ABSTRACT FINAL REPORT

Abstract 33

General Information

Title	:	Dr.
FirstName	:	Jyotindu
LastName	:	Debnath
Email ID	:	jyotindu_debnath@rediffmail.com
InstituteName	:	Armed Forces Medical College, Pune
Department	:	
Address	:	Armed Forces Medical College Solapur Road Pune
City/Zipcode	:	Pune / 411040
State	:	Maharashtra
Country	:	India
PhoneNo	:	26330825
Mobile No	:	7875900034

Abstract Information

Abstract Title : Detecting Plagiarism in Scientific Writings: Is there any problem?

Abstract : **Background:** Software based plagiarism detection tools (PDT) are being increasingly used to detect digital plagiarism.
Aim: A pilot study was designed to assess efficacy and accuracy of one of the commonly used software based PDT named iThenticate.
Materials and Methods: 50 (fifty) documents were selected from various Indian National and International medical journals and uploaded in the PDT for online checking of similarity index. Similarity indices were graded as follows: Near total: 91-100%, Very high: 81-90%, High: 71-80%%, Moderate: 61-70%, Medium: 51-60%, Mild: 41-50%, Low: 31-40%, Very low: 21-30%, Lower: 11-20%, Least: 1-10%. Relevance of similarity report was graded as a) Highly relevant b) Relevant c) Questionable Relevance, d) Irrelevant, e) Not Applicable.

Results: 50 documents from the year 2007 till 2015 were examined. Similarity reports ranged from 0% to 100%. Accurate depiction of similarity reports (moderate, high, very high and near total grades) were noted in 21 documents. False low similarity report (mild, low and very low grades) was obtained in 4 documents. False negative (lower, least grades) similarity reports was obtained in 25 documents. Highly relevant, relevant, questionable relevance and irrelevant similarity reports were obtained in 42%, 12%, 24%, 22% respectively. All of the 12 documents (100%) tested from the block of year 2007 to 2010 showed relevance of similarity report. However, the relevance of similarity report for the year 2011-2013 (5 out of 13, 38%), 2014 (2 out of 8, 25%) and 2015 (3 out of 17, 18%) showed a steady decline as the year of the study advanced.

Conclusion: It is impossible to get a completely flawless PDT. There is a need to be aware of false positive and false negative similarity reports by PDTs. One must apply critical human element to minimize the extent of erroneous similarity reports and interpretation of the test results.