality and augmented reality – at least not yet. I am sure this will happen one day but no, not yet. This is a red flag indicating the article may have been written in part by AI or the author/s have cut and pasted from another article on another topic.

There is a lengthy section in the results/data which reads like a horse race. This is an attempt to explain the clustering of researchers on a country basis, except it is not written like that, it is written in a way that makes the data sound like the results of a horse race.... And in first place we have, followed closely by....

Figure 5 – has no accompanying colour chart to describe coding colours for this map.

Other decidedly odd things in this article include:

demonstrated b4.2 y (line 38 page 9) not sure where the b4.2y comes from or what it means.

The author/s writes “These authors, who most likely studied” – what? Either they studied it or not – read their articles to see what they studied. It is clear that the author/s have not read any of the articles they cite.

Table 1 is titled Top 10 Most Reliable Authors – Reliable is not the right word here.

This sentence does not make sense: “Each country has a very different process for producing documentation on community radio (fig 5).” Well, researchers research, using similar methods or drawing from a range of methods so I am not sure what this means.

Use of the word documents to categorise research publications is wrong.

Also this sentence is strange: “Australia comes in second place with 85” – it is not a race, it may be that some countries have more of a focus on research on community radio, but I am now back at the ‘Scopus is a failure argument’.

Jacqueline Ewart
Professor of Communication
Griffith University.