

Peer Review

Review of: "Sneaked references: Fabricated reference metadata distort citation counts"

Jules Di Scala¹

1. Paul Sabatier University (Université Toulouse III - Paul Sabatier), Toulouse, France

Disclaimer : this review aims to learn how to use this platform. Do not trust what is written next (you should check the article tho, and make your own review !)

This article exposes a new kind of fraud : "sneaked references", which are hidden references added in the metadata some publisher send to Crossref.

Honestly really well written article !

The cited literature is also very instructive [\[1\]](#)[\[2\]](#)[\[3\]](#)

References

1. [^]Jeroen Baas, Michiel Schotten, Andrew Plume, Grégoire Côté, et al. (2020). Scopus as a curated, high-quality bibliometric data source for academic research in quantitative science studies. *Quantitative Science Studies*, vol. 1 (1), 377-386. doi:10.1162/qss_a_00019.
2. [^]Alberto Baccini, Giuseppe De Nicolao, Eugenio Petrovich. (2019). Citation gaming induced by bibliometric evaluation: A country-level comparative analysis. *PLoS ONE*, vol. 14 (9), e0221212. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0221212.
3. [^]Jöran Beel, Bela Gipp. (2010). On the robustness of google scholar against spam. doi:10.1145/1810617.1810683.

Attachments: available at <https://doi.org/10.32388/5YLG00>

Declarations

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.