GUIDANCE RESOURCE

Managing Hallucinated and Fabricated References and Citations: Recommendations from the No-Fee (Diamond) Open Access Publishing in Africa Community of Practice

Authors

Femi Qudus Arogundade

West and Central African Research and Education Network (WACREN), Accra, Ghana

Izuchukwu Okafor

University of Massachusetts Chan Medical School, Worcester, Massachusetts, United States

Ina Smith

Academy of Science of South Africa (ASSAf); Directory of Open Access Journals (DOAJ)

Other Contributors

Tesfaye Gebeyehu

Jimma University, Ethiopia

Milica Ševkušić

Electronic Information for Libraries (EIFL)

Members of the No-Fee Open Access Publishing in Africa Community of Practice

No-Fee Open Access Publishing in Africa Community of Practice

Collaboration for Sustainable Open Access Publishing in Africa

November 2026

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0).

About this resource

This resource presents the recommendations that emerged from the 19th No-Fee (Diamond) Open Access Publishing in Africa Community of Practice meeting, held on 15 July 2026, on how editors should assess and respond to hallucinated, fabricated, and otherwise problematic references and citations in submitted manuscripts. Community members discussed whether the presence or number of problematic references should influence editorial decisions, whether such cases should result in desk rejection, how editors can distinguish between deliberate fabrication and honest or technical errors, and how reference and citation verification can be incorporated into editorial workflows.

These recommendations primarily address hallucinated, fabricated, or otherwise problematic references and citations identified in manuscripts during editorial screening or peer review. Post-publication concerns are addressed only briefly, as journals should follow established post-publication research-integrity procedures, which may involve issuing a correction, retraction, expression of concern, or other appropriate action.

The recommendations in this resource are based on a flexible, research-integrity-based approach to addressing hallucinated and fabricated references and citations in submitted manuscripts rather than setting fixed numerical thresholds. The resource covers reference verification, investigation of problematic references, proportionate editorial responses, risk-based classification of integrity concerns, AI literacy for editors and reviewers, approaches to handling repeated cases of authors submitting manuscripts with fabricated or hallucinated references and citations, and the development of an anonymised knowledge base of cases. It also identifies areas for further research and includes recommended readings and resources.

This resource has been developed as part of the Collaboration for Sustainable Open Access Publishing in Africa project, funded by the Wellcome Trust (grant number 228148/Z/23/Z). The authors would like to thank the members of the No-Fee Open Access Publishing in Africa Community of Practice for their valuable input.

Key Terms

- **Fabricated reference:** A source that does not exist but is presented as though it does.
- **Hallucinated reference:** A fabricated reference generated using a generative AI system that may appear plausible but does not correspond to an identifiable source.
- **Incorrect reference:** A verifiable source that is cited with inaccurate or incomplete bibliographic information, such as an incorrect author name, year, title, journal name, volume, page number, or persistent identifier, such as a DOI, ARK, or Handle.
- **Problematic citation:** A citation that raises concerns about accuracy, relevance, or appropriate use, including instances where a verifiable source does not support the statement for which it is cited.

Introduction

The increased use of generative AI tools by authors has increased the frequency of fabricated or "hallucinated" citations and references in submitted manuscripts (Resnik & Hosseini, 2026; Travis, 2025). These issues pose significant challenges for journal editors and reviewers. Whether due to the use of generative AI or not, some problematic references may simply result from errors in bibliographic tools, including inaccurate imported metadata, technical limitations of citation software, and incorrectly configured citation styles (Homol, 2014; Kratochvíl, 2017). Many journals now have generative AI policies on their websites that clearly guide authors, reviewers, and editors on the use of generative AI tools, including what is permissible and what is not. However, recent conversations, reports, and direct comments from editors and reviewers indicate that editors and reviewers are increasingly encountering manuscripts containing fabricated references or citations, and there is no clear, widely adopted policy or guidance on how journals should respond to cases of fabricated references or citations, especially during initial editorial assessment or peer review.

It is important to cite the correct sources and provide complete and accurate bibliographic information for each reference in the manuscript. However, several studies on the accuracy of references in various scientific disciplines have reported error rates ranging from 25% to 54% (Ioannidis, 2018; Rivkin, 2020). Reports have shown that some authors have a habit of citing papers they have not actually read simply because the title appears relevant to their study, which is broadly regarded as poor scholarly practice (Van de Weert & Stella, 2019). Authors may also copy citations from the reference lists of other papers without consulting or verifying the original sources, a practice demonstrated by the propagation of identical bibliographic errors across publications (Serenko et al., 2021; Simkin & Roychowdhury, 2003). Such citation copying can perpetuate inaccurate or outdated references and may also contribute to the continued uncritical citation of articles that have subsequently been retracted (Hsiao & Schneider, 2022; Wang et al., 2022).

There are therefore many ways that fabricated, hallucinated, or incorrect citations and references can appear in a manuscript. These problems are not limited to submitted manuscripts, as fabricated or unverifiable references have also been identified in published journal articles (Han et al., 2026; Travis, 2025; Walle et al., 2026). According to COPE, "AI tools cannot meet the requirements for authorship as they cannot take responsibility for the submitted work" (COPE Council, 2024). However, authors' continued use of generative AI tools to prepare manuscripts has made initial editorial assessment more demanding, as editors now need to examine the reliability and integrity of information in submitted manuscripts more carefully before deciding whether they should proceed to peer review, because these tools can generate fabricated or hallucinated content (Bhatnagar, 2025; Picazo-Sanchez & Ortiz-Martin, 2026). These challenges are already influencing editorial decisions. For example, the editors of the *Review of International Political Economy* reported rejecting 29 manuscripts without peer review in 2025 because of AI hallucinations involving references and quotations that were fabricated (Elias et al., 2026, p. 505). However, if desk rejection is adopted, what about reference errors caused by bibliographic tools? If an author submits a paper containing false references due to a bibliographic tool error, rejecting the manuscript on that basis could be seen as punishing the author for an honest mistake. In that sense, desk rejection may be unfair, and it has become necessary to seek perspectives from the broader

research community rather than base editorial decisions solely on the views and comments of a few editors and reviewers.

Against this background, several questions remain unanswered about how journals should assess and respond to cases of hallucinated or fabricated references and citations. These include whether such cases should result in desk rejection, how editors should distinguish between intentional fabrication and honest or technical errors, and how the nature and extent of the error should influence the editorial response. To explore these questions from a broader perspective, the 19th No-Fee (Diamond) Open Access Publishing in Africa Community of Practice meeting provided an opportunity for community members to share their views, experiences, and recommendations on how journals/editors should handle cases of hallucinated or fabricated references and citations. The Community of Practice is moderated by the West and Central African Research and Education Network (WACREN), in collaboration with Electronic Information for Libraries (EIFL) and African Journals Online (AJOL), as part of the Collaboration for Sustainable Open Access Publishing in Africa project and provides support to African Diamond OA publishers and journal editors (EIFL, 2024). Diamond OA journals are journals that provide immediate and free access to published articles without charging readers or authors any fees and are funded through several sources, often involving participatory funding models (Chekole et al., 2026; Kuchma & Ševkušić, 2025).

Questions Asked and Addressed

1. While editors and reviewers argue that manuscripts containing hallucinated or fabricated references or citations should be desk rejected, should any such instance warrant rejection, or should the decision depend on the number of problematic references or citations identified?

2. Reviewers often argue that reviewing manuscripts containing fabricated or hallucinated references is a waste of their time. Who, therefore, should be responsible for verifying references?

3. Some manuscripts contain 50 to 80 references, and editors may not have the capacity to verify every reference across the large number of manuscripts they receive. How can reference verification be managed within existing editorial workflows?

4. Where journals use citation or reference-checking tools for initial screening, editors may still need to manually verify flagged references. How should this additional workload be managed?

5. Should authors who repeatedly submit manuscripts containing fabricated references or citations have their institutions notified?

6. Should journals consider restricting or banning authors from making future submissions where there is a repeated pattern of fabricated or hallucinated references?

7. More broadly, how should journals distinguish between deliberate fabrication, AI-generated hallucinations, honest mistakes, and errors introduced by bibliographic or reference-management tools?

8. What approaches can journals adopt to ensure that their response is proportionate to the seriousness and potential impact of the problem?

Recommendations

1. Avoid Fixed Numerical Thresholds

Journals should avoid introducing fixed thresholds, such as specifying how many inaccurate or unverifiable or fabricated references constitute misconduct or require desk rejection. Since errors can vary substantially in their nature and consequences, numerical thresholds may not adequately capture different forms of plagiarism, hallucination, fabrication, or research-integrity concerns. A single problematic reference may require investigation, while several minor errors may be correctable. The appropriate response should therefore depend on the nature, significance, and implications of the problem.

2. Approach Manuscripts With an Open but Critical Mindset

Editors should begin manuscript assessment in good faith. The aim should not be to determine immediately whether an error resulted from AI use, intentional misconduct, or an honest mistake.

The primary question should be:

Is there a claim or fact presented in the manuscript that cannot be verified, explained, or supported, and does it affect the integrity of the research?

This kind of approach would allow editors to investigate issues without prematurely attributing intent.

3. Strengthen Reference Verification as Part of Editorial Screening

Reference checking should form part of the initial editorial screening before peer review. At this stage, the primary focus should be on identifying fabricated references and checking the existence, completeness, and bibliographic accuracy of the reference list and citations, including whether citations in the manuscript are appropriately matched with entries in the reference list.

Where references exist but contain formatting, citation-style, or incomplete bibliographic information, the manuscript can be returned to the authors for correction and resubmission rather than being desk rejected. Where references cannot be verified, editors should investigate further where feasible, for example by searching bibliographic databases. Where verification remains impossible, editors can ask authors to provide links to the cited sources, complete bibliographic information, or clarification on the origin and accuracy of the references.

Editors may occasionally identify clearly inappropriate or irrelevant citations during initial screening, for example where a cited source is obviously unrelated to the subject being discussed. Where such problems are identified, they should inform the editor’s decision or be raised with the authors. However, editors may not

always be able to determine whether a reference has been exaggerated, misapplied, or interpreted inaccurately, particularly where the cited source falls within the same field or subfield as the manuscript being reviewed. Assessing whether a reference adequately supports the statement for which it is cited should therefore primarily form part of the peer-review process, as this would usually require subject-level expertise.

Where reference or citation concerns are raised by reviewers during peer review, editors should ensure that the concerns are addressed and, where necessary, ask authors to verify, correct, replace, or remove the affected citations.

Recommended Readings: COPE Discussion Document: Citation Manipulation and ICMJE, Preparing a Manuscript for Submission to a Medical Journal: References.

4. Adopt a Holistic Research Integrity Approach: Treat an Unverifiable or Incorrect Reference as a Trigger for Investigation, Not Necessarily Automatic Rejection

Editors and reviewers should assess referencing and citation concerns within the broader context of research integrity rather than treating them as isolated issues. Problems with references and citations may reflect wider shortcomings in scholarly research and publishing including inadequate source verification, inaccurate reporting, or insufficient attention to detail. An apparently incorrect, fabricated or unverifiable reference should normally trigger further investigation before peer review proceeds.

However, the identification of one problematic reference or citation does not necessarily mean that the manuscript should automatically be rejected. Failure to locate a source in Crossref, Scopus, Web of Science, PubMed, Google Scholar or another bibliographic database is not evidence that the source is fabricated. Where an investigation establishes that several references are clearly fabricated or hallucinated, particularly where they are material to the manuscript's argument, a desk rejection may be appropriate.

Where concerns remain after initial investigation, authors should normally be given an opportunity to respond before a conclusion of fabrication or serious research misconduct is reached. Editors should identify the specific references or citations of concern, request clarification or supporting evidence, and allow the author a reasonable opportunity to explain or correct the problem. The editor should consider the author's response before deciding whether the issue represents an honest error, an unresolved integrity concern, or possible fabrication. The concern, correspondence, evidence considered, and editorial decision should be documented appropriately.

Where fabricated or incorrect references and citations are identified after publication, journals should follow established post-publication research integrity procedures. Where the published article remains reliable but specific errors can be corrected, a correction may be more appropriate than a retraction. Where there are clear concerns about the reliability of the publication, but there is not enough evidence or an investigation is ongoing, an expression of concern may be appropriate. According to COPE, "an expression of concern might be warranted if there are major and credible concerns about the reliability of a publication which do not meet the

criteria for a retraction, or conclusive evidence cannot be obtained for some time" (COPE Council, 2025b). Where final documented evidence establishes that the publication is unreliable, retraction may be appropriate.

Recommended Readings: COPE Guidelines: Expressions of Concern and COPE Retraction Guidelines.

5. Resolve Significant Integrity Concerns Before Peer Review

Where references or other elements of a manuscript cannot be adequately verified, editors should consider resolving the concern before sending the manuscript for peer review. The underlying principle is that editors should resolve significant integrity concerns about a manuscript, including the accuracy of its references and citations, before asking reviewers to evaluate it. Addressing significant integrity concerns at the editorial screening stage prevents reviewers from being placed in the position of having to investigate whether references or citations are accurate and carry out manual checks that should have been addressed during initial editorial screening, although this should not stop reviewers from conducting additional checks when reviewing manuscripts.

6. Assess the Significance and Risk of Identified Problems

Rather than using numerical thresholds, journals could develop risk-based or classification-based guidance to help editors understand the potential implications of different problems. Manuscript issues should always be considered according to their impact. Under a risk-based approach, reference issues could broadly be considered as low, moderate, or high risk, depending on their impact on the integrity of the research. In this sense, a low-risk issue could involve a limited error that does not materially affect the research and can be readily corrected. A moderate-risk issue could involve errors that affect an important part of the manuscript and require further investigation or substantial correction. A high-risk issue could involve AI-generated content that fundamentally affects the evidence, methodology, argument, findings, or conclusions of the research. A model of the risk-based classification is suggested below:

I. Lower-risk issues: Minor reference errors, formatting problems, or inaccuracies that can be corrected without affecting the reported findings or argument.

II. Moderate-risk issues: Issues requiring clarification or verification that may affect part of the manuscript but do not necessarily affect the integrity of the research.

III. Higher-risk issues: Substantial fabricated or unverifiable evidence, methodological problems, distorted findings, or other issues that materially affect the validity or integrity of the research.

Journals are encouraged to develop a field-specific risk-based framework to assist editors in determining the seriousness of AI-related reference and citation problems. This classification should not be adopted as an automatic decision rule. Rather, it would provide editors and reviewers with a structured basis for exercising editorial judgement. Rigid thresholds should therefore not be introduced.

7. Establish Clear Responsibility for Reference and Citation Verification

Where access to external reviewers who can specifically support reference and citation verification is limited, journals should consider training in-house reviewers and co-editors to support reference and citation verification, which would strengthen the journals' capacity to identify fabricated, hallucinated or inaccurate references and citations in submitted manuscripts. A trained reference manager primarily responsible for reference and citation verification can provide specialised support in assessing whether citations adequately support the claims made in a manuscript and in identifying inaccurate, fabricated, or hallucinated citations and references. This role should not be conflated with that of copyeditors, whose primary responsibility is formatting accepted manuscripts into in-house style and addressing grammatical errors, although both roles can be complementary, particularly in journals where the copyeditors also check references and citations.

8. AI Literacy: Capacity Building for Editors and Reviewers

Editors and reviewers should understand how AI systems, and more broadly, generative AI tools work. This includes learning to recognise AI-generated content and understanding hallucinations. AI literacy should therefore be treated as part of the broader capacity building required for responsible editorial and peer-review practice. AI literacy can help editors and reviewers recognise indicators that may warrant further investigation, understand the limitations of AI-detection tools, and assess disclosed or suspected AI use without assuming that AI use can be reliably inferred from textual characteristics alone. This would allow editors and reviewers to identify issues that may require further investigation. Results from AI detection tools showing possible AI misuse should not be treated as evidence of misconduct or used as the sole basis for rejecting a manuscript because of high false-positive and negative rates (Weber-Wulff et al., 2023). As journals adopt AI policies, they should also consider how to strengthen AI literacy among editors and reviewers, who are primarily involved in safeguarding the quality and integrity of scholarly publications. In addition to having AI policies for authors, journals should also have policies on AI use by editors and reviewers. Without author permission, editors and reviewers should not upload manuscripts to public AI systems where confidentiality cannot be assured. Publishers can explore independently built AI systems (publisher-controlled) to support editorial workflows, including reference and citation verification, while ensuring that manuscript confidentiality and other ethical requirements are protected.

Recommended Readings: "Suspected AI-generated manuscripts and advice from the COPE Council" and Who wrote this? Evaluating the reliability of AI detection tools in higher education

9. Contribute to the Development of an Anonymised Knowledge Base of Cases

Journals and editors should share anonymised research integrity case examples on AI misuse, similar to COPE case collections, including instances of hallucinated references, substantial citation or reference fabrication, fabricated evidence, problematic AI-generated arguments, AI-generated images or figures, and methodological flaws. Such case collections could document successful verification approaches, editorial investigations, and the actions taken in response to identified problems, thereby promoting transparency, consistency in editorial responses, and best practices in managing AI-related and other research integrity concerns. For the broader

publishing community, an anonymised repository of research integrity cases could help journals identify and respond to similar or emerging forms of AI-related misconduct, facilitate shared learning across publishers, and provide a valuable resource for less experienced or newly appointed editors navigating complex integrity challenges.

10. Handling Repeat Offenders

Where the same author or group of authors is associated with repeated submissions containing substantiated fabrication or serious integrity concerns, journals should document the pattern and apply their established research-integrity procedures. Authors should be given an opportunity to respond. Where concerns are serious, unresolved, or indicate possible broader research misconduct, the journal may consider referring the matter to the appropriate research-integrity officer or institution in accordance with established publication-ethics guidance. Journals should avoid automatically banning authors from future submission solely on the basis of previous cases. According to COPE, "banning authors can introduce legal risk to the journal due to perceived reputational harm, discrimination, or professional harm caused by restricting access to publishing" (COPE Council, 2025a). The primary aim should be deterrence and protection of the journal's credibility. Consistent checking and open documentation of anonymised cases on journal websites similar to COPE anonymised cases will discourage the submission of poorly written manuscripts or manuscripts containing fabricated references and citations, and signal to the community that the journal takes research integrity seriously.

Recommended Reading: Banning authors from publishing - Cope Position

11. Designing Future Studies on Fabricated or Hallucinated Citations and References

Future studies should aim to produce practical, evidence-informed guidance or a risk-based framework rather than numerical rules. As such, the methodological approach should use mixed-methods, with qualitative work particularly important for understanding editorial decision-making. It can focus on interviews and commentaries from key populations, including editors, reviewers, authors, and research-integrity officers, with an optional survey. Such studies should aim to produce outputs such as a synthesised set of recommendations, useful editorial guidance, and policies that journals can adapt.

Conclusion

A clear consensus against numerical thresholds and in favour of a flexible, investigative, risk-based approach grounded in research integrity practices was reached during the meeting. Editors are encouraged to check references and citations routinely, return manuscripts for clarification instead of desk rejection where appropriate, and consider desk rejection where substantiated fabrication or hallucination materially affects the integrity of the research. Future studies on hallucinated citations and references should focus on producing evidence-informed guidance and recommendations that can help editors address cases of hallucinated citations and references. Such studies should be largely qualitative rather than quantitative, drawing on the perspectives and experiences of key stakeholders, including editors, reviewers, authors, and research-integrity officers.

Recommended Readings and Resources

Generative AI in Diamond Open Access Publishing - https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17580185

Quality in Diamond Open Access Publishing: guidelines, policies and templates - https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17404838

Reference Accuracy: Authors', Reviewers', Editors', and Publishers' Contributions - https://doi.org/10.3346/jkms.2014.29.12.1587

Editors' Role in Ensuring Responsible Use of AI - https://www.icmje.org/recommendations/browse/artificial-intelligence/ai-use-by-editors.html

Suspected AI-generated manuscripts and advice from the COPE Council - https://publicationethics.org/guidance/case/suspected-ai-generated-manuscripts

Phantom citations: An empirical study of non-existent and unverifiable references in scholarly literature - https://doi.org/10.1002/asi.70104

Fabrication and errors in the bibliographic citations generated by ChatGPT - https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-023-41032-5

Responsible Use of Generative AI in Referencing Practices - https://files.su.ac.za/public/division-research-development/documents/2026-05/responsible-use-generative-ai-referencing-practices.pdf

The ethics of using artificial intelligence in scientific research: new guidance needed for a new tool - https://doi.org/10.1007/s43681-024-00493-8

Impact of large language models on peer review opinions from a fine-grained perspective: evidence from top conference proceedings in AI - https://arxiv.org/abs/2604.19578

COPE Discussion Document: Citation Manipulation and ICMJE - https://publicationethics.org/guidance/discussion-document/citation-manipulation

COPE Guideline: Expressions of Concern - https://publicationethics.org/guidance/guideline/expressions-concern

COPE Retraction Guidelines. - https://publicationethics.org/guidance/guideline/retraction-guidelines

Preparing a Manuscript for Submission to a Medical Journal: References - https://www.icmje.org/recommendations/browse/manuscript-preparation/preparing-for-submission.html

From data corruption to algorithmic discrimination: a structured narrative review of the impact of data integrity on AI ethics - https://doi.org/10.1007/s43681-026-01198-w

Towards a transparent and reproducible AI-assisted research paper writing - https://doi.org/10.1186/s44342-025-00057-0

Hallucination in Generative AI: Challenges to data integrity, ethical concerns and implications for knowledge management - https://doi.org/10.1177/18758789261463098

Are AI hallucinations the same as error information? A qualitative exploration of hallucination tolerance and resistance strategies - https://www.researchgate.net/publication/399846747_Are_AI_hallucinations_the_same_as_error_information_A_qualitative_exploration_of_hallucination_tolerance_and_resistance_strategies

Recording: Beyond Track Changes: Measuring the Impact of Human Manuscript Editing in an AI-Driven Publishing Landscape https://ease.org.uk/event/manuscript-editors-event-beyond-track-changes-measuring-the-impact-of-human-manuscript-editing-in-an-ai-driven-publishing-landscape/

References

Bhatnagar, N. (2025). Unfair practice of using AI in writing manuscripts: A new challenge for the editorial team! *BJKines - National Journal of Basic & Applied Sciences*, *17*, 45–46. https://doi.org/10.25259/BJKines_22_2025

Chekole, A., Arogundade, F. Q., Aamira, B., Chilimo, W., Kuchma, I., Leonard, A., Levy, M., Luescher, T., Phiri, L., Ševkušić, M., Smith, I., & Wella, K. (2026). *Funding sources of African no-fee open access journals.* Zenodo. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18569135

COPE Council. (2024). *COPE position: Authorship and AI*. Committee on Publication Ethics. https://doi.org/10.24318/cCVRZBms

COPE Council. (2025a). *Banning authors from publishing*. Committee on Publication Ethics. https://doi.org/10.24318/J9HyjNqw

COPE Council. (2025b). *COPE guidelines: Expressions of concern.* Committee on Publication Ethics. https://doi.org/10.24318/mw2J3661

EIFL. (2024). *Collaboration for sustainable open access publishing in Africa: EIFL and partners AJOL and WACREN launch three-year project to strengthen Diamond open access publishing in Africa*. https://www.eifl.net/eifl-in-action/collaboration-sustainable-open-access-publishing-africa

Elias, J., Hozić, A. A., Johnston, A., Köstem, S., Moschella, M., Ponte, S., Wang, H., & Young, K. L. (2026). RIPE 2025 diversity statement. *Review of International Political Economy, 33*(1), 503–508. https://doi.org/10.1080/09692290.2026.2622720

Han, C., Manoharan, S., Ye, X., & Speidel, U. (2026). Phantom citations: An empirical study of non-existent and unverifiable references in scholarly literature. *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology, 77*(10), 1287–1316. https://doi.org/10.1002/asi.70104

Homol, L. (2014). Web-based citation management tools: Comparing the accuracy of their electronic journal citations. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship, 40*(6), 552–557. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acalib.2014.09.011

Hsiao, T. K., & Schneider, J. (2022). Continued use of retracted papers: Temporal trends in citations and (lack of) awareness of retractions shown in citation contexts in biomedicine. *Quantitative Science Studies, 2*(4), 1144–1169. https://doi.org/10.1162/qss_a_00155

Ioannidis, J. P. A. (2018). Massive citations to misleading methods and research tools: Matthew effect, quotation error and citation copying. *European Journal of Epidemiology*, *33*(11), 1021–1023. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10654-018-0449-x

Kratochvíl, J. (2017). Comparison of the accuracy of bibliographical references generated for medical citation styles by EndNote, Mendeley, RefWorks and Zotero. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, *43*(1), 57–66. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acalib.2016.09.001

Kuchma, I., & Ševkušić, M. (2025). *Quality in diamond open access publishing: Guidelines, policies and templates* (Version 2.0). Zenodo. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17404838

Picazo-Sanchez, P., & Ortiz-Martin, L. (2026). Evaluating the integrity of LLM-generated citations: Prevalence and risks of fabricated references in scientific literature. *Data, 11*(5), 122. https://doi.org/10.3390/data11050122

Resnik, D. B., & Hosseini, M. (2026). Hallucinated citations produced by generative artificial intelligence may constitute research misconduct when citations function as data in scholarly papers. *Accountability in Research*. Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1080/08989621.2026.2645390

Rivkin, A. (2020). Manuscript referencing errors and their impact on shaping current evidence. *American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education*, *84*(7), ajpe7846. https://doi.org/10.5688/ajpe7846

Serenko, A., Dumay, J., Hsiao, P.-C. K., & Choo, C. W. (2021). Do they practice what they preach? The presence of problematic citations in business ethics research. *Journal of Documentation, 77*(6), 1304–1320. https://doi.org/10.1108/JD-01-2021-0018

Simkin, M. V., & Roychowdhury, V. P. (2003). Read before you cite! *Complex Systems, 14*(3), 269–274. https://doi.org/10.25088/ComplexSystems.14.3.269

Travis, K. (2025, December 2). *The case of the fake references in an ethics journal*. Retraction Watch. https://retractionwatch.com/2025/12/02/fake-references-chatgpt-journal-academic-ethics-springer-nature-whistleblowing

Van de Weert, M., & Stella, L. (2019). The dangers of citing papers you did not read or understand. *Journal of Molecular Structure*, *1186*, 102–103. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.molstruc.2019.03.024

Walle, Y. M., Gedefaw, S. T., & Bezabih, H. A. (2026). Retraction note: Whistleblowing in Ethiopian public educational institutions: Perspectives of individuals with disabilities. *Journal of Academic Ethics, 24*, Article 38. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10805-025-09714-z

Wang, Z., Shi, Q., Zhou, Q., Zhao, S., Hou, R., Lu, S., Gao, X., Chen, Y., & PRESS Working Group. (2022). Retracted systematic reviews continued to be frequently cited: A citation analysis. *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology, 149*, 137–145. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclinepi.2022.05.013

Weber-Wulff, D., Anohina-Naumeca, A., Bjelobaba, S., Foltýnek, T., Guerrero-Dib, J., Popoola, O., Šigut, P., & Waddington, L. (2023). Testing of detection tools for AI-generated text. *International Journal for Educational Integrity, 19*, Article 26. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40979-023-00146-z