

Review of: "[Commentary] Honorary Authorship in Biomedical Journals: The Endless Story"

Sanjoy Kar

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The paper discusses the unethical practice of listing scientists as co-authors without significant contributions to the manuscript, known as honorary authorship. The author notes that this practice is on the rise, and while it can help junior researchers get more publications and career opportunities, it can dilute the contribution of each author and ruin the reputation of an honorary author if the data accuracy and integrity were found questionable after publication. The author also mentions that seniors may seek honorary authorship for more peer recognition and possible financial gains.

The commentary provides evidence of the prevalence of honorary authorship in the biomedical field, and highlights its responsibility for the over inflation in the number of authors per article in biomedical journals. The author notes that articles with more than five listed authors are more likely to have "honorary authors" than those with three or fewer authors, and that the average number of authors per paper has increased more than five-fold in the last century.

The author suggests that anyone listed as an author should fulfill the criteria established by the International Committee of Medical Journal Editors for authorship in biomedical research. The author also explains that gift authorship can be considered a subtype of honorary authorship and discusses the unethical practice of ghost authorship.

Overall, the article on honorary authorship is relevant and fascinating, but requires more development to qualify as a scientific publication. The author should do a thorough review of the literature, provide empirical evidence, and adopt a structured approach with a clear purpose and methodology. The ethical considerations surrounding honorary authorship should also be explored thoroughly, and the nuances of author contribution should be considered. In summary, the article has potential but needs more work to meet the standards of a scientific publication.