



# Effects of retractions in primary health care

Hinpetch Daungsupawong<sup>a,\*</sup>, Viroj Wiwanitkit<sup>b</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Private Academic Consultant, Phonhong, Lao People's Democratic Republic; <sup>b</sup>Department of Research Analytics, Saveetha Dental College and Hospitals, Saveetha Institute of Medical and Technical Sciences Saveetha University, Chennai, India

## DEAR EDITOR,

We would like to share ideas on the publication “The trend and ripple effects of retractions in primary health care: A bibliometric analysis.”<sup>1</sup> This analysis sheds light on the characteristics and implications of retracted papers in the primary care literature. However, critical thinking from other perspectives is necessary. The reported retraction rate of 0.01% seems extremely low, particularly in comparison to the overall PubMed metric. This discrepancy raises concerns regarding the methodological rigor in capturing the full spectrum of retracted material, whether explicit inclusion criteria exist for the bibliographic analysis, and the likelihood that retractions may be overlooked or neglected. Additional clarity about the selection process may enhance the validity of the findings.

Although the focus of this study is on the causes of retractions, which are primarily scientific misconduct, it may benefit from a more in-depth examination of the circumstances surrounding them. Understanding the causes of wrongdoing, such as institutional constraints, financial links, and academic culture, might help identify systemic issues in primary care. Furthermore, looking into the backgrounds of writers, such as their work situation or previous publication history, can tell whether some groups are more inclined to cheat. A more thorough analysis of the sociocultural elements that drive these retractions could shed light on preventive interventions.

Another difficulty is analyzing citations following a study's retraction. The finding that retracted papers continue to be cited

is troubling. However, the implications of such repercussions require further investigation. Do these citations have a beneficial or negative impact on future research, clinical practice, or policy decisions? Furthermore, analyzing the citation patterns of unretracted works would provide a clearer picture of the ripple effects in scientific discourse. Answering these questions may indicate the larger influence of retracted publications on public health outcomes.

To identify new and exciting avenues, this study investigates interdisciplinary research by incorporating qualitative research methodologies, including interviews with authors and journal editors, to assess attitudes regarding retraction and probable retractions. Furthermore, investigating the efficacy of current retraction protocols and the role of social media in affecting opinions of retracted work may yield new insights. Future study could concentrate on longitudinal studies to investigate the long-term effects of retracted papers on research integrity and public trust in primary care literature. Expanding the scope and analytical approaches would enable scholars to better address the complexities of withdrawn literature and its implications for the field.

## REFERENCE

1. Lin KC, Chen YC, Lin MH, Chen TJ. The trend and ripple effects of retractions in primary health care: a bibliometric analysis/ *Chin Med Assoc* 2024;87:927–32.

\*Address correspondence. Dr. Hinpetch Daungsupawong, Private Academic Consultant, Lak 52, Phonhong, Vientiane 10000, Laos. E-mail address: hinpetchdaung@gmail.com (H. Daungsupawong).

Conflicts of interest: The authors declare that they have no conflicts of interest related to the subject matter or materials discussed in this article.

*Journal of Chinese Medical Association.* (2025): 88: 577.

doi: 10.1097/JCMA.0000000000001244

Copyright © 2025, the Chinese Medical Association. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>)