

# Can ChatGPT predict article retraction based on Twitter mentions?

Er-Te Zheng<sup>1</sup>, Hui-Zhen Fu<sup>2</sup>, Zhichao Fang<sup>1,3\*</sup>

\* Corresponding author

Er-Te Zheng (ORCID: 0000-0001-8759-3643)

<sup>1</sup> School of Information Resource Management, Renmin University of China, Beijing, China.

E-mail: [zhengerte@ruc.edu.cn](mailto:zhengerte@ruc.edu.cn)

Hui-Zhen Fu (ORCID: 0000-0002-1534-9374)

<sup>2</sup> Department of Information Resources Management, Zhejiang University, Hangzhou, China.

E-mail: [fuhuizhen@zju.edu.cn](mailto:fuhuizhen@zju.edu.cn)

Zhichao Fang (ORCID: 0000-0002-3802-2227)

<sup>1</sup> School of Information Resource Management, Renmin University of China, Beijing, China.

<sup>3</sup> Centre for Science and Technology Studies (CWTS), Leiden University, Leiden, The Netherlands.

E-mail: [z.fang@cwts.leidenuniv.nl](mailto:z.fang@cwts.leidenuniv.nl)

## Abstract

Detecting problematic research articles timely is a vital task. This study explores whether Twitter mentions of retracted articles can signal potential problems with the articles prior to retraction, thereby playing a role in predicting future retraction of problematic articles. A dataset comprising 3,505 retracted articles and their associated Twitter mentions is analyzed, alongside 3,505 non-retracted articles with similar characteristics obtained using the Coarsened Exact Matching method. The effectiveness of Twitter mentions in predicting article retraction is evaluated by four prediction methods, including manual labelling, keyword identification, machine learning models, and ChatGPT. Manual labelling results indicate that there are indeed retracted articles with their Twitter mentions containing recognizable evidence signaling problems before retraction, although they represent only a limited share of all retracted articles with Twitter mention data (approximately 16%). Using the manual labelling results as the baseline, ChatGPT demonstrates superior performance compared to other methods, implying its potential in assisting human judgment for predicting article retraction. This study uncovers both the potential and limitation of social media events as an early warning system for article retraction, shedding light on a potential application of generative artificial intelligence in promoting research integrity.

## Keywords

Altmetrics, social media metrics, academic misconduct, large language model, retracted articles, research integrity

## 1. Introduction

The dissemination of problematic research articles has the potential to spread misinformation within both the scientific community and the general population (Candal-Pedreira et al., 2022; Larsson, 1995). Consequently, there has been growing attention on article retraction as “a mechanism for correcting the literature and alerting readers to articles that contain such seriously flawed or erroneous content or data that their findings and conclusions cannot be relied upon” (COPE Council, 2019). To uphold the integrity of scientific literature, there is an increasing demand for the proactive detection of problematic articles and the mitigation of post-retraction effects (Bar-Ilan & Halevi, 2017), particularly in light of the increasing incidence of article retraction over recent decades (Van Noorden, 2011, 2023; Vuong et al., 2020).

In addition to peer review, conventional approaches for identifying problematic articles have focused primarily on text-based plagiarism (Eysenbach, 2000; Wager, 2011) and image manipulation (Bik et al., 2016; Koppers et al., 2017). However, these methods have limitations in detecting more nuanced forms of misconduct, such as data falsification and authorship issues. Since instances of article retraction are at times prompted by readers identifying problems in the articles, as exemplified by the recent study using artificial intelligence to generate biological research illustrations (Guo et al., 2024), which sparked widespread social media discussion, leading to its swift retraction just three days after publication. It is imperative to explore the potential role of reader comments in signaling problems that may lead to article retraction. As integral components of altmetrics, reader comments posted on various social media platforms, such as Twitter<sup>1</sup>, Facebook, and blogs, provide tangible evidence to monitor online engagement with retracted articles in a timely manner.

### *1.1 Altmetric research on retracted articles*

Existing altmetric literature has focused not only on characterizing the overall online attention towards retracted articles but also on comparing the online attention between retracted and non-retracted articles, as well as between pre- and post-retraction phases. Generally, a range of previous studies has reported that retracted articles also attract significant social media attention, especially on platforms like Twitter and from members of the general public (Khademizadeh et al., 2023; Khan et al., 2022). Shema et al. (2019) observed a positive correlation between a higher Altmetric Attention Score (AAS) and the likelihood of retraction due to misconduct. Furthermore, retracted articles have been found to receive even greater attention on social media

---

<sup>1</sup> Twitter, referred to as X since its acquisition by Elon Musk, remains the official name at the time of our data collection. Therefore, we continue to use “Twitter” as well as “tweets” in this study.

compared to non-retracted articles and their corresponding retraction notices (Peng et al., 2022; Serghiou et al., 2021). For instance, on Twitter, it has been found that the average number of tweets and engagements, such as retweets, likes, and replies, received by retracted articles surpasses that of non-retracted articles with similar characteristics (Dambanemuya et al., 2024).

Concerning the comparison of social media attention towards retracted articles between pre- and post-retraction phases, research conducted by Dambanemuya et al. (2024) indicated that the majority of Twitter attention to retracted articles occurred before retraction. Similarly, Serghiou et al. (2021) discovered that, using the compound indicator AAS as the measure, pre-retraction attention to popular articles with higher AAS significantly exceeded post-retraction attention. The significant social media attention directed towards problematic articles before their retraction allows for investigations into the early discussions around future retracted articles.

### *1.2 Application of Twitter mentions in the identification of problematic articles*

Scholarly Twitter mentions (i.e., tweets referring to scholarly articles) constitute one of the most prevalent and timely types of altmetric data (Costas et al., 2015; Ortega, 2018; Sugimoto et al., 2017; Thelwall et al., 2013). They serve as a prominent research focus in altmetric analyses concerning retracted articles. Many previous studies have explored social media attention towards retracted articles, considering Twitter mentions as a significant indicator. These studies have generally concluded that retracted articles garner considerable attention from Twitter users (Bornmann & Haunschild, 2018), often exceeding that received by non-retracted articles, as noted previously (Peng et al., 2022; Sotudeh et al., 2022).

Additionally, Twitter mentions tend to accumulate shortly after the publication of scholarly articles, making them one of the fastest among all types of altmetric data (Z. Fang & Costas, 2020; Yu et al., 2017). This rapid accumulation enables a more timely understanding of public engagement with articles in the early stages after publication. Consequently, some previous studies have sought to identify problematic articles by leveraging the advantage of Twitter mentions. For example, using a compiled list of keywords related to retraction, Dambanemuya et al. (2024) found that retracted articles had significantly more tweets containing retraction-related keywords compared to non-retracted articles, both before and after retraction. This aligns with the manual labelling results from Peng et al. (2022), which revealed that Twitter mentions tended to express more criticism towards retracted articles than non-retracted ones. These findings are further corroborated by sentiment analysis conducted by Amiri et al. (2024), showing that approximately one-third of retracted articles had negative sentiment in their pre-retraction tweets, and negative tweets were more frequently retweeted than positive or neutral ones. In a case study of three retracted articles on COVID-19, Haunschild and Bornmann (2021) found that tweets casting doubt on the validity of two of the articles emerged shortly after their publication. These previous studies have unveiled the potential of Twitter mentions in predicting article retraction and signaling potential misinformation. Nevertheless, it remains

unknown, based on larger datasets comprising both retracted and non-retracted articles, to what extent Twitter mentions can indicate problems within articles that may lead to a risk of retraction.

### *1.3 Application of ChatGPT in prediction*

ChatGPT, a powerful large language model (LLM) developed by OpenAI, has caught unprecedented attention since its launch in November, 2022. Due to its remarkable performance in natural language understanding and processing, ChatGPT has already been recognized as a promising tool in diverse fields (Sallam, 2023), like education (Fütterer et al., 2023), business (Paul et al., 2023), healthcare (Casella et al., 2023), and scientific research (Mahuli et al., 2023). This has evoked a mixed mood of enthusiasm and concern because of the opportunities and challenges it has introduced (Dwivedi et al., 2023).

The contextual understanding capacity of ChatGPT in natural language suggests its potential value in making predictions by processing textual information and engaging in conversational interactions. Consequently, there have been exploratory efforts to utilize ChatGPT in various prediction scenarios across different domains. For instance, in the field of economics, Lopez-Lira and Tang (2023) assessed the ability of ChatGPT to forecast daily stock market returns based on its analysis of news headlines released the day before trading. In healthcare, Patrinos et al. (2023) tasked ChatGPT with predicting the future of personalized medicine and pharmacogenomics. From a scientific research perspective, ChatGPT has been evaluated for its ability to predict future Nobel Prize laureates (Conroy, 2023b). More relevant to regular research activities, Liang et al. (2023) investigated the effectiveness of GPT-4 in generating feedback on research manuscripts, compared to feedback provided by human peer reviewers. Their research revealed a significant overlap in the feedback generated by GPT-4 and human reviewers, suggesting that ChatGPT could complement human expert evaluation and offer timely feedback prior to peer-review.

Summing up the above, the potential of Twitter mentions to imply problems and the capabilities of ChatGPT in prediction have sparked our interest in an unresolved question: can ChatGPT be utilized to predict article retraction based on the texts of Twitter mentions? Answering this question can offer a novel approach to early detection of problematic articles, thus facilitating more immediate academic purification and mitigating the threat of misinformation to society.

### *1.4 Objectives of this study*

The main objective of this study is to explore the potential of ChatGPT in predicting article retraction based on social media engagement with scholarly articles, using Twitter as the example. We aim to investigate (1) the capacity of Twitter mentions to indicate problems within scholarly articles that may lead to article retraction, and (2) the effectiveness of ChatGPT in predicting article retraction based on the texts of Twitter mentions. Specifically, the objective leads us to address the following two research questions:

**RQ1.** To what extent can Twitter mentions predict the retraction of scholarly articles in advance of formal retraction?

**RQ2.** With the results of human prediction as the baseline, how does the performance of ChatGPT in predicting article retraction, based on the texts of Twitter mentions, compare to other prediction methods, including keyword identification and machine learning?

## **2. Data and methods**


### *2.1 Dataset*

To obtain retracted articles, we searched for the keywords “retracted article” and “retraction” in the titles of scholarly articles indexed by the *Science Citation Index-Expanded* (SCI-E) and *Social Science Citation Index* (SSCI) of the Web of Science (WoS). Following the matching process between the titles of retracted articles and their corresponding retraction notices retrieved through the search, we obtained 6,123 distinct retracted articles published from 2012 to 2021 (a ten-year time span).

Using the tweet IDs of original Twitter mentions provided by Altmetric.com, we collected Twitter mention data for these retracted articles, including the tweet posted date (i.e., the date on which a tweet is posted) and tweet texts, via the Twitter API in May, 2022. Given that being mentioned on Twitter is a prerequisite for this study, we filtered out retracted articles without any tweets. Consequently, we obtained a total of 3,628 retracted articles with at least one tweet (accounting for 59.3%). Additionally, we gathered bibliometric data for these retracted articles from the in-house WoS database hosted at the Centre for Science and Technology Studies (CWTS) of Leiden University (version: March, 2022).

### *2.2 Methods*

For clarity, Figure 1 illustrates the research workflow, systematically detailing the sequential steps of data sampling, cleaning, and analyzing undertaken in this study. The methods used for data processing are elaborated upon as follows.



**Figure 1.** Research workflow of the study


(1) Matching method: Coarsened Exact Matching (CEM)

To examine whether Twitter mentions can predict retraction, this study considers tweets about both retracted and non-retracted articles (i.e., scholarly articles that were not retracted at the time of our data collection). We adopt the Coarsened Exact Matching (CEM) method to match non-retracted articles with the selected retracted articles. CEM is a matching technique that involves coarsening the values of covariates into groups and then performing exact matching within each group (Blackwell et al., 2009; Iacus et al., 2012). This method aims to reduce the imbalance of covariates between the treatment and control groups by pruning observations that have no matches in the other group.

From the WoS database, non-retracted articles were matched with the retracted articles in our dataset based on four covariates, including publication venue (i.e., journal), publication year, number of authors, and number of tweets received. This ensures that the successfully matched retracted and non-retracted articles are published in the same journal of the same year, with a similar number of authors and tweets. From the WoS database, there are 749,480 non-retracted articles that were published in the same issue of the same journals as the 3,628 retracted articles in our dataset. Similarly, the 436,223 non-retracted articles have accumulated at least one tweet.

After applying the CEM matching, a total of 7,010 articles were successfully matched, comprising 3,505 retracted articles and 3,505 non-retracted articles. Overall, the 3,505 retracted articles have accumulated 17,134 tweets (hereafter referred to as *retracted tweets*), while the 3,505 non-retracted articles have accumulated 12,389 tweets (hereafter referred to as *non-retracted tweets*). It should be noted that the bibliometric data of non-retracted articles was also retrieved from the in-house WoS database at CWTS, and the Twitter data was collected via the Twitter API in May, 2022. The effectiveness of the matching is validated based on the L1 distance, as depicted in Table A1 in the Appendix.

Since this study sets out to explore the potential of tweets in predicting article retraction, we focus solely on tweets posted before the retraction date of articles (i.e., the date on which a scholarly article is officially retracted). For retracted articles, their retraction dates were retrieved from the Retraction Watch database in February, 2022. However, for non-retracted articles, as they do not have retraction date information, we followed the approach used by Peng et al. (2022) and assigned each non-retracted article an assumptive retraction date identical to its matched retracted counterpart. In cases where non-retracted articles were matched with multiple retracted counterparts, we chose the average retraction date of the matched retracted articles as the assumptive retraction date for the non-retracted article. Consequently, we maintain a consistent observation time window for Twitter discussions for both matched retracted and non-retracted articles. After screening out tweets posted after the retraction date, there were 15,383 retracted tweets and 11,031 non-retracted tweets remaining. Figure 2 shows the number of tweets posted before or after retraction for retracted and non-retracted articles, respectively.




**Figure 2.** Number of tweets posted before or after retraction for retracted and non-retracted articles

(2) Tweets filtering: similarity calculation between tweet texts and article titles

Given the potential “emptiness” of tweet texts due to the echoing of article titles (Robinson-Garcia et al., 2017), we conducted several steps of data cleaning to exclude tweets with less substantial information. First, we removed URLs and handle names of mentioned users (i.e., character strings prefixed with @) from all tweet texts in our dataset. Second, we calculated the Levenshtein distance to measure the similarity between the cleaned tweet texts and the title of the corresponding scholarly articles referenced in the tweets. The Levenshtein distance ranges from 0 to 100, with higher values indicating greater similarity between the two texts. Figure 3 shows the distribution of Levenshtein distance scores for retracted tweets and non-retracted tweets, respectively. We excluded those tweets with a Levenshtein distance greater than 90 from the analysis, as such high similarity may suggest a simple echo of the article title rather than original thought from Twitter users. Finally, based on the language field of tweet texts responded by the Twitter API, we only included tweets written in English language for analysis, resulting in a final dataset comprising 8,367 retracted tweets (associated with 1,981 retracted articles) and 6,180 non-retracted tweets (associated with 1,970 non-retracted articles), respectively.





**Figure 3.** Distribution of Levenshtein distance between the tweet texts and the corresponding article titles for retracted tweets (left panel) and non-retracted tweets (right panel)

### (3) Baseline: manual labelling

Based on the publication year of scholarly articles, we classified the sample articles and their tweets into two distinct sets: the training set comprising articles published between 2012 and 2020, and the test set comprising articles published in 2021. Table 1 lists the number of articles and tweets in the training set and test set, respectively.

**Table 1.** Number of articles and tweets in the training set and the test set

Dataset	Non-/retracted	Number of articles	Number of tweets
Training set	Retracted	1,823	7,838
	Non-retracted	1,791	5,642
Test set	Retracted	158	529
	Non-retracted	179	538

Two authors of this study acted as coders, independently labelling the 337 articles in the test set. They marked articles they each deemed at risk of retraction based solely on the tweet texts. Neither coder had prior knowledge of the retraction status of the articles; their predictions were solely based on the content of the tweet texts referencing the articles. The labelling process adhered to predefined rules to ensure consistency and accuracy. If a tweet was considered indicative of significant problems within an article, the article was predicted to be at risk of retraction. Additionally, both coders were encouraged to document any uncertainties or interpretations encountered for subsequent discussion and resolution.

Following the labelling process, we employed Cohen's Kappa coefficient to assess the consistency of the labelling results. The Cohen's Kappa coefficient was calculated to be 0.722, indicating a substantial level of agreement between the two coders. Subsequently, the two coders engaged in an in-depth discussion regarding all labelling results to reach a consensus.

This consensus served as the final human prediction results for this study. The human prediction results were utilized as the baseline to evaluate the performance of other prediction methods, including keyword identification, machine learning, and ChatGPT, as detailed below.

#### (4) Keyword identification

The first prediction method we examined is keyword identification, which operates on the premise that tweets related to retracted articles may contain more critical words highlighting potential problems with the articles. Therefore, the presence of specific critical keywords in tweets could serve as an indicator for predicting article retraction.

Based on the tweets in the training set, we calculated the TF-IDF values for keywords used in the texts of retracted tweets and non-retracted tweets, respectively. Then, we computed the TF-IDF difference of each keyword between the two types of texts. A positive difference indicates that the keyword appears more frequently in retracted tweets than in non-retracted tweets. From the keywords with the highest TF-IDF differences, we selected 128 main keywords as critical keywords for predicting article retraction, as listed in Table A2 in the Appendix. These critical keywords were then used to predict the retraction status of articles in the test set.

#### (5) Machine learning models

The second method employed for predicting retraction is machine learning, which allows computers to learn from data and make predictions or decisions without explicit programming. Specifically, this study used four classical machine learning models, including:

- Naive Bayes (NB): A classification method used for predicting or categorizing data based on probabilistic principles. It is valued for its elegant simplicity and efficiency, making it particularly appealing for tasks such as text classification.
- Random Forest (RF): A versatile ensemble learning method used for a wide range of tasks, including classification and regression. RF combines multiple decision trees to make robust predictions. This method mitigates overfitting and improves model accuracy through the aggregation of diverse tree-based models.
- Support Vector Machines (SVM): A powerful machine learning algorithm employed for binary classification and regression tasks. SVM aims to find the optimal decision boundary and can effectively manage high-dimensional data. It skillfully identifies a hyperplane that maximizes the margin between classes, thereby enhancing robust classification performance.
- Logistic Regression (LR): A statistical method used for binary classification and probability estimation. LR models the relationship between input features and a categorical outcome. It is favored for its interpretability, making it suitable for tasks where understanding the feature-outcome relationship is essential, and it can handle both linear and nonlinear relationships effectively.

Using the Python library *scikit-learn*, we trained the four machine learning models on the data in the training set. Subsequently, we applied these trained models to predict whether the articles in the test set would be retracted based on their tweet texts. This process involved feeding the tweet texts as input features into the trained models, which then outputted predictions on whether the article would be retracted or not.

#### (6) ChatGPT

The third method utilized for predicting retraction is ChatGPT, consisting of GPT-3.5 and GPT-4 at present, with the latter representing a more advanced iteration of the model. In this study, we used prompts to guide GPT-3.5 and GPT-4 to predict the retraction of articles based on tweet texts from the test set. Besides predicting whether an article would be retracted based on its related tweets (*YES* or *NO*), GPT-3.5 and GPT-4 were prompted to provide reasons for their predictions of retraction. Table 2 gives an example of the GPT-3.5 and GPT-4 predictions based on the tweet texts of a sample article.

**Table 2.** A sample tweet of an article and the response of ChatGPT

Tweet texts of an article	Response of ChatGPT
<p><i>“The wrong marker was selected due to the nonstandard operation of the experiment?”</i></p>	<p><i>GPT-3.5: “YES. The use of the wrong marker suggests a significant error that could result in the retraction of the paper, as it undermines the credibility and conclusions of the experiment.”</i></p>
	<p><i>GPT-4: “YES. The mention of a 'wrong marker' and 'nonstandard operation' implies potential issues with the research process, which could lead to retraction.”</i></p>

### 2.3 Indicators

To evaluate the performance of the prediction methods examined in this study, we selected four commonly used evaluation metrics, including *accuracy*, *precision*, *recall*, and *F1-Score*. Each metric offers insights into the effectiveness of prediction methods from different perspectives, and their comprehensive use facilitates a more nuanced comparison of prediction performance across different methods. Furthermore, we compared the performance of these methods against human predictions, considering the manual labelling results as the baseline. To be specific:

- *Accuracy* refers to the percentage of correct predictions among all predictions made. In this study, the accuracy of a prediction method reflects the probability of correctly predicting both retracted and non-retracted articles among all sample articles in the test set.

- *Precision*, also known as positive predictive value, represents the percentage of samples correctly predicted as positive among all positive predictions. In this study, the precision of a prediction method reflects the probability of correctly predicting retracted articles among all sample articles predicted as retracted in the test set.
- *Recall*, also known as sensitivity, denotes the percentage of samples correctly predicted as positive among all samples that are indeed positive. In this study, the recall of a method reflects the probability of correctly predicting retracted articles among all retracted articles in the test set.
- The *F1-Score* considers both precision and recall, its formula is:

$$F1 - Score = \frac{2 \times Precision \times Recall}{Precision + Recall}$$

The value of F1-Score ranges from 0 to 1, with higher values indicating better prediction performance of the method.

### 3. Results

This section consists of three parts. The first part addresses the research question regarding the potential of tweets in predicting article retraction based on the results of human prediction. The second part compares the performance of the four prediction methods studied, including manual labelling, keyword identification, machine learning, and ChatGPT. The third part further compares the results of the latter three methods with human prediction as the baseline.

#### 3.1 The potential of Twitter mentions in predicting article retraction

Manual labelling was initially conducted to address a fundamental question of the study: whether tweets per se can provide recognizable evidence indicating potential problems in articles, which may ultimately lead to article retraction. Based on the tweet texts of the 337 articles in the test set, 28 articles were labelled positive (i.e., *retracted*) because the coders identified critical messages in the tweets that may imply a risk of retraction. Conversely, the remaining 309 articles were labelled negative (i.e., *non-retracted*) because there were no evident words expressing a critical attitude towards the tweeted articles. Since there were 158 articles in the test set that had actually been retracted, the values of accuracy, precision, recall, and F1-Score of human prediction are 60.24%, 92.86%, 16.46%, and 0.28, respectively.

The results of human prediction suggest that, overall, only a limited portion of retracted articles had their Twitter mentions conveying detectable concerns about potential problems prior to retraction (as represented by recall = 16.46%). In contrast, the Twitter mentions of most retracted articles did not identify the potential problems that led to article retraction. However, for those articles with Twitter mentions labelled as an indication of future retraction, the majority of them were indeed retracted after being highlighted on Twitter (as represented by

precision = 92.86%). This suggests the potential of scholarly Twitter mentions in predicting article retraction.


### 3.2 The performance of different methods in predicting article retraction

To evaluate the performance of different methods in predicting article retraction based on Twitter mentions, Table 3 presents the values of the four evaluation indicators (i.e., accuracy, precision, recall, and F1-Score) for the four main methods applied to the test set. Different methods exhibit varying performance, particularly in terms of precision and recall. As mentioned earlier, the results of manual labelling suggest that only approximately 16% of retracted articles have Twitter mentions with concrete evidence implying future retraction, and nearly 93% of human prediction of retraction proved correct. With the results of human prediction as the reference, a too high recall and F1-Score may indicate overfitting of methods, such as keyword identification and the LR, RF, and NB models of machine learning, whose recall far exceeds 16%. In comparison, the prediction results of the SVM model of machine learning and ChatGPT (both GPT-3.5 and GPT-4) are closer to human prediction in terms of both recall and precision, indicating better performance of prediction based on scholarly Twitter mentions.

**Table 3.** Performance of different methods in predicting article retraction

Method	Accuracy (%)	Precision (%)	Recall (%)	F1-Score
Keyword identification	52.52	49.35	48.10	0.49
Machine learning: LR	61.13	58.82	56.96	0.58
Machine learning: RF	58.16	56.80	44.94	0.50
Machine learning: NB	59.05	55.00	69.62	0.61
Machine learning: SVM	56.68	63.64	17.72	0.28
ChatGPT: GPT-3.5	58.16	66.67	21.52	0.33
ChatGPT: GPT-4	57.57	75.86	13.92	0.24
Human prediction	60.24	92.86	16.46	0.28

Figure 4 further illustrates the distribution of retracted and non-retracted articles predicted by different methods among all 158 actual retracted articles and 179 non-retracted articles in our test set. In Figure 4, grey bars represent articles predicted as retracted, while white bars represent those predicted as non-retracted by each method. Consistent with the findings discussed earlier, although the methods of keyword identification and the three machine learning models (i.e., LR, RF, and NB) predicted more retracted articles correctly, they also misclassified a larger number of actually non-retracted articles as retracted. In contrast, ChatGPT and the SVM model are more aligned with the results of human prediction.



**Figure 4.** Distribution of retracted and non-retracted articles predicted by different methods among actual retracted articles (left panel) and non-retracted articles (right panel)

### 3.3 A comparison of performance between human prediction and different prediction methods


In addition to comparing the performance of prediction methods with the actual retraction situation as the reference, we further compared the performance of different methods with human prediction as the reference. This was done to determine the extent to which each method’s prediction aligns with human judgment. Table 4 presents the performance of the three main methods (i.e., keyword identification, machine learning, and ChatGPT) with the results of human prediction as the reference instead. We calculated the indicators ‘accuracy’, ‘precision’, ‘recall’, and ‘F1-Score’ with the results of human prediction assumed as the actual situation. Overall, ChatGPT, particularly GPT-4, exhibits the strongest consistency with human prediction, as reflected by higher values of ‘accuracy’, ‘precision’, and ‘F1-Score’ compared to other methods.

**Table 4.** Performance of different methods with human prediction as the reference

Method	Accuracy’ (%)	Precision’ (%)	Recall’ (%)	F1-Score’
Keyword identification	59.64	14.94	82.14	0.25
Machine learning: LR	56.97	11.76	64.29	0.20
Machine learning: RF	63.50	12.00	53.57	0.20
Machine learning: NB	47.77	13.00	92.86	0.23
Machine learning: SVM	84.57	22.73	35.71	0.28
ChatGPT: GPT-3.5	87.83	37.25	67.86	0.48
ChatGPT: GPT-4	94.96	68.97	71.43	0.70

Note: The indicators ‘accuracy’, ‘precision’, ‘recall’, and ‘F1-Score’ are followed by quotation marks here to distinguish them from the indicators in Table 3.

Figure 5 illustrates the distribution of retracted and non-retracted articles predicted by different methods among all 28 articles predicted by human as retracted and the 309 articles predicted by human as non-retracted. Keyword identification and the three machine learning models (i.e., LR, RF, and NB) identified a significantly larger number of retracted articles that are not recognizable to humans. In comparison, the predictions made by GPT-4 demonstrate a closer alignment with human judgments, marked by a reduced incidence of articles being identified as retracted that humans have predicted as non-retracted, and a substantial quantity of articles identified as retracted that are likewise predicted to be retracted by humans.



**Figure 5.** Distribution of retracted and non-retracted articles predicted by different methods among retracted articles (left panel) and non-retracted articles (right panel) predicted by human

#### 4. Discussion

The spread of problematic research articles can have a long-lasting impact on not only the scientific but also broader communities, as extensively documented in the literature. References to retracted articles persist in scholarly publications (Yang et al., 2022), reference management platforms (Bar-Ilan & Halevi, 2018), and even policy documents (Malkov et al., 2023). This threat underscores the need for a more responsive system to alert readers against relying on problematic evidence, thus ensuring retraction, the mechanism for correcting the literature and warning readers about problematic articles, to come into play in time.

Given the substantial volume of data associated with retracted articles (Serghiou et al., 2021) and the rapid interaction with newly published articles (Z. Fang & Costas, 2020), social media

has been suggested as useful instruments to enhance scientific ethics (Gross, 2016). Based on a set of Twitter mentions to retracted articles and their non-retracted counterparts, this study first (1) validated the feasibility to identify problematic articles and predict retraction based on tweet texts through human labelling, and then (2) demonstrated the potential of ChatGPT in making such predictions using human prediction results as the baseline, thus addressing the two research questions we proposed.

#### *4.1 The ability of Twitter mentions to predict article retraction*

Based on the results of human prediction, this study revealed that only a small proportion of Twitter mentions of retracted articles contained recognizable information enabling humans to make accurate predictions about future retractions, encompassing about 16% of retracted articles. Besides, only 59.3% of retracted articles in this study had accumulated at least one Twitter mention, thus identifying all problematic articles solely through tweets remains a challenging task.

The lack of concrete evidence indicating problems with articles in Twitter mentions can be attributed to several factors. First, a significant portion of Twitter users engaging with scholarly articles come from outside academia and may lack subject matter expertise in the relevant fields (Haustein, 2019; Zhang et al., 2023). Consequently, these users may not possess the professional knowledge required to critically assess the methods and results in the tweeted articles. Second, many scholarly Twitter mentions are primarily intended for dissemination and sharing purposes (Didegah et al., 2018; Mohammadi et al., 2018). Such user motivations may not always lead to the unearthing of potential problems within the tweeted articles, but rather contribute to the proliferation of mechanical tweets devoid of original thought (Robinson-Garcia et al., 2017). Moreover, bot accounts play a significant role in science communication on Twitter, whether for regular articles (Didegah et al., 2018) or retracted articles (Dambanemuya et al., 2024), further exacerbating the deficiency of original and critical thought in tweets.

Despite the sparsity of Twitter mentions indicating problems, for those with detectable evidence implying potential problems with articles, 93% of the articles predicted as retracted by humans were indeed retracted, demonstrating the notable potential of Twitter mentions as valuable indicators of future retraction. Through our observation, two types of critical tweets manifest their proficiency in predicting article retraction. The first type explicitly highlights errors or academic misconduct presented in articles (e.g., “*Someone's been using my abstract generator*”). The second type employs forms of critique or irony to highlight the debatable quality of articles (e.g., “*Why did the journal publish this nonsense paper?*”). Such doubts expressed by Twitter users may prompt journals to initiate investigative procedures into the articles. If these investigations substantiate the existence and severity of the problems alluded to in tweets, the articles would subsequently be retracted. In this context, critical Twitter



mentions can serve as catalysts in the retraction of problematic articles, underscoring their value in being incorporated into early warning system for research integrity.

#### 4.2 ChatGPT as a potential assistance of human prediction

The capacity of generative artificial intelligence to facilitate scientific discovery has been widely discussed (Epstein et al., 2023; Wang et al., 2023). Research has demonstrated that large language models exhibit performance in text annotation tasks that matches or exceeds that of human annotators (Gilardi et al., 2023; Ziems et al., 2024). This study contributes to the growing body of literature by applying it to promote research integrity. In contrast to keyword identification and machine learning models, ChatGPT, particularly GPT-4, performed exceptionally well in predicting article retraction based on tweet texts, closely aligning with human prediction. In addition, ChatGPT offers an important advantage over other methods – it can provide reasoning for its predictions, whereas other methods are unable to explain in detail for their decisions. For example, as seen from the sample articles 1 and 2 in Table 5, ChatGPT demonstrates a profound understanding of tweets and accurately extracts information that can potentially predict article retraction. It provides valuable assistance in using tweets to assess whether an article has underlying problems.

**Table 5.** Sample tweets and predictive response of ChatGPT

Sample article	Sample tweet texts imported	Response of ChatGPT
Article 1	<i>“Seen in ..., this is a very bizarre paper. The paper discusses both groundwater seepage and dance training. Good thing we have paywalled journals like ... making massive profits because they do quality control, right?”</i>	<i>GPT-3.5: “YES. These tweets suggest that the related paper will be retracted. They all either mock or express concern about the quality of the paper and its publication, indicating potential issues with the peer review process or the validity of the research itself.”</i>
	<i>“Why Did a Peer-Reviewed Journal Publish Hundreds of Nonsense Papers?”</i>	<i>GPT-4: “YES. Tweets imply issues with the paper's content, suggesting potential for retraction due to low-quality or nonsensical research.”</i>
Article 2	<i>“what are you doing to science? please stop your nonsense journals! #scienceintegrity”</i>	<i>GPT-3.5: “YES. The tweet indicates that the paper will be retracted because it suggests that the paper is problematic and the journal publisher is not ensuring scientific integrity.”</i>

		<i>GPT-4: “YES. The tweet criticizes the journal's quality control, suggesting potential issues that could lead to article retractions.”</i>
<i>Article 3</i>	<i>“Light-activated Creation of enzymes such as PRMT5, an arginine methyltransferase explains why Nobel Prize-winning works of ... were retracted prior to her placement on ... team of science advisors/idiot minions/evolutionary theorists.”</i>	<i>GPT-3.5: “YES. The tweet suggests that the related article will be retracted because it mentions the retraction of .....’s Nobel Prize-winning works and connects it to the publication of a paper about the creation of enzymes using light activation, indicating potential issues with the paper.”</i>
		<i>GPT-4: “YES. The tweet seems to indicate some controversy surrounding related work by a noted scientist, possibly indicating the article may face challenges.”</i>

Despite the potential of ChatGPT in making human-like predictions, there are occasions when its outputs may be inappropriate. For instance, in the context of article 3 in Table 5, where a tweet stated that the tweeted article explained why a Noble laureate’s articles were retracted, ChatGPT incorrectly linked the tweeted article to the retracted articles by the Nobel laureate. This exemplifies the risks associated with logical reasoning fallacies and the propensity for over-interpretation inherent in ChatGPT’s responses. Hence, it is critical to acknowledge that ChatGPT is not without error, and may generate incorrect predictions. Moving forward, it is essential for future research to improve and train ChatGPT with appropriate social media data, thereby enhancing its effectiveness in predicting article retractions.

The possible misuse of ChatGPT for academic writing and data fabrication has raised significant concerns about its threat to the integrity of scientific publishing (Conroy, 2023a; Naddaf, 2023; Silva et al., 2023). However, the findings of this study reveal that ChatGPT, to a certain extent, is capable of identifying problematic articles through analysis of their related tweets, thereby expediting the retraction process for such articles. Consequently, the employment of ChatGPT within the realm of scientific research presents both negative and positive ramifications, heavily dependent on how individuals utilize this tool.

For the future research agenda, incorporating reader comments from diverse platforms, like Facebook and Reddit, would expand the array of data sources and provide a more comprehensive understanding of public opinions regarding research articles. Furthermore, the integration of other large language models, such as Claude, PaLM, and LaMDA, can further enrich the analysis of reader comments. Comparing the performance of these models, in relation

to both the actual retraction status of articles and the predictions made by ChatGPT and humans, would enable a thorough assessment of each model's effectiveness in predicting article retraction. Such a comparative analysis would offer valuable insights into the relative strengths and limitations of different prediction methods, thereby contributing to advancements in the field of research integrity and article retraction prediction.

#### *4.3 Limitations of the study*

There are some limitations of this study. First, while human prediction results were used as the baseline, it is important to acknowledge that human judgment may be subject to biases and limitations. Second, this study did not differentiate between various reasons for article retraction, such as methodological mistakes, data errors, and misconduct (F. C. Fang et al., 2012). Each of these reasons may elicit distinct patterns in Twitter mentions, necessitating further investigation to delineate the effectiveness of Twitter in detecting different types of retractions. Lastly, the study solely focused on tweet texts and did not consider additional contextual factors associated with Twitter mentions, such as the engagement happened around Twitter mentions (e.g., retweets, likes, replies) and the roles that different types of users may play in disseminating retracted articles (Dambanemuya et al., 2024). Incorporating these factors into future research can provide a more fine-grained understanding of the role of Twitter in detecting problematic articles.

## **5. Conclusions**

Through manual labelling, this study found that critical Twitter mentions with evidence indicating the problems with articles demonstrated a notably high precision in predicting future article retraction (around 93%), although this kind of Twitter mentions constituted a relatively small proportion of all mentions to retracted articles. Overall, Twitter mentions show promising potential in bolstering early warning systems for problematic articles, thereby mitigating the dissemination of misinformation. With the results of manual labelling as the baseline, our findings indicated that ChatGPT, particularly GPT-4, outperformed other prediction methods, such as keyword identification and machine learning models, in making predictions more consistent with human judgment. Therefore, ChatGPT emerges as an effective tool for assisting humans in detecting potentially problematic articles based on Twitter data. This study contributes to the growing body of literature on the application of ChatGPT in scientific research, offering a novel perspective on the role of generative artificial intelligence in fostering research integrity.

## **Acknowledgements**

This study is financially supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (No. 72304274), the Scientific Research Funding of Renmin University of China (No. 23XNF037),

and the National Social Science Foundation of China (No. 22CTQ032). The authors thank Altmetric.com for providing the data for research purposes.

## References

- Amiri, M., Yaghtin, M., & Sotudeh, H. (2024). How do tweeters feel about scientific misinformation: An infoveillance sentiment analysis of tweets on retraction notices and retracted papers. *Scientometrics*, *129*(1), 261–287. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-023-04871-7>
- Bar-Ilan, J., & Halevi, G. (2017). Post retraction citations in context: A case study. *Scientometrics*, *113*(1), 547–565. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-017-2242-0>
- Bar-Ilan, J., & Halevi, G. (2018). Temporal characteristics of retracted articles. *Scientometrics*, *116*(3), 1771–1783. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-018-2802-y>
- Bik, E. M., Casadevall, A., & Fang, F. C. (2016). The prevalence of inappropriate image duplication in biomedical research publications. *mBio*, *7*(3), 10.1128/mbio.00809-16. <https://doi.org/10.1128/mbio.00809-16>
- Blackwell, M., Iacus, S., King, G., & Porro, G. (2009). Cem: Coarsened exact matching in Stata. *The Stata Journal*, *9*(4), 524–546. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1536867X0900900402>
- Bornmann, L., & Haunschild, R. (2018). Allegation of scientific misconduct increases Twitter attention. *Scientometrics*, *115*(2), 1097–1100. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-018-2698-6>
- Candal-Pedreira, C., Pérez-Ríos, M., & Ruano-Ravina, A. (2022). Retraction of scientific papers: Types of retraction, consequences, and impacts. In J. Faintuch & S. Faintuch (Eds.), *Integrity of Scientific Research: Fraud, Misconduct and Fake News in the Academic, Medical and Social Environment* (pp. 397–407). Springer International Publishing. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-99680-2\\_40](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-99680-2_40)
- Cascella, M., Montomoli, J., Bellini, V., & Bignami, E. (2023). Evaluating the feasibility of ChatGPT in healthcare: An analysis of multiple clinical and research scenarios. *Journal of Medical Systems*, *47*(1), 33. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10916-023-01925-4>
- Conroy, G. (2023a). How ChatGPT and other AI tools could disrupt scientific publishing. *Nature*, *622*(7982), 234–236. <https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-023-03144-w>
- Conroy, G. (2023b, September 28). Can AI predict who will win a Nobel Prize? *Nature*. <https://www.nature.com/articles/d41586-023-03074-7>
- COPE Council. (2019, November 2). *COPE retraction guidelines—English*. <https://doi.org/10.24318/cope.2019.1.4>
- Costas, R., Zahedi, Z., & Wouters, P. (2015). Do “altmetrics” correlate with citations? Extensive comparison of altmetric indicators with citations from a multidisciplinary perspective. *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology*, *66*(10), 2003–2019. <https://doi.org/10.1002/asi.23309>

- Dambanemuya, H. K., Abhari, R., Vincent, N., & Horvát, E.-Á. (2024). *Online engagement with retracted articles: Who, when, and how?* (arXiv:2203.04228; Version 3). arXiv. <http://arxiv.org/abs/2203.04228>
- Didegah, F., Mejlgaard, N., & Sørensen, M. P. (2018). Investigating the quality of interactions and public engagement around scientific papers on Twitter. *Journal of Informetrics*, *12*(3), 960–971. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joi.2018.08.002>
- Dwivedi, Y. K., Kshetri, N., Hughes, L., Slade, E. L., Jeyaraj, A., Kar, A. K., Baabdullah, A. M., Koochang, A., Raghavan, V., Ahuja, M., Albanna, H., Albashrawi, M. A., Al-Busaidi, A. S., Balakrishnan, J., Barlette, Y., Basu, S., Bose, I., Brooks, L., Buhalis, D., ... Wright, R. (2023). Opinion Paper: “So what if ChatGPT wrote it?” Multidisciplinary perspectives on opportunities, challenges and implications of generative conversational AI for research, practice and policy. *International Journal of Information Management*, *71*, 102642. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2023.102642>
- Epstein, Z., Hertzmann, A., & THE INVESTIGATORS OF HUMAN CREATIVITY. (2023). Art and the science of generative AI. *Science*, *380*(6650), 1110–1111. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.adh4451>
- Eysenbach, G. (2000). Report of a case of cyberplagiarism—And reflections on detecting and preventing academic misconduct using the Internet. *Journal of Medical Internet Research*, *2*(1), e793. <https://doi.org/10.2196/jmir.2.1.e4>
- Fang, F. C., Steen, R. G., & Casadevall, A. (2012). Misconduct accounts for the majority of retracted scientific publications. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, *109*(42), 17028–17033. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1212247109>
- Fang, Z., & Costas, R. (2020). Studying the accumulation velocity of altmetric data tracked by Altmetric.com. *Scientometrics*, *123*(2), 1077–1101. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-020-03405-9>
- Fütterer, T., Fischer, C., Alekseeva, A., Chen, X., Tate, T., Warschauer, M., & Gerjets, P. (2023). ChatGPT in education: Global reactions to AI innovations. *Scientific Reports*, *13*(1), 15310. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-023-42227-6>
- Gilardi, F., Alizadeh, M., & Kubli, M. (2023). ChatGPT outperforms crowd workers for text-annotation tasks. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, *120*(30), e2305016120. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2305016120>
- Gross, C. (2016). Scientific misconduct. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *67*(1), 693–711. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-psych-122414-033437>
- Guo, X., Dong, L., & Hao, D. (2024). Cellular functions of spermatogonial stem cells in relation to JAK/STAT signaling pathway. *Frontiers in Cell and Developmental Biology*, *11*, 1339390. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fcell.2023.1339390>
- Haunschild, R., & Bornmann, L. (2021). Can tweets be used to detect problems early with scientific papers? A case study of three retracted COVID-19/SARS-CoV-2 papers. *Scientometrics*, *126*(6), 5181–5199. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-021-03962-7>

- Haustein, S. (2019). Scholarly Twitter Metrics. In W. Glänzel, H. F. Moed, U. Schmoch, & M. Thelwall (Eds.), *Springer Handbook of Science and Technology Indicators* (pp. 729–760). Springer International Publishing. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-02511-3\\_28](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-02511-3_28)
- Iacus, S. M., King, G., & Porro, G. (2012). Causal inference without balance checking: Coarsened exact matching. *Political Analysis*, 20(1), 1–24.
- Khademizadeh, S., Danesh, F., Esmaeili, S., Lund, B., & Santos-d' Amorim, K. (2023). Evolution of retracted publications in the medical sciences: Citations analysis, bibliometrics, and altmetrics trends. *Accountability in Research*, 0(0), 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08989621.2023.2223996>
- Khan, H., Gupta, P., Zimba, O., & Gupta, L. (2022). Bibliometric and altmetric analysis of retracted articles on COVID-19. *Journal of Korean Medical Science*, 37(6). <https://doi.org/10.3346/jkms.2022.37.e44>
- Koppers, L., Wormer, H., & Ickstadt, K. (2017). Towards a systematic screening tool for quality assurance and semiautomatic fraud detection for images in the Life Sciences. *Science and Engineering Ethics*, 23(4), 1113–1128. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11948-016-9841-7>
- Larsson, K. S. (1995). The dissemination of false data through inadequate citation. *Journal of Internal Medicine*, 238(5), 445–450. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2796.1995.tb01222.x>
- Liang, W., Zhang, Y., Cao, H., Wang, B., Ding, D., Yang, X., Vodrahalli, K., He, S., Smith, D., Yin, Y., McFarland, D., & Zou, J. (2023). *Can large language models provide useful feedback on research papers? A large-scale empirical analysis* (arXiv:2310.01783; Version 1). arXiv. <http://arxiv.org/abs/2310.01783>
- Lopez-Lira, A., & Tang, Y. (2023). *Can ChatGPT forecast stock price movements? Return predictability and large language models* (arXiv:2304.07619). arXiv. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2304.07619>
- Mahuli, S. A., Rai, A., Mahuli, A. V., & Kumar, A. (2023). Application ChatGPT in conducting systematic reviews and meta-analyses. *British Dental Journal*, 235(2), Article 2. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41415-023-6132-y>
- Malkov, D., Yaqub, O., & Siepel, J. (2023). The spread of retracted research into policy literature. *Quantitative Science Studies*, 4(1), 68–90. [https://doi.org/10.1162/qss\\_a\\_00243](https://doi.org/10.1162/qss_a_00243)
- Mohammadi, E., Thelwall, M., Kwasny, M., & Holmes, K. L. (2018). Academic information on Twitter: A user survey. *PLOS ONE*, 13(5), e0197265. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0197265>
- Naddaf, M. (2023). ChatGPT generates fake data set to support scientific hypothesis. *Nature*, 623(7989), 895–896. <https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-023-03635-w>

- Ortega, J. L. (2018). The life cycle of altmetric impact: A longitudinal study of six metrics from PlumX. *Journal of Informetrics*, *12*(3), 579–589.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joi.2018.06.001>
- Patrinós, G. P., Sarhangi, N., Sarrami, B., Khodayari, N., Larijani, B., & Hasanzad, M. (2023). Using ChatGPT to predict the future of personalized medicine. *The Pharmacogenomics Journal*, *23*(6), 178–184. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41397-023-00316-9>
- Paul, J., Ueno, A., & Dennis, C. (2023). ChatGPT and consumers: Benefits, pitfalls and future research agenda. *International Journal of Consumer Studies*, *47*(4), 1213–1225.  
<https://doi.org/10.1111/ijcs.12928>
- Peng, H., Romero, D. M., & Horvát, E.-Á. (2022). Dynamics of cross-platform attention to retracted papers. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, *119*(25), e2119086119. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2119086119>
- Robinson-Garcia, N., Costas, R., Isett, K., Melkers, J., & Hicks, D. (2017). The unbearable emptiness of tweeting—About journal articles. *PLOS ONE*, *12*(8), e0183551.  
<https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0183551>
- Sallam, M. (2023). ChatGPT utility in healthcare education, research, and practice: Systematic review on the promising perspectives and valid concerns. *Healthcare*, *11*(6), Article 6. <https://doi.org/10.3390/healthcare11060887>
- Serghiou, S., Marton, R. M., & Ioannidis, J. P. A. (2021). Media and social media attention to retracted articles according to Altmetric. *PLOS ONE*, *16*(5), e0248625.  
<https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0248625>
- Shema, H., Hahn, O., Mazarakis, A., & Peters, I. (2019). Retractions from altmetric and bibliometric perspectives. *Information - Wissenschaft & Praxis*, *70*(2–3), 98–110.  
<https://doi.org/10.1515/iwp-2019-2006>
- Silva, T. P., Ocampo, T. S. C., Alencar-Palha, C., Oliveira-Santos, C., Takeshita, W. M., & Oliveira, M. L. (2023). ChatGPT: A tool for scientific writing or a threat to integrity? *British Journal of Radiology*, *96*(1152), 20230430.  
<https://doi.org/10.1259/bjr.20230430>
- Sotudeh, H., Barahmand, N., Yousefi, Z., & Yaghtin, M. (2022). How do academia and society react to erroneous or deceitful claims? The case of retracted articles' recognition. *Journal of Information Science*, *48*(2), 182–198.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0165551520945853>
- Sugimoto, C. R., Work, S., Larivière, V., & Haustein, S. (2017). Scholarly use of social media and altmetrics: A review of the literature. *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology*, *68*(9), 2037–2062. <https://doi.org/10.1002/asi.23833>
- Thelwall, M., Haustein, S., Larivière, V., & Sugimoto, C. R. (2013). Do altmetrics work? Twitter and ten other social web services. *PLOS ONE*, *8*(5), e64841.  
<https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0064841>

- Van Noorden, R. (2011). Science publishing: The trouble with retractions. *Nature*, 478(7367), 26–28. <https://doi.org/10.1038/478026a>
- Van Noorden, R. (2023). More than 10,000 research papers were retracted in 2023—A new record. *Nature*, 624(7992), 479–481. <https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-023-03974-8>
- Vuong, Q.-H., La, V.-P., Ho, M.-T., Vuong, T.-T., & Ho, M.-T. (2020). Characteristics of retracted articles based on retraction data from online sources through February 2019. *Science Editing*, 7(1), 34–44. <https://doi.org/10.6087/kcse.187>
- Wager, E. (2011). How journals can prevent, detect and respond to misconduct. *Notfall + Rettungsmedizin*, 14(8), 613–615. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10049-011-1543-8>
- Wang, H., Fu, T., Du, Y., Gao, W., Huang, K., Liu, Z., Chandak, P., Liu, S., Van Katwyk, P., Deac, A., Anandkumar, A., Bergen, K., Gomes, C. P., Ho, S., Kohli, P., Lasenby, J., Leskovec, J., Liu, T.-Y., Manrai, A., ... Zitnik, M. (2023). Scientific discovery in the age of artificial intelligence. *Nature*, 620(7972), 47–60. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-023-06221-2>
- Yang, S., Qi, F., Diao, H., & Ajiferuke, I. (2022). Do retraction practices work effectively? Evidence from citations of psychological retracted articles. *Journal of Information Science*, 01655515221097623. <https://doi.org/10.1177/01655515221097623>
- Yu, H., Xu, S., Xiao, T., Hemminger, B. M., & Yang, S. (2017). Global science discussed in local altmetrics: Weibo and its comparison with Twitter. *Journal of Informetrics*, 11(2), 466–482. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joi.2017.02.011>
- Zhang, L., Gou, Z., Fang, Z., Sivertsen, G., & Huang, Y. (2023). Who tweets scientific publications? A large-scale study of tweeting audiences in all areas of research. *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology*, 74(13), 1485–1497. <https://doi.org/10.1002/asi.24830>
- Ziems, C., Held, W., Shaikh, O., Chen, J., Zhang, Z., & Yang, D. (2024). Can large language models transform computational social science? *Computational Linguistics*, 1–55. [https://doi.org/10.1162/coli\\_a\\_00502](https://doi.org/10.1162/coli_a_00502)

## Appendix

The retracted and non-retracted articles were matched based on four covariates: journal, publication year, number of authors, and number of tweets, as outlined in Table A1. The L1 distance serves as an important indicator to measure the balance achieved through CEM matching. The value of L1 distance is between 0 and 1. A value closer to 0 indicates minimal dissimilarity in covariates between the treatment and control groups and hence, superior matching effectiveness, while a value closer to 1 signifies poorer matching outcomes. Table A1 demonstrates that after CEM matching, the differences in each covariate between the treatment and control groups have been significantly reduced.



**Table A1.** L1 distance between the treatment and control groups before and after CEM matching

Covariate	Original data	CEM weighted
journal_id	0.57	0
pub_year	0.11	0
n_author	0.14	0.06
n_tweets	0.18	0.03
N: Control; Treatment	436,223; 3,628	3,505; 3,505

**Table A2.** The 128 critical keywords selected to predict article retraction

Critical keywords
risk, resistance, researchretracted, depression, control, retraction, retracted, issue, mortality, design, publishing, investigation, publisher, publish, editor, wrong, plagiarism, failure, concern, issues, problem, standard, duplication, controversial, concerns, falsification, lose, ethical, limited, lying, retract, creator, gods, overload, criticism, bias, proof, nonsense, peerreview, journal, error, proper, unexpected, harmful, crap, fraud, fake, pruittdata, worst, moralizing, wtf, wth, what, wait, joke, unclear, withdrawn, lie, contradiction, claim, flawed, damn, doubt, creatorgate, manipulation, pathetic, manipulated, reputation, awareness, stupid, crackpot, why, shame, dishonesty, controversy, trouble, dumb, raise, authorship, fuck, dangerous, pseudoscience, strange, embarrass, unethical, hate, pretend, questionable, copyediting, mess, bummed, how, unscientific, handofgod, inconclusive, oversight, irresponsible, informed, garbage, lied, absurd, disrespectful, whoa, objections, retractracistsbasically, terrifying, confounder, fucking, badscience, abhorrent, complaint, contradicted, dodgy, worry, troubling, laughable, misconduct, fakedata, confusing, seriously, unsure, disappointing, withdraw, verify, confuse, mortal, debacle, shameful.