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INTRODUCTION
Getting inspiration from some other researcher might surpass an acceptable limit and thus reflecting in the draft as ‘Plagiarism’. Softwares have been launched to curb and check this menace. In Journal of clinical and diagnostic research (JCDR), we used softwares for plagiarism check, but after few significant misses, we changed our strategy. We moved on to using Google, by manually running each sentence in google database, an exhaustive job. This study is our analysis of the lessons learned from this change in practise. To make the study balanced, we present the data of result comparisons of google against other three reputed softwares. The present data is a pilot of an ongoing study as a part of PDSA.

METHODOLOGY
Twenty five articles (case and original researches) were selected from JCDR database where decision was greatly affected due to plagiarism, based on google report. Same articles were run through three plagiarism softwares (ithenticate, viper, plagiarism checker X). This study primarily looked into the nature of plagiarism, rather than the percentage. Case details and discussion in case report; result and discussion in original research were considered important, as decision was influenced by these sections.

RESULT
It was found that google and ithenticate were at par, plagiarism checker X had misses but not critical however Viper’s misses were significant. The added value of google was that, the images could be checked for plagiarism.
An issue was noted with ithenticate, where it missed publications/duplicate publications recently updated on web. Considering google as standard, the timeline of updation of the databases observed was plagiarism checker X followed by ithenticate and lastly viper.

CONCLUSION
We suggest using minimum two softwares, atleast twice (at submission and before publication) with the results always being evaluated by an editor rather than relying on percentage. For images, google images should always be used.