

Editorial

Dear readers,
as You know the publishing of scientific articles is under constant change over the years, partly due to the introduction of many new journals, most of them published online and open access. While the introduction of new scientific journals should be seen in general as positive news, this way of publishing, as a matter of fact, caused a relevant increase in the costs of publication for researchers, and such costs are subtracted from other possible uses.

The increase in the number of scientific journals corresponded also to a huge increase in submitted articles, partly due to the increase in researchers (a very positive fact), but also to the use of publishing parameters for teaching/research habilitations and funding applications. More published articles means more funding and a faster career, and the increase in quantity very rarely leads to an increase in quality.

For this reason, some (few?) researchers submit articles that result too carelessly written, and in some cases even contain some parts of the text (partially) copied from somewhere else, figures already used in other articles, and even wrong (?) figures. Also multiple submissions may be another issue, that is the same article is sent to more journals.

In many cases of these misconducts, the reviewers (and the editors) have large difficulties intervening. In some cases, one can remember very similar sentences read somewhere else (it occurred to me a couple of times) or notice a strange change in style from one paragraph to another, but in most cases, the misconduct is noticed only after the article has already been published (for multiple submission it would be impossible doing otherwise), often leading to retraction (Steen et al. 2013).

For this reason, the editorial committee decided, from now on, to indicate directly in the journal which articles published in *Caryologia* (fortunately very very few) resulted to have some flaws like those listed above.

Alessio Papini,
editor-in-chief of *Caryologia*

Literature cited

Steen RG, Casadevall A, Fang FC. (2013) Why has the number of scientific retractions increased? *LoS ONE* 8, e68397.