BRAINIACS
BRAIN IMAGING AND COMPUTING SCIENCES
2025 Volume 6
Issue 2 Edoc U5E197453

When Other Authors Plagiarize Your Work, Will the Journal Stand with You?*

Adam Craig and Carl Taswell†

Commentary

Most honest researchers devoted to scientific truth and research integrity in support of trustworthy published literature assume that publishers will retract publications with plagiarism when reported to them. This belief rests on the shared understanding of the scientific community as a reputation economy in which cheating with plagiarism and/or assisting plagiarists by publishing their intellectual property theft leads to a loss of credibility. Some may believe that it is only less reputable journals which delay, disregard, or deny complaints even in the presence of clear evidence proving the plagiarism. Others may believe that the publishers of more reputable journals, especially where the original work was published, will influence the plagiarists' publisher to adhere to publishing ethics that require retraction of the plagiarizing work. Such a code of conduct would seem sensible, as the siphoning of citations away from the victim's publication to the perpetrator's publication, also harms the impact factor of the journal in which the original work appeared. However, in practice, well-connected plagiarists can publish their thievery even in presumably reputable journals, as colleagues at Brain Health Alliance (BHA) working on the PORTAL-DOORS Project (PDP) have observed over the past decade while seeking to correct and retract the plagiarism of their work published in the scientific literature.

In 2007, *IEEE Transactions on Information Technology in Biomedicine* published C. Taswell (2007), which described the growing need for better data and metadata management in science, a set of design principles to guide such management, and a data interoperability, exchange and messaging protocol that supported those principles. In 2010, MDPI's *Future Internet* published C. Taswell (2010), which reported further refinements of the design of the software infrastructure, including the hierarchically distributed mobile metadata (HDMM) architectural style, which balanced the need for data integrity and the value of distributing data across multiple servers in a networked cyberinfrastructure system. Since then, BHA has continued to develop and improve the free and open source Nexus-PORTAL-DOORS-Scribe (NPDS) cyberinfrastructure (Craig, Bae, et al. 2016; Choksi and C. Taswell 2020; Athreya et al. 2023) available at PDP-DREAM Software.

Unfairly in 2016, *Nature Scientific Data* published "The FAIR Guiding Principles for Scientific Data Management and Stewardship" by Wilkinson *et al.* which presented a paraphrased version of the same collection of PDP, HDMM, and NPDS principles without citation of any of the original literature published by Taswell, without discussion of a plan to support these principles with software, and without disclosure of the conflicts of interest involved in the matter. Springer-Nature published this plagiarism by Wilkinson *et al.* in violation of publishing ethics and its own advertised policies that prohibit plagiarism, that require disclosure of conflicts of interest, and that require *due diligence* for discussion and citation of original sources from previously published literature. In Craig, Ambati, et al. (2019), a team of scholars analyzed and detailed the concept mappings with the equivalent paraphrases for all of the so-called FAIR principles that were plagiarized by Wilkinson *et al.* from the original PDP, HDMM, and NPDS principles by Taswell (see itemized listings in Tables III to VI) and concluded that Wilkinson *et al.* failed to innovate in any way or introduce any new concept other than rebranding Taswell's collection of principles as their so-called FAIR Principles.

Moreover, as part of this plagiarism analysis report, Craig, Ambati, et al. (2019) extended the original collection of PDP, HDMM, and NPDS principles with the addition of the *equivalent entities* principle as a novel principle necessary for data and metadata management to prevent plagiarism. Craig, Ambati, et al. (2019) called the new consolidated collection of principles the DREAM principles for the phrase *Discoverable Data with Reproducible Results for Equivalent Entities with Accessible Attributes and Manageable Metadata*. The omission of an equivalent entities principle by Wilkinson *et al.* in their FAIR Principles remains a fundamental flaw in their collection of principles that enabled them to plagiarize with *willful disregard* of the historical record of published literature, and thus, to contradict the FAIRness and fairness that they continue to claim to promote. Craig, Athreya, et al. (2023) later applied the FAIR Metrics, with the recursive acronym FAIR now representing the phrases *Fair Attribution to Indexed Reports* and *Fair Acknowledgment of Information Records*, to evaluation of the plagiarism by Wilkinson *et al.* in order to quantitatively count and compare the numbers of plagiarized claims, novel claims, claims properly attributed to previously published work, and claims misattributed incorrectly to prior work.

Carl Taswell, author of C. Taswell (2007) and C. Taswell (2010), contacted the authors of the Wilkinson *et al.* FAIR Principles asking them to publish a correction for their omission of citation. When they failed to respond appropriately (see discussion of *mis-information, dis-information, anti-information and caco-information* by S. K. Taswell et al. (2021)), Taswell sought redress from their home institutions and the publishers of both the plagiarizing work and the original works. But none of these institutions or publishers have addressed the matter (C. Taswell 2024; C. Taswell 2025a; C. Taswell 2025b) with any expression of concern for citational justice (C. Taswell 2022) or any expression of concern about

*Document created 2025-11-08, updated 2025-11-29, published 2025-11-30.
†Correspondence to ctaswell@bhavi.us.

the controversy (C. Taswell 2023) such that all of these non-responses to date can be grouped into one of four categories descriptively named the *silent treatment, pass-the-buck treatment, sham investigation, or kangaroo court investigation* (C. Taswell 2024). As a consequence, this case of plagiarism has been silenced, censored, and otherwise ghosted at major publishers and professional organizations as if the original body of work with many dozens of published reports never existed even though they have always been available freely open access online since 2007 at the PORTAL-DOORS Project.

Falsifying the historical record of published literature does not serve science, scientists, nor the public. These concerns do not represent merely a question of interactional ethics in a moral society, but result in practical real-world consequences with harm to the victims of plagiarism and to all scientists and the public because it pollutes the historical record of published literature that can no longer be considered trustworthy. Many of the Wilkinson *et al.* plagiarists and those collaborating with them by propagating the plagiarism have received significant amounts of research funding for the express purpose of promoting the principles that they plagiarized (C. Taswell 2025b). The Frontiers FAIR^2 initiative further illustrates the fanaticism with which publishers have adopted the plagiarists' choice of branding while seeking to charge CHF 5500 for each FAIR data article. Publishers cannot have it both ways at the same time. It is not possible to claim fairness or FAIRness with any interpretation of FAIR for data, metadata or any kind of research while also abandoning respect for publishing ethics, refusing to support open public scientific debate, and failing to provide authentic fairness to the victim of the plagiarism and the history of published literature about metadata and data management that preceded the Wilkinson *et al.* FAIR Principles. This tolerance for and acceptance of plagiarism by major publishers (whether Springer-Nature, MDPI, or Frontiers) demonstrates the rewards that plagiarists can reap in a broken system that has abandoned the past requirement for *due diligence*, that has failed to maintain the past prohibition against plagiarism, and instead, that now prioritizes cartel-insider affiliation, grant-funding power, and/or corporate profits over scientific truth and research integrity.

Institutions that seek to sponsor innovation rather than imitation must require authors to search the publication history of a scientific field with proper *due diligence*, instead of wrongly engaging in a ghosting review (Craig and C. Taswell 2025) or incorrectly arguing a dismissive review (Phelps 2010) claiming that a study or proposal is the first of its kind when it is not. Meanwhile, honest authors must take a hard look at a publisher's history of standing with either the plagiarists or the original creators of novel works. When you as an author choose a journal to publish your novel research for which you want the recognition and credit that it deserves, will the publishers and editors of that journal stand with you if your research is victimized by plagiarism and ghosting?

Citation

Brainiacs 2025 Volume 6 Issue 2 Edoc U5E197453
Title: "When Other Authors Plagiarize Your Work, Will the Journal Stand with You?"
Authors: Adam Craig and Carl Taswell
Dates: created 2025-11-08, updated 2025-11-29, published 2025-11-30

Contact: ctaswell@bhavi.us
NPDS: LINKS/Brainiacs/Craig2025WOAPYW
DOI: 10.48085/U5E197453

Affiliations

Brain Health Alliance Virtual Institute, Ladera Ranch, California, USA.

References

[1] A. Athreya, A. Craig, S. K. Taswell, and C. Taswell. "Opening democratised portals and doors to the free flow of findable facts." *Research Features Magazine* (148 July 26, 2023), pp. 54–57. ISSN: 2399-1548. URL: https://researchfeatures.com/opening-democratised-portals-doors-free-flow-findable-facts/ (cited p. 1).

[2] S. Choksi and C. Taswell. "The Nexus-PORTAL-DOORS-Scribe (NPDS) Learning Intelligence aNd Knowledge System (LINKS)." *Brainiacs Journal of Brain Imaging And Computing Sciences* 1.1, B61CA3D89 (1 Dec. 30, 2020), pp. 1–9. DOI: 10.48085/B61CA3D89 (cited p. 1).

[3] A. Craig, A. Ambati, S. Dutta, P. Kowshik, S. Nori, S. K. Taswell, Q. Wu, and C. Taswell. "DREAM Principles and FAIR Metrics from the PORTAL-DOORS Project for the Semantic Web." In: *2019 IEEE 11th International Conference on Electronics, Computers and Artificial Intelligence (ECAI)* (June 28, 2019). Pitesti, Romania: IEEE, June 2019, pp. 1–8. DOI: 10.1109/ECAI46879.2019.9042003. URL: https://portaldoors.org/pub/docs/ECAI2019DREAMFAIR0612.pdf (cited p. 1).

[4] A. Craig, A. Athreya, and C. Taswell. "Example evaluations of plagiarism cases using FAIR Metrics and the PDP-DREAM Ontology." *IEEE eScience 2023* 61 (Oct. 13, 2023), pp. 1–2. DOI: 10.1109/e-Science58273.2023.10254806 (cited p. 1).

[5] A. Craig, S. H. Bae, T. Veeramacheneni, S. K. Taswell, and C. Taswell. "Web Service APIs for Scribe Registrars, Nexus Diristries, PORTAL Registries and DOORS Directories in the NPD System." In: *Proceedings 9th International SWAT4LS Conference*. Amsterdam, Netherlands, 2016. URL: https://ceur-ws.org/Vol-1795/paper4.pdf (cited p. 1).

[6] A. Craig and C. Taswell. "From the 'Best of Our Knowledge' to the 'Best Available Knowledge'" (Oct. 9, 2025). In preparation, Guardians 2025 Proceedings. URL: https://guardians.bhavi.us/pub/docs/BHAVI20251009Guardians-ACraig.pdf (cited p. 2).

[7] R. P. Phelps. "Worse than Plagiarism? Firstness Claims and Dismissive Reviews (Presentation Slides)." In: *International Test Commission, 7th Conference, Hong Kong, July*. 2010 (cited p. 2).

[8] C. Taswell. "DOORS to the Semantic Web and Grid with a PORTAL for Biomedical Computing." *IEEE Transactions on Information Technology in Biomedicine* 12.2 (2 Mar. 2007). In the Special Section on Bio-Grid published online 3 Aug. 2007, pp. 191–204. ISSN: 1089-7771. DOI: 10.1109/TITB.2007.905861 (cited p. 1).

[9] C. Taswell. "A Distributed Infrastructure for Metadata about Metadata: The HDMM Architectural Style and PORTAL-DOORS System." *Future Internet* 2.2 (2010), pp. 156–189. ISSN: 1999-5903. DOI: 10.3390/FI2020156. URL: https://www.mdpi.com/1999-5903/2/2/156/ (cited p. 1).

[10] C. Taswell. "Epistemic Injustice, Open Access, and Citational Justice." *Brainiacs Journal of Brain Imaging And Computing Sciences* 3.2 (Dec. 30, 2022). ISSN: 2766-6883. DOI: 10.48085/X3B678B7A (cited p. 1).

[11] C. Taswell. "Reproducibility, Validity, and Integrity in Scholarly Research: What Accountability for Willful Disregard?" *Brainiacs Journal of Brain Imaging And Computing Sciences* 4.2 (Dec. 31, 2023). DOI: 10.48085/L3570F30F (cited p. 2).

[12] C. Taswell. "Unfairness by the FAIR Principles Promoters: A Case Study on the Absence of Accountability for Integrity in Research Publishing." In: *Current Academic Studies in Technology and Education 2024*. Ed. by T. A. Oliveira and M. T. Hebebci. abstract in Proceedings of the ICATES 2024 Conference. May 3, 2024. Chap. 12, pp. 298–325. ISBN: 978-6256959675. URL: https://www.isres.org/current-academic-studies-in-technology-and-education-2024-74-b.html (cited pp. 1, 2).

[13] C. Taswell. "Unfairness by the FAIR Principles Promoters: A Case Study on Misconduct by Complaint Investigators Who Aid and Abet Plagiarists." In: *Proceedings of the HICSS 58th Conference*. Jan. 8, 2025. URL: https://hdl.handle.net/10125/109639 (cited p. 1).

[14] C. Taswell. "Unfairness by the FAIR Principles Promoters: Falsifying the Historical Record of Scientific Reports in Knowledge Engineering versus Maintaining Standards for Objective Truth in Publicly Funded Research." In: *Proceedings of the ICATES 2025 Conference*. ARSTE, 2025, pp. 90–97. URL: https://www.portaldoors.org/pub/docs/ICATES2025-049-Taswell250502.pdf (cited pp. 1, 2).

[15] S. K. Taswell, A. Athreya, M. Akella, and C. Taswell. "Truth in Science." *Brainiacs Journal of Brain Imaging and Computing Sciences* 2.1 (1 Dec. 31, 2021), pp. 1–9. DOI: 10.48085/M85EC99EE. URL: https://BrainiacsJournal.org/links/brainiacs/Taswell2021Truth (cited p. 1).

