



Retraction, a recurring theme La retracción un tema recurrente

J. Selva Andina Anim. Sci. 2025; 12(2):68-70.

The generation of scientific knowledge and its transfer undoubtedly becomes a necessity that allows institutions; whether they are universities, institutes, governmental or non-governmental organizations, to lay the foundations for the research carried out and put to the consideration of the scientific community, so that they endorse through their referencing, and most importantly, the generation of technological, biomedical, environmental, health, education, etc. development.

Through the transfer of knowledge, intellectual production is generated, which today and through digitization, has become a tool of utmost importance, since, through it, it is possible to disseminate the research carried out and be visible through the means created for that purpose, scientific journals.

But a problem arises, and it seems like a recurrence, which was not seen often, the retraction, according to data, the first was in 1979, of an article published in 1973, and as can be seen it is almost six years that it took, the reason, the digitization. Now a large percentage of the scientific literature is going through critical moments, and that the retraction has become recurrent, weekly there are journals that are retracting articles by prestigious researchers, and even more so in high-impact journals.

Now, the retraction is a kind of safeguard for the editor, since it allows the researchers of the specialty to make their evaluations of the information and test the procedures that such an author would have carried out, these do not agree with reality, so the way to follow is communication with the editor, making him notice that such published research lacks rigor or has shortcomings. It is known that the role of the editor is seen in the need to carry out research on the subject and if this is correct, communicate with the authors, to settle this matter as soon as possible.

It seems a simple issue, but the question is, where is the integrity of the authors who incurred in this abnormality, and what happened to the control mechanisms that a journal has. It is possible that due to the volume of articles and the haste in the edition of a journal, some steps are omitted before its edition, and these shortcomings are commented on, so what should be done. The answer lies in the nebula, because some authors have forgotten integrity and it is not at all uncommon for them to incur in these abnormalities, given the need

for their authorities, who insist on prompt publication. The one that would benefit him with an increase in his salary, better job prospects, or some prize in between.

So the editor and the journal in question where they are, it is not easy for an editor today, to know if an article has integrity in its development, or not, since institutions present news through their articles that they send to a journal, so that it can be submitted to arbitration, and for more technological tools, that it is held, it cannot be asserted, that said experiment has or has not met the standards of quality, or whether or not there was scientific fraud, that issue is difficult to question, and only time, and when a group of researchers from another institution performs these evaluation tests sees that there were shortcomings, that is where the problems and inconsistencies arise, before it is unlikely and the publisher is the one who bears the responsibility, and if this abnormality is confirmed, the retraction will proceed.

Now, and after so much effort, the retraction is justified, either it is a path only to ask questions, or only to satisfy the appetites of some who for obvious reasons dedicate themselves to this task. This statement cannot be given with certainty, because it depends on the area of research and the type of scientific work that is questioned, the important thing is that the editor, in addition to proceeding to an evaluation through the editorial processes that each journal has as a resource, and despite the existing technological tools, retraction will continue to be a latent issue, Because let's not forget that it is imperative that authors and institutions have their policies and programs or instruments that measure the quality of research before it is sent for evaluation to a journal.

Nor should we forget that when an article is published and available to the scientific world, it becomes public and over time it would become a reference or model for others, and that it may be in the long run a topic that generates such an impact, that it could save lives, improve education, generate environmental policies, generate new development models. In short, we must be cautious when submitting an article for possible publication, but, above all, we must have a healthy judgment that the authors have complied with all the criteria established by the regulations on research in its different areas and levels.

Finally, and by way of analysis, the retraction is necessary, since it would become a brake to prevent publications from existing that for some reason should not be published, since in the long run they could generate discomfort in the scientific community and in this sense we must as editors, be vigilant and be attentive to the possible situations that may occur over time.

Conflicts of interest

There are no conflicts of interest.

Ethical considerations

This was prepared respecting data from authors and institutions, hence only the information has been generalized.

Loza-Murguía Manuel Gregorio PhD 
DIRECTOR - EDITOR-IN-CHIEF
Executive Chairman - Honorary of the Board of Directors
Spanish National Research Council for Science and Biotechnology
Fundación Selva Andina Research Society
La Paz – Plurinational State of Bolivia
Phone. +591 - 671 10665 -752 14458
E-mail. infoselvandina@gmail.com
E-mail. boliviamanloza@yahoo.com

2025. Journal of the Selva Andina Animal Science®. Bolivia. All rights reserved.