

## Counting Papers, Losing Purpose: A Crisis in Medical Research Quality

Fizza Sahar Anwar<sup>1</sup>

Copyright © 2024 The Author(s). Published by Foundation University Journal of Dentistry.

In modern academic medicine, the maxim “*publish or perish*” has shifted from a warning to an institutional culture. Publications influence hiring, promotions, grant success, and institutional reputation. Yet this relentless expectation risks distorting the very essence of scientific inquiry: rigorous, purposeful investigation that advances both clinical practice and patient care. Increasing evidence suggests that when quantity becomes the dominant metric of success, the quality, integrity, and value of medical research are compromised.<sup>1,2</sup>

The entrenched culture of publication pressure incentivizes researchers to prioritize rapid output over methodological depth. Clinical scientists, particularly early-career faculty and postgraduate trainees must balance patient care, teaching, and administrative responsibilities alongside academic productivity requirements. This often leads to small, underpowered studies, fragmented publications, and limited innovation.<sup>3</sup> Such practices dilute the scientific literature and contribute little to meaningful knowledge advancement.

Ethical challenges represent another serious consequence of the pressure to publish. Studies have consistently linked excessive publication demands with questionable research practices, including selective reporting, inappropriate authorship, plagiarism, and, in severe cases, data fabrication and falsification.<sup>4</sup> The continued rise in article retractions globally reflects systemic vulnerabilities rather than isolated misconduct, with publication pressure frequently identified as a key underlying factor.<sup>5</sup> The expansion of predatory journals further exploits this environment by offering rapid publication without robust peer review, disproportionately affecting early-career medical researchers.<sup>6</sup>

The peer-review system itself is under considerable strain. The exponential growth in manuscript submissions has increased reviewer fatigue and editorial burden, threatening the depth and consistency of manuscript evaluation.<sup>7</sup> Clinicians serving as reviewers often receive little recognition for this work, despite its central role in maintaining research quality. Consequently, the safeguards designed to protect scientific rigor are increasingly challenged.

Beyond academia, the consequences of compromised research quality are particularly concerning in medicine, where published evidence directly informs clinical guidelines, healthcare policy, and patient care. Poor-quality or unreliable studies can misguide clinical decision-making, waste limited research funding, and erode public trust in medical science.<sup>8</sup> In this context, the cost of prioritizing quantity over quality extends far beyond academic metrics.

Addressing this issue requires a system-level shift in how academic success is defined and rewarded. Institutions and regulatory bodies must adopt holistic evaluation frameworks that emphasize methodological rigor, ethical conduct, reproducibility, and real-world impact rather than publication counts alone. Journals have a critical role in strengthening peer-review standards, promoting transparency, and valuing negative or replication studies. Equally important is mentorship that fosters responsible research practices and resilience against metric-driven pressures.

In the medical profession, where research outcomes influence lives and livelihoods, safeguarding research quality is both an ethical obligation and a professional responsibility. Rebalancing academic incentives toward rigor, relevance, and integrity is essential to sustaining trustworthy medical science and ensuring that research truly serves patients and society.

<sup>1</sup>Head and Assistant Professor, Department of Dental Education & Research, Foundation University College of Dentistry, Foundation University Islamabad, Pakistan.

**Corresponding author:** Fizza Sahar Anwar, Department of Dental Education & Research, Foundation University College of Dentistry, Foundation University Islamabad, Pakistan.

**Email:** drfizza.fucd@fui.edu.pk

**DOI:** 10.33897/fujd.v6i1.524

### DISCLAIMER

None.

### CONFLICT OF INTEREST

None to declare.

**ETHICAL STATEMENT**

Not applicable.

**FUNDING DISCLOSURE**

The author received no financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

**AUTHORS' CONTRIBUTION**

Conception and design, drafting, critical review, and approval of the final version of the manuscript to be published: F. S. Anwar

**REFERENCES**

1. Moher D, Naudet F, Cristea IA, Miedema F, Ioannidis JPA, Goodman SN. Assessing scientists for hiring, promotion, and tenure. *PLoS Biol.* 2018;16(3):e2004089.
2. Ioannidis JPA. Why most clinical research is not useful. *PLoS Med.* 2016;13(6):e1002049.
3. Edwards MA, Roy S. Academic research in the 21st century: Maintaining scientific integrity in a climate of perverse incentives and hypercompetition. *Environ Eng Sci.* 2017;34(1):51-61.
4. Tjldink JK, Verbeke R, Smulders YM. Publication pressure and scientific misconduct in medical scientists. *J Empir Res Hum Res Ethics.* 2014;9(5):64-71.
5. Brainard J, You J. What a massive database of retracted papers reveals about science publishing's "death penalty". *Science.* 2018;362(6413):390-3.
6. Cobey KD, Lalu MM, Skidmore B, Ahmadzai N, Grudniewicz A, Moher D. What is a predatory journal? A scoping review. *F1000Res.* 2018;7:1001.
7. Tennant JP, Ross-Hellauer T. The limitations to our understanding of peer review. *Res Integr Peer Rev.* 2020;5:6.
8. Chalmers I, Glasziou P. Avoidable waste in the production and reporting research evidence. *Lancet.* 2009;374(9683):86-9.

**How to cite this Article:**

Anwar FS. Editorial: Counting Papers, Losing Purpose: A Crisis in Medical Research Quality. *Found Univ J Dent.* 2026;6(1):1-2