
Sneaked references: Cooked reference metadata inflate citation counts

Lonni Besançon · Guillaume Cabanac · Cyril Labbé · Alexander Magazinov

Version: October 4, 2023

Abstract We report evidence of an undocumented method to manipulate citation counts involving ‘sneaked’ references. Sneaked references are registered as metadata for scientific articles in which they do not appear. This manipulation exploits trusted relationships between various actors: publishers, the Crossref metadata registration agency, digital libraries, and bibliometric platforms. By collecting metadata from various sources, we show that extra undue references are actually sneaked in at Digital Object Identifier (DOI) registration time, resulting in artificially inflated citation counts. As a case study, focusing on three journals from a given publisher, we identified at least 9% sneaked references (5,978/65,836) mainly benefiting two authors. Despite not existing in the articles, these sneaked references exist in metadata registries and inappropriately propagate to bibliometric dashboards. Furthermore, we discovered ‘lost’ references: the studied bibliometric platform failed to index at least 56% (36,939/65,836) of the references listed in the HTML version of the publications. The extent of the sneaked and lost references in the global literature remains unknown and requires further investigations. Bibliometric platforms producing citation counts should identify, quantify, and correct these flaws to provide accurate data to their patrons and prevent further citation gaming.

L. Besançon

Media and Information Technology, Linköping University, Norrköping, Sweden

E-mail: lonni.besancon@gmail.com

ORCID: 0000-0002-7207-1276

G. Cabanac

Université Toulouse 3 – Paul Sabatier, IRIT UMR 5505 CNRS, 31062 Toulouse, France

Institut universitaire de France (IUF), France

E-mail: guillaume.cabanac@univ-tlse3.fr

ORCID: 0000-0003-3060-6241

C. Labbé

Univ. Grenoble Alpes, CNRS, Grenoble INP, LIG, 38000 Grenoble, France

E-mail: cyril.labbe@univ-grenoble-alpes.fr

ORCID: 0000-0003-4855-7038

A. Magazinov

Yandex.Kazakhstan, 43 Dostyq av., Almaty 050010, Kazakhstan

E-mail: magazinov-al@yandex.ru

ORCID: 0000-0002-9406-013X

Keywords sneaked references · undue citations · citation manipulation · metadata registration · bibliometrics · research evaluation

1 Introduction

It is now well recognised that the *Publish or Perish* atmosphere fuels questionable research practices (Crous, 2019). The introduction and widespread adoption of computed indicators (*h*-index, impact factor. . .) has been leading academics to a situation where publishing is not enough and being cited is crucial. In this world of *Be Cited or Perish*, motivations for citation manipulations are on the rise (Lawrence, 2007). Possibilities of such manipulations have been documented by whistleblowers and researchers alike (Baccini, De Nicolao, & Petrovich, 2019; Haley, 2017).

Beel and Gipp (2010) experimented hiding citations to human eyes by using ‘white on white’ text. Labbé (2010) achieved *h*-index manipulation through injection of meaningless texts containing a fixed set of references. Delgado López-Cózar, Robinson-García, and Torres-Salinas (2014) reproduced the previous experiment, demonstrating how the *h*-index and impact factors of real researchers and journals can be manipulated. It is worth noting that some editorial practices may not be too far away from this type of manipulation: a seemingly legitimate editorial could cite all articles from a journal, thereby increasing its Impact Factor (e.g., Foley & Valkonen, 2012; Heathers & Grimes, 2022). Another method is the so-called ‘citation cartel’ method (Franck, 1999). As part of the cartel, you cite specific authors that will cite you in return. This kind of manipulation also arises at the journal level (Davis, 2016; Kojaku, Livan, & Masuda, 2021). Another example is called ‘citation plantation’¹ and refers to undue over-citation of certain authors, even on unrelated topics. Last but not least, one of the most famous and common methods, is the addition of references through the peer-review process. At review time, authors may be asked by reviewers and editors to add undue references to their submission. Whistleblowers and academic sleuths often try to detect citation manipulations through skews in citation (or self-citation) data (Szomszor, Pendlebury, & Adams, 2020; Van Noorden, 2020b; Wren & Georgescu, 2022).

As the motivation for and practice of citation manipulation gain traction, the consequences of such a practice are starting to become visible in academia. From time to time, highly cited researchers are banned from editorial boards (Van Noorden, 2020a) because of their unethical practice to trade citations for manuscript acceptance. In 2021, Clarivate excluded 300 researchers from its *Highly Cited Researchers* list, and about 550 in 2022 (Oransky, 2022). This decision was taken based on evidence of citation manipulation. Another example: some malevolent individuals forge hijacked journals by imitating current or defunct journals (Abalkina, Cabanac, Labbé, & Magazinov, 2022). They publish non-reviewed papers that cite papers generating potential undue citations. Some manage to get these indexed by Elsevier’s Scopus, a bibliometric platform that computes author-level indicators for research assessment (Baas, Schotten, Plume, Côté, & Karimi, 2020).

It is worth pointing out that citation manipulation by various actors occurs at many places and at different times during the life cycle of a scientific publication. Up until now, the documented manipulations always implied modifications of the version of record (Hinchliffe, 2022) (i.e., the *real* article available in PDF/HTML in its final version) by adding references to it. In this paper, we document a new flaw that is currently exploited: *sneaking undue references* during the DOI registration by supplying extra and irrelevant metadata.

¹ <https://pubpeer.com/search?q=%22citation+plantation%22>

The scientific publication itself, namely the version of record, remains unaltered and undue citations are actually *unreachable* by readers. We provide evidence that this manipulation is in use as we discovered in at least three journals of an open access publisher. This exploit will remain available as long as the metadata pushed by publishers are not carefully verified.

2 The exploit: Increased citation counts with sneaked references

From a paper's bibliography to bibliometric dashboards, the path is long for references to be counted. Different actors using various deception techniques can sneak undue references in along this path.

2.1 Context: the DOI and metadata registration process

As [Figure 1](#) shows, after acceptance and before publication of papers, publishers register DOIs to Registration Agencies. The main one is Crossref that mints DOIs for a fee and hosts the publishers' metadata that become publicly available ([Hendricks, Tkaczyk, Lin, & Feeney, 2020](#)). Most publishers push the reference lists of their papers as part of the registered metadata ([Singh Chawla, 2022](#)).² Crossref is then used as a source by multiple platforms such as SpringerLink,³ The Lens ([Penfold, 2020](#)), or Dimensions ([Herzog, Hook, & Konkiel, 2020](#)).⁴ Bibliometric platforms source from the metadata registered at Crossref *inter alia* to report indicators at the individual/institutional/journal levels, such as citation counts, impact factors, and *h*-indices.




Fig. 1 References' long path from authors to bibliometric dashboards: after Editorial and Peer-Review assessment, metadata are registered to a DOI provider (here Crossref). Metadata are then retrieved by bibliometric platforms (The Lens, SpringerLink, Dimensions) that provide various services, such as a search engine and bibliometric dashboards for institutions.

² <https://www.crossref.org/documentation/schema-library/markup-guide-metadata-segments/references/>

³ <https://citations.springernature.com/about>

⁴ To the best of our knowledge, Google Scholar relies on various sources and crawling methods ([van Noorden, 2014](#)).

2.2 The manipulation . . . explained

Crossref hosts as-such the metadata sent by their members, namely the publishers:

“Our metadata is provided to us by our members, and we don’t curate or clean up the metadata in any way. We do insert metadata into outputs such as DOI matches for citations, recursive relationships, and clearly flag those pieces as being inserted by Crossref in our metadata outputs.
This means, good or bad, metadata accuracy depends on the quality of metadata provided by our members.”

— ‘Metadata principles and practices’ from Crossref
<https://www.crossref.org/documentation/principles-practices/>

When registering a new publication and its references at Crossref, a publisher may sneak extra undue references in the metadata sent in addition to the ones originally present. Then, digital libraries (e.g., SpringerLink) and bibliometric platforms (e.g., Dimensions) harvest these metadata, undue citations included. These sneaked references are processed and counted even if they are not present in the original publication.

This new way to manipulate citation counts relies on metadata manipulations that leave the original text untouched. This exploit is made possible because Crossref trusts publishers to extract, report, and send them metadata about the publications, including the references. As a matter of fact, Crossref not controlling the accuracy of the metadata provided by publishers creates a ‘security breach’ within the information flow. The next section shows that this manipulation is actually in use.

3 Case study: Evidence of sneaked references in three journals of a given publisher

To provide evidence of citation counts manipulation, one needs to collect samples of metadata at three different places along the reference registration path depicted in [Figure 1](#). Sneaked references are revealed when comparing the reference lists of publications as provided 1) by the publisher on its website, 2) on the metadata registry at Crossref and 3) by a bibliometric platform: Dimensions.

As proof of the ‘sneaked references’ manipulation happening, let us analyse three journals published by *Technoscience Academy*,⁵ an Indian open access publisher and Crossref member. These three journals were selected after we identified incoherent metadata that we flagged in May 2022 on PubPeer ([Figure 2](#)). This case involves a Hindawi journal article published on 22 March 2022. The Hindawi website showed a large number of citations ($n = 107$) for a publication that had been online for less than two months. On the screenshot in [Figure 2](#), the number 107 stems from Altmetric, a service offered by Dimensions that sources data from publishers and Crossref.⁶ Moreover, this number was far greater than the number of downloads ($n = 62$). These two observations combined had us suspect manipulations going on.

Further examination revealed that this Hindawi publication had no citations on Google Scholar. According to Dimensions, citations stemmed mostly from three main journals with 1,000+ DOIs registered at Crossref. After careful verification, the citing publications did not

⁵ <https://technoscienceacademy.com>

⁶ Crossref reported 107 citations for this paper, see the attribute `is-referenced-by-count` shown at <https://web.archive.org/web/202205/http://api.crossref.org/works/doi/10.1155/2022/3685419>.

Energetic and Valuable Path Compendium Routing Using Frustration Free Communication Dimension Extension Algorithm in MANET
 Wireless Communications and Mobile Computing (2022) - 3 Comments
 doi: 10.1155/2022/3685419 issn: 1530-8677 issn: 1530-8669

D. Veeraiyah, G. Joel Sunny Deol, Rajendra Kumar Ganiya, J. Nageswara Rao, Suneetha Bulla, Assefa Alene

#1 Guillaume Cabanac commented May 2022

This Hindawi 2022 article viewed 107 times (including me) and downloaded 62 times is cited 107 times.

Wireless Communications and Mobile Computing / 2022 / Article

On this page

- Abstract
- Introduction
- Related Works
- Experimental Results
- Conclusion
- Data Availability
- Conflicts of Interest
- References
- Copyright
- Related articles

Special Issue

Machine Learning Enabled Signal Processing Techniques for Large Scale 5G and 5G Networks

View this Special Issue

Research Article | Open Access
 Volume 2022 | Article ID 3685419 | <https://doi.org/10.1155/2022/3685419>

Show citation

Energetic and Valuable Path Compendium Routing Using Frustration Free Communication Dimension Extension Algorithm in MANET

D. Veeraiyah,¹ G. Joel Sunny Deol,² Rajendra Kumar Ganiya,³ J. Nageswara Rao,⁴ Suneetha Bulla,⁴ and Assefa Alene⁵

Academic Editor: Mohammad Farukh Hashmi

Received	Accepted	Published
17 Dec 2021	23 Feb 2022	22 Mar 2022

Abstract

In the mobile ad hoc network (MANET), nodes are energetic nodes; also, it does not provide valuable routing, since it has the limited size for routing information storage for

PDF

- Download Citation
- Download other formats
- Order printed copies

Views: 107
 Downloads: 62

Related articles

Novel Link Establishment Communication Scheme against Selfish Attack Using Node Reward with Trust Level Evaluation Algorithm in MANET

Fig. 2 PubPeer post <https://pubpeer.com/publications/A172115FC8D0A5F44B31A18B08BB26> reporting a Hindawi journal article with more citations than downloads. Most citations appear not to match any of the references in the allegedly citing publications. After careful examination, it appeared that these were sneaked references: existing in the metadata only and not in the PDFs of the allegedly 'citing' publications.

contain any references to the Hindawi article. This is clear evidence that some references registered at Crossref (for the citing publication) do not exist in reality. We assess the extent of the discrepancy between the bibliographies of 1) the published papers and 2) the metadata that were registered, hypothesising that these two sets of references should be identical—except for undue sneaked references.

3.1 Method to assess the extent of sneaked references

This section introduces a two-step method to measure differences between reference lists. First, we collect metadata about a publisher's catalogue from three sources: the publisher's website, Crossref, and Dimensions. Second, we compare the reference lists as they appear in these three sources. We illustrate this method with the three largest journals published by *Technoscience Academy* and report numbers as of January 2023.

3.1.1 Collecting metadata from Crossref

Crossref releases the list of DOIs they mint by journal and by publisher in the Crossref Depositor.⁷ For example, here are the DOIs of the journals registered for *Technoscience Academy*:

- 1,063 DOIs minted for *IJSRSET*: the *International Journal of Scientific Research in Science, Engineering and Technology* at <https://data.crossref.org/depositorreport?pubid=J325422>.
- 1,347 DOIs minted for *IJSRCSEIT*: the *International Journal of Scientific Research in Computer Science, Engineering and Information Technology* at <https://data.crossref.org/depositorreport?pubid=J326368>.
- 1,276 DOIs minted for *IJSRST*: the *International Journal of Scientific Research in Science and Technology* at <https://data.crossref.org/depositorreport?pubid=J325454>.

We retrieved the reference list of each publication by querying the Crossref API. For instance, <https://api.crossref.org/works/10.32628/IJSRST229212> provides the metadata of publication doi:10.32628/IJSRST229212, including an attribute called `reference-count`. For this particular example, Crossref provided a list of 47 references (Figure 3).

The figure consists of two side-by-side screenshots. The left screenshot shows a JSON metadata object for a publication. The 'reference-count' field is highlighted in blue and has the value 47. Other fields include 'publisher', 'content-domain', 'short-content-title', 'journal-title', 'abstract', 'DOI', 'type', 'created', 'page', 'source', 'is-referenced-by-count', 'title', 'prefix', 'url', 'member', and 'published-online'. The 'reference' field contains a list of 47 references, with the first few shown as examples. The right screenshot shows the Dimensions website page for the same publication. It displays the title 'An Applied Mean Substitutions Technique for Detection of Anomalous Value in Data Mining', the author 'Dardharaben Dapikumar Parule', and a list of 13 references. The references listed on Dimensions are a subset of the references provided by Crossref.

Fig. 3 Reference list for publication doi:10.32628/IJSRST229212 as registered at Crossref (left: <https://api.crossref.org/works/10.32628/IJSRST229212>) and as retrieved from Dimensions (right: <https://app.dimensions.ai/details/publication/pub.1146638907>). Crossref provides the attribute `reference-count` (highlighted in blue) and a reference list of 47 references (numbers 0 to 9 shown). References 6 to 46 are sneaked references. Dimensions lists 13 references, none of them appear in the original paper (Figure 4).

⁷ <https://www.crossref.org/06members/51depositor.html>

3.1.2 Metadata collection from the Publisher's web site

We retrieved the reference list of each publication identified in the previous section. Without any available API to retrieve metadata from the publisher, this step is specific to each journal. The journal articles *Technoscience Academy* publishes are in open access: available in both PDF and HTML. We assumed that the reference lists provided in HTML conformed to the ones present in the PDF files—and verified this by visual inspection of a dozen cases. HTML pages feature a tab with the list of references that we collected via *ad hoc* scripts.

The paper of our running example (doi:10.32628/IJSRST229212) has seven references shown in the PDF and on the HTML page (Figure 4). The references listed in HTML are also found in Crossref. But an additional set of 40 well-formed references turn out to be undue references to unrelated publications. This set comprises sneaked references that might have been added at registration time.

<p style="font-size: small;">Dr. Darshanaben Dipakkumar Pandya et al Int J Sci Res Sci & Technol, March-April-2022, 9(2) : 103-108</p> <p>entry and run further the Inliers detection Approach algorithm and Mean Substitution technique approach to do the analysis of the data and calculate the sum of points to the value in each case.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">VII. Conclusion</p> <p>The conclusion lies in the fact that Inliers are usually the unwanted entries which always affects the data in one or the other form and misrepresents the distribution of the data. Sometimes it becomes necessary to keep even the Inliers entries because they play an important role in the data but in our case achieving our main objective is to discovering Inliers entries and i.e. to delete the Inliers entries from database. Proposed approach provides proper consolidated report using data relative attributes of the database.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">VIII. REFERENCES</p> <p style="font-size: x-small;">Table 4: Mean Substitution technique approach of the dataset with and without Inliers.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> [1]. Lee, J., & Wonpil, Y. (2014). Concurrent Tracking of Inliers and Outliers. [2]. Winkler, W. (1998). Problems with inliers. Retrieved October 5, 2015. [3]. Muralidharan K and Arti M. investigation of instantaneous and early failures in Pareto distribution, <i>Journal of statistical theory and Applications</i>, Vol. 7, 2008, pp. 187-204. [4]. Muralidharan, K and B. K. Kale Inlier detection using Schwartz information criterion. <i>J. Reliability and Stat. Studies</i>, Vol. 1(1), 2008, pp.1-5. [5]. K. Muralidharan, Arti, Khabia, Inliers process in normal distribution, (Vol.8) 2013, March. [6]. K. Muralidharan, Arti, Khabia, Inliers modeling and applications, University of Bedfordshire, 2011. [7]. Winkler, W. E. (1997). Problems with inliers. Paper presented at the European Conference of Statisticians, Prague. last accessed 28 May 2014.
---	--

An Applied Mean Substitutions Technique for Detection of Anomalous Value in Data Mining

Author(s): Dr. Darshanaben Dipakkumar Pandya, Dr. Abhijeetsinh Jadhav, Dr. Sheshang D. Degadwala

Abstract
Authors
Keywords
References
Details

1. Lee, J., & Wonpil, Y. (2014). Concurrent Tracking of Inliers and Outliers.
2. Winkler, W. (1998). Problems with inliers. Retrieved October 5, 2015.
3. Muralidharan K and Arti M. investigation of instantaneous and early failures in Pareto distribution, *Journal of statistical theory and Applications*, Vol. 7, 2008, pp. 187-204.
4. Muralidharan, K and B. K. Kale Inlier detection using Schwartz information criterion. *J. Reliability and Stat. Studies*, Vol. 1(1), 2008, pp.1-5.
5. K. Muralidharan, Arti, Khabia, Inliers process in normal distribution, (Vol.8) 2013, March.
6. K. Muralidharan, theory of inliers modeling and applications, University of Bedfordshire, 2011.
7. Winkler, W. E. (1997). Problems with inliers. Paper presented at the European Conference of Statisticians, Prague. last accessed 28 May 2014.

Fig. 4 Reference list in PDF (left) and in HTML (right) versions of doi:10.32628/IJSRST229212. In this case, the PDF and HTML versions match each other, which is expected.

3.1.3 Metadata collection from Dimensions

Dimensions provides registered accounts for free, allowing users to query their database and export results up to 5k publication records. We used the 'Publisher' filter of Dimensions to collect the metadata of all papers published by *Technoscience Academy* and exported results using the 'Export for bibliometric mapping' feature. The export came as a CSV file of 3,634 publication records. One of the columns contains the reference list for each paper, as recorded by Dimensions.

According to this file, the article of the running example (doi:10.32628/IJSRST229212) has 13 references. . . to be compared to seven in HTML and 47 registered at Crossref. Visual inspection of the references found at Dimensions (Figure 3) reveals that none of these 13 references are from the original set of seven references (PDF and HTML, Figure 4).

Along the registration process, the seven original references were replaced by 13 undue sneaked references. The original version of the publication lists seven references; it was registered at Crossref with 40 undue sneaked references. Finally, Dimensions reports 13 references for this paper, all sneaked. The seven original references appearing in HTML/PDF got lost along the path.

3.1.4 Detecting sneaked and lost references

Tracing the propagation of individual references from one platform to another proves quite challenging due to the variability of reference formatting (e.g., APA, MLA, Chicago...). We decided to examine and compare the number of references to estimate inconsistencies between the size of the reference list in HTML/PDF versions and the registered metadata.

For each publication p , let R_C^p (resp. R_D^p) be the number of references registered at Crossref (respectively Dimensions) and S^p the number of references shown in the PDF or HTML versions. Then $\delta_x^p = R_x^p - S^p$ given $x \in \{C, D\}$ estimates inconsistencies. The value δ_D^p (respectively δ_C^p) reflects inconsistencies between registered references at Crossref (respectively Dimensions) and those present in HTML/PDF for publication p . Let us interpret δ_x^p :

- A zero value for δ_x^p indicates that, for publication p , the number of references registered in x equals the number of references listed in its PDF/HTML version. However, $\delta_x^p = 0$ does not guarantee that the registered references are the same as the references in the PDF/HTML.
- $\delta_x^p < 0$ reveals *lost* references: some are present in the publication p but are not registered. In that case δ_x^p is a lower bound of *lost* references.
- $\delta_x^p > 0$ is the lower bound of the number of *sneaked* references for publication p .

Let us illustrate the ‘lower bound’ nuance on the running example: $p = \text{IJSRST229212}$. The number of sneaked references is underestimated when computing $\delta_D^p = R_D^p - S^p = 13 - 7 = 6$ in comparison with the exact number of sneaked references which is equal to 13 (see [Figure 3](#) and [Figure 4](#)). In that example, since $\delta_p^i > 0$ we cannot conclude that references are lost. However, comparing the content of the reference list allows us to see that all seven references of the HTML/PDF version are lost (see [Figure 3](#) and [Figure 4](#)). We can therefore see that δ_p^i also underestimates the number of lost references.

For a particular set \mathcal{A} of journal articles, three publication subsets can be distinguished:

- The subset *OK* noted with a checkmark ✓, contains publications for which $\delta_x^p = 0$.
- The subset *Sneaked* noted with a ghost 👻, contains publications for which $\delta_x^p > 0$, where we have evidence that references have been sneaked.
- The subset *Missing* noted with a skull ☠, contains publications for which $\delta_x^p < 0$, where we have evidence that references are lost.

For a set \mathcal{A} , we can compute Δ_x^{\checkmark} (respectively $\Delta_x^{\text{☠}}$) the overall lower bound of sneaked (respectively lost) references with the sum over $p \in \mathcal{A}$ of positive (respectively negative) δ^i :

$$\Delta_x^{\checkmark} = \sum_{p \in \checkmark} \delta_x^p$$

$$\Delta_x^{\text{☠}} = \sum_{p \in \text{☠}} \delta_x^p$$

It is also possible to see if references found in publications of the *Sneaked* set benefit a few people or a few journals in particular. We detail the results of our analysis below.

3.2 Results

3.2.1 Quantitative analysis

The lower bound of sneaked ($\Delta_x^{\hat{A}}$) and lost references (Δ_x^{\otimes}) for the set of journal articles from three journals presented previously are given in [Table 1](#) and [Table 2](#). Data were collected from three different sources (publisher’s website, Crossref, and Dimensions). Differences observed between HTML/PDF and Crossref (Δ_C^x) are shown in [Table 1](#), whereas [Table 2](#) shows the differences between HTML/PDF and Dimensions (Δ_D^x).

Table 1 Statistics on the *Technoscience Academy* corpus showing the discrepancies between the references found in the versions of record (HTML/PDF) and the ones registered at Crossref.

Status		Number of articles	Number of references		
			in HTML	in Crossref	in Crossref – in HTML
OK	✓	3,203	55,252	55,252	0
Sneaked	⚠	230	4,426	10,404	$\Delta_C^{\hat{A}} = 5,978$
Missing	☠	73	957	180	$\Delta_C^{\otimes} = -777$
Total	ℳ	3,506	60,635	65,836	—

In [Table 1](#) an article is counted in the *Sneaked* set if the reference list in HTML/PDF is shorter than the one found at Crossref ($\delta_C^i > 0$). Among the 3,506 articles published by these three journals, at least 230 articles contain more references than they should. $\Delta_C^{\hat{A}} = 5,978$ is the lower estimation of the total number of references that were unduly sneaked at registration time. This represents an augmentation of 9.8% of the original set of references (60,635). Out of 65,836 references that were registered, $9.1\% = 5,978/65,836$ are therefore *Sneaked*. In addition, for 73 articles some references were missing (status *Missing*), and in total, at least 777 references are missing in Crossref. This represents a decrease of $1.2\% = 777/60,635$.

Table 2 Statistics on the *Technoscience Academy* corpus showing the discrepancies between the references found in versions of record (HTML/PDF) and the ones registered in Dimensions.

Status		Number of articles	Number of references		
			in HTML	in Dimensions	in Dimensions – in HTML
OK	✓	202	2,414	2,414	0
Sneaked	⚠	120	1,656	2,672	$\Delta_D^{\hat{A}} = 1,016$
Missing	☠	3,184	56,565	31,853	$\Delta_D^{\otimes} = -24,712$
Total	ℳ	3,506	60,635	36,939	—

[Table 2](#) compares the sizes of the reference lists in HTML/PDF and in Dimensions. For the vast majority of publications some references are missing. This is the case for 3,184 articles (status *Missing*) out of the total of 3,506. For these publications, some references can be seen in HTML/PDF but are not registered in Dimensions. In total, at least $40.7\% = 24,712/60,635$ of the original references are missing in Dimensions. For 120 publications, more references can be found in Dimensions than in the HTML version (status *Sneaked*). In total,

at least $2.7\% = 1,016/36,939$ of references registered for these journals are undue sneaked references.

3.2.2 Qualitative analysis

To understand the discrepancies highlighted above, we decided to closely inspect some examples of problematic cases. In particular, we decided first to inspect the cases displaying significantly large discrepancies. For instance:

- [doi:10.32628/ijrsrset21852](https://doi.org/10.32628/ijrsrset21852) has 150 references in its HTML version but 300 are registered in Crossref. We noticed that the [reference list is duplicated](#). Only 114 references can be found in Dimensions. Among the $186 = 300 - 114$ missing references, an example is a reference claimed to be a technical report from the Liverpool John Moores University, UK by Younis & Kifayat which, after verification, is not indexed by Dimensions (but is indexed in Google Scholar).
- [doi:10.32628/ijrst229394](https://doi.org/10.32628/ijrst229394) lists 27 references in HTML/PDF but $108 = 4 \times 27$ were registered in Crossref. We noticed that the same set of 27 references were [registered four times](#). Nevertheless, only 19 references can be found in Dimensions such that eight references are missing.

From these examples, we can conclude that lost references (status *Missing*) may often result from a failure to attach a given reference to a *citable item* because of incomplete or erroneous registered metadata in Crossref. Noteworthy, some types of references are, by definition, not indexed in Dimensions (private correspondences, songs. . .). We can also conclude that some of the *sneaked* references may be due to careless management of metadata resulting in such erroneous registrations. These duplications however do not seem to propagate to Dimensions: at most one occurrence of the duplicated references was listed.

However, not all *sneaked* references can be explained by careless metadata registration as can be seen in the following example. The article [doi:10.32628/ijrst229154](https://doi.org/10.32628/ijrst229154) has an HTML/PDF version that lists 23 references. However, 63 can be found in Crossref and 33 in Dimensions. An analysis of the 10 *sneaked* references in Dimensions reveals that they benefit mainly to two authors (Rao & Kataria). It therefore seems that additional references may be *sneaked* to benefit specific scholars. To verify this hypothesis, we computed the most frequent words in Crossref's metadata for papers identified as containing *sneaked* references. This analysis reveals that undue *sneaked* references mostly benefited to two scholars and to a few journals published by *Technoscience Academy*:

- 'J. Nageswara Rao' benefited from 3,103 extra citations.
- 'Bhavesh Kataria' benefited from 1,564 extra citations.
- The *International Journal of Scientific Research in Science, Engineering and Technology (IJSRSET)* gained 826 extra citations.
- The *International Journal of Advanced Science and Technology (IJAST)* was unduly cited 537 times.
- The *Turkish Journal of Physiotherapy and Rehabilitation* appeared 428 times in sneaked references.

It is worth noting that [Abalkina et al. \(2022\)](#) identified as 'hijacked' these last two journals in the list above.

4 Discussions: Outcomes and possible countermeasures

Crossref, the largest DOI registration agency, provides metadata to many downstream consumers, such as Dimensions, The Lens, or SpringerLink. The numbers provided by these downstream services guide funding decisions and state policies. Our results shed light on flawed metadata affecting reference registration and, in turn, citation counts. We have identified a new source of quality problems: undue references *sneaked* at metadata registration time. To the best of our knowledge, the vulnerability we discovered is the first documented exploit of metadata that does not modify the underlying PDF/HTML article. Our analysis highlights that the problems may arise from various origins ranging from publishers' careless management of metadata to potential citation counts manipulations. We indeed observed artificially inflated citation counts that seem to mostly benefit specific scholars or scientific journals. The metadata registration process is vulnerable: it was and is likely to be abused by various actors (authors, journals, publishers) to unduly inflate their citation counts. Additionally, this vulnerability, if exploited, may hinder other scholars who will not obtain their deserved citations.

To prevent exploits of this vulnerability affecting the computation of citation counts, many actions and countermeasures exist. The most trivial ones imply the three key actors (see [Figure 1](#)) checking each others' metadata:

- Publishers and Crossref should check and compare the coherence of references registered and the ones actually present in publications (PDF/HTML).
- Bibliometric platforms and Crossref should check on each other to make sure that citation counts are coherent with registered metadata.
- Bibliometric platforms and publishers should check on each other, to ensure that citations credited to articles are indeed supported by the associated references in the citing publications.

A more extensive countermeasure would involve third parties independently auditing the whole process: from checking the metadata uploaded into metadata registration agencies to checking the validity of citation counts. The Initiative for Open Citations (I4OC) currently estimates that 99% of the all citations in the literature are pushed to Crossref ([Schiermeier, 2017](#); [Shotton, 2013](#); [Singh Chawla, 2022](#)). Open and free access to APIs at various steps of the process is required to enable third parties to check the global quality of the provided data.

A curative action is also needed. The [COPE \(2019\)](#) guidelines on citation manipulation should account for the exploits that we have introduced in this article. We believe it is important to issue guidelines to specify the appropriate reporting and editorial actions regarding such cases of exploits and manipulations. On top of correcting science and the scholarly literature in due time ([Besançon, Bik, Heathers, & Meyerowitz-Katz, 2022](#)), extra attention must be given to correct erroneous reference metadata.

5 Conclusion

This article showed evidence of an undocumented vulnerability affecting the process of metadata registration for academic works. Despite being absent from the Version of Record (in HTML/PDF), sneaked references exist in the metadata, which in turn inflates citation counts unduly. The method we proposed estimates lower bounds for the number of references that were lost and sneaked in. Through a case study, we show that this vulnerability

is actually exploited. One still needs to apply this method on the entire literature to estimate the extent of the ‘sneaked/lost references’ issue at the global scale.

Our work questions the quality and veracity of the reference metadata harvested at Crossref and used by bibliometric platforms, such as Dimensions. These metadata support commercial bibliometric services and inform influential rankings of institutions and individuals. All actors involved should be held accountable for the quality of the data they provide and trade. We believe they must prevent metadata abuse, keeping in mind the inerrant drawbacks of the extensive use of citation metrics, fuelling elaborate cheating schemes.

Supporting information

We release supplementary materials for reproducibility purposes and future scientific literature screening. The code developed to collect and analyze the data reported in this article is archived at Zenodo (<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.8388930>).

Acknowledgements We thank Dr Nick H. Wise, for discussions, and feedback on the first version of this manuscript. CL and GC acknowledge the NanoBubbles project that has received Synergy grant funding from the European Research Council (ERC), within the European Union’s Horizon 2020 program, grant agreement no. 951393.

References

- Abalkina, A., Cabanac, G., Labbé, C., & Magazinov, A. (2022, September 9). Improper legitimization of hijacked journals through citations. *arXiv*. (Oral Presentation at PRC’22, the 9th International Congress on Peer Review and Scientific Publication) doi: [10.48550/arXiv.2209.04703](https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2209.04703)
- Baas, J., Schotten, M., Plume, A., Côté, G., & Karimi, R. (2020). Scopus as a curated, high-quality bibliometric data source for academic research in quantitative science studies. *Quantitative Science Studies*, 1(1), 377–386. doi: [10.1162/qss_a_00019](https://doi.org/10.1162/qss_a_00019)
- Baccini, A., De Nicolao, G., & Petrovich, E. (2019). Citation gaming induced by bibliometric evaluation: A country-level comparative analysis. *PLoS One*, 14(9), e0221212. doi: [10.1371/journal.pone.0221212](https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0221212)
- Beel, J., & Gipp, B. (2010). On the robustness of Google Scholar against spam. In *HT’10: Proceedings of the 21st ACM conference on Hypertext and hypermedia* (pp. 297–298). ACM. doi: [10.1145/1810617.1810683](https://doi.org/10.1145/1810617.1810683)
- Besançon, L., Bik, E., Heathers, J., & Meyerowitz-Katz, G. (2022). Correction of scientific literature: too little, too late! *PLoS Biology*, 20(3), e3001572. doi: [10.1371/journal.pbio.3001572](https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pbio.3001572)
- COPE. (2019, July). *Citation manipulation*. doi: [10.24318/cope.2019.3.1](https://doi.org/10.24318/cope.2019.3.1)
- Crous, C. J. (2019). The darker side of quantitative academic performance metrics. *South African Journal of Science*, 115(7/8), 1–3. doi: [10.17159/sajs.2019/5785](https://doi.org/10.17159/sajs.2019/5785)
- Davis, P. (2016, September 26). *Visualizing citation cartels*. Retrieved from <https://wp.me/peaj1R-cdk> (Scholarly Kitchen)
- Delgado López-Cózar, E., Robinson-García, N., & Torres-Salinas, D. (2014). The Google Scholar experiment: How to index false papers and manipulate bibliometric indicators. *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology*, 65(3), 446–454. doi: [10.1002/asi.23056](https://doi.org/10.1002/asi.23056)

- Foley, J. A., & Valkonen, L. (2012). Are higher cited papers accepted faster for publication? [Editorial]. *Cortex*, 48(6), 647–653. doi: [10.1016/j.cortex.2012.03.018](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cortex.2012.03.018)
- Franck, G. (1999). Scientific communication—A vanity fair? [Essays on science and society]. *Science*, 286(5437), 53–55. doi: [10.1126/science.286.5437.53](https://doi.org/10.1126/science.286.5437.53)
- Haley, M. R. (2017). On the inauspicious incentives of the scholar-level h-index: an economist's take on collusive and coercive citation. *Applied Economics Letters*, 24(2), 85–89. doi: [10.1080/13504851.2016.1164812](https://doi.org/10.1080/13504851.2016.1164812)
- Heathers, J. A., & Grimes, D. R. (2022). *Impact Factor manipulation—the mechanics behind a precipitous rise in Impact Factor: A case study from the British Journal of Sports Medicine*. (OSF preprint) doi: [10.17605/osf.io/4c6xa](https://doi.org/10.17605/osf.io/4c6xa)
- Hendricks, G., Tkaczyk, D., Lin, J., & Feeney, P. (2020). Crossref: The sustainable source of community-owned scholarly metadata. *Quantitative Science Studies*, 1(1), 414–427. doi: [10.1162/qss_a_00022](https://doi.org/10.1162/qss_a_00022)
- Herzog, C., Hook, D., & Konkiel, S. (2020). Dimensions: Bringing down barriers between scientometricians and data. *Quantitative Science Studies*, 1(1), 387–395. doi: [10.1162/qss_a_00020](https://doi.org/10.1162/qss_a_00020)
- Hinchliffe, L. J. (2022). The version of record as a central organizing concept in scholarly publishing. *Information Services & Use*, 42(3–4), 309–314. doi: [10.3233/isu-220164](https://doi.org/10.3233/isu-220164)
- Kojaku, S., Livan, G., & Masuda, N. (2021). Detecting anomalous citation groups in journal networks. *Scientific Reports*, 11(1). doi: [10.1038/s41598-021-93572-3](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-021-93572-3)
- Labbé, C. (2010). Ike Antkare, one of the great stars in the scientific firmament. *ISSI Newsletter*, 6(2), 48–52.
- Lawrence, P. A. (2007). The mismeasurement of science. *Current biology*, 17(15), R583–R585. doi: [10.1016/j.cub.2007.06.014](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cub.2007.06.014)
- Oransky, I. (2022, November 15). *Why misconduct could keep scientists from earning Highly Cited Researcher designations, and how our database plays a part*. Retrieved from <https://retractionwatch.com/?p=126033> (Retraction Watch)
- Penfold, R. (2020). Using the Lens database for staff publications. *Journal of the Medical Library Association*, 108(2), 341–344. doi: [10.5195/jmla.2020.918](https://doi.org/10.5195/jmla.2020.918)
- Schiermeier, Q. (2017). Initiative aims to break science's citation paywall [News]. *Nature*. doi: [10.1038/nature.2017.21800](https://doi.org/10.1038/nature.2017.21800)
- Shotton, D. (2013). Publishing: Open citations [Comment]. *Nature*, 502(7471), 295–297. doi: [10.1038/502295a](https://doi.org/10.1038/502295a)
- Singh Chawla, D. (2022). Five-year campaign breaks science's citation paywall [News]. *Nature*. doi: [10.1038/d41586-022-02926-y](https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-022-02926-y)
- Szomszor, M., Pendlebury, D. A., & Adams, J. (2020). How much is too much? The difference between research influence and self-citation excess. *Scientometrics*, 123(2), 1119–1147. doi: [10.1007/s11192-020-03417-5](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-020-03417-5)
- van Noorden, R. (2014). Google Scholar pioneer on search engine's future. *Nature*. doi: [10.1038/nature.2014.16269](https://doi.org/10.1038/nature.2014.16269)
- Van Noorden, R. (2020a). Highly cited researcher banned from journal board for citation abuse. *Nature*, 578(7794), 200–202. doi: [10.1038/d41586-020-00335-7](https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-020-00335-7)
- Van Noorden, R. (2020b). Signs of 'citation hacking' flagged in scientific papers. *Nature*, 584(7822), 508–508. doi: [10.1038/d41586-020-02378-2](https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-020-02378-2)
- Wren, J. D., & Georgescu, C. (2022). Detecting anomalous referencing patterns in PubMed papers suggestive of author-centric reference list manipulation. *Scientometrics*, 127(10), 5753–5771. doi: [10.1007/s11192-022-04503-6](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-022-04503-6)