

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

Monika Bolek¹

¹ University of Lodz

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

I believe that the note is emotional, and not enough discussed as the scientific paper should be.

The author should do a thorough review of the literature on the subject and focus on the negative and positive aspects of honorary authorship. This problem should also be embedded in the area of ethics, which would allow to defend the arguments and side presented by the author.

Technical remark. The publications in this section should be presented in a time order:

In 1994, Shapiro *et al.* [4] surveyed authors of 184 research articles and found a rate of approximately 26% of honorary authorships. Wislar *et al.* in 2011 found evidence of honorary authorship in 25% of original research reports, 15% of review articles, and 11.2% of editorials published in six major medical journals published in 2008 [5]. In 2014, Kennedy *et al.* [6] reported that in the nursing literature the prevalence of honorary authorship was 42%. This rising trend may indicate an aggressive progression of the phenomenon over a few years.

The article can be published after significant corrections have been made. I want to read it after they are introduced. The topic is very important and interesting, worth to be developed.