

AN UNETHICAL METHOD OF INCREASING PUBLICATION COUNTS: SALAMI SLICING

Anurag Verma

Allahabad Degree College, University of Allahabad

Researchers and academicians have begun to use salami slicing as a result of the increased dependence on their publication count to win favor. It increases the number of publications they have, but the study's credibility is compromised because it is unethical. In light of salami slicing, the same population study is repeated, but the reports are broken up. In order to slice the entire study into many publications, the data are divided into least publishable units (LPU). It is against the research ethical code, and the publisher needs to know about the researcher's methods.

In academia, the term "Salami Slicing" refers to the needless split of a single research subject matter, dataset, and argument into numerous papers for submission in various journals. Salami Slicing is used to boost the research metrics of the researcher to achieve a good academic performance indicator (API) score, enabling them get a competitive edge over other researchers and academicians.

Salami slicing is a manner of dividing down data from a single research idea into smaller "publishable" pieces, units, also called "slices." Karlsson, J., & Beaufils, P. (2013).

Nobody would deny that the desire to publicize new results as soon as possible is acceptable. However, the desire to do so only to increase the number of publications is not justified. Much of the problem stems not from academics' natural drive to boost their publication count, but from the conditions imposed by funding and appointment authorities, which determine what is supported and who receives tenure. In the 'publish or perish' climate that has developed in recent decades, overemphasis on the size of an individual's (and, increasingly, entire research group's) publication record as a measure inevitably prioritizes number over quality when assessing their research output.

Splitting a study into "slices" that share the same hypothesis, population, and techniques is generally not a smart idea. Avoid publishing the same "slice" more than once. Cope. Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE) (2005).

Even within journals that expressly addressed salami publication, the specific guidelines were sometimes vague, with no indication of the consequences of noncompliance. A vague policy statement, such as "it is critical to refrain from fragmenting a single study into multiple parts for the purpose of increasing submissions," clearly lacks practical viability.

References

1. Karlsson, J., & Beaufils, P. (2013). Legitimate division of large data sets, salami slicing and dual publication, where does a fraud begin? *Knee Surgery, Sports Traumatology, Arthroscopy*, 21(4), 751-752.)
2. IJEBlog.2019 Available from: <https://ijeblog.com/2019/11/19/salamipublishing-why-we-need-to-talk-about-it/>.

3. Subedi, K., & Subedi, N. (2023). Misconduct in research: The troubling practice of salami slicing. *Journal of Gandaki Medical College-Nepal*, 16(1), 1–5. <https://doi.org/10.3126/jgmcn.v16i1.56137>
4. Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE) (2005). Cases: Salami publication. Available at: publicationethics.org/case/case-salami-slicing. Accessed on February 14, 2019.
5. The cost of salami slicing. *Nature Mater* 4, 1 (2005). <https://doi.org/10.1038/nmat1305>.