TSP Trends in Scholarly Publishing

OPEN ACCESS

Navigating Research Integrity: Insights and Reflections from a Researcher's Perspective

Aniela Pinto Kempka

Graduate Program in Food Science and Technology, and Multicentric Graduate Program in Biochemistry and Molecular Biology, State University of Santa Catarina, Brazil

Corresponding Author: Aniela Pinto Kempka (aniela.kempka@udesc.br)

ABSTRACT

This opinion piece offers a personal reflection on the evolving meaning of scientific integrity in 2025, a year marked by rapid technological, editorial, and cultural shifts across the global research landscape. Rather than focusing on traditional forms of misconduct, the text explores integrity as a dynamic, human-centered experience that emerges in researchers' everyday interactions, choices, and reflections. The discussion highlights how contemporary science, accelerated by artificial intelligence, expanding research fields, and increasingly interconnected workflows, creates new grey areas, including thematic proximity, overlapping research directions, and uncertainties that arise naturally in fast-moving disciplines. These situations underscore the importance of balancing structural components of integrity with the ethical responsibility of individual researchers, whose actions, communication, and sensitivity play an essential role in sustaining trust and respect within scientific communities. How editorial ecosystems are adapting to thematic convergence and the influence of AI-generated writing, emphasizing the need for transparency, fairness, and contextual interpretation. Ultimately, the text argues that integrity today is less about enforcing rules and more about fostering a healthy research culture built on dialogue, maturity, and shared responsibility. This personal perspective reinforces that, as science evolves, so must our understanding of integrity, embracing both structural guidance and conscious individual conduct to support ethical, collaborative, and resilient scientific practice.

KEYWORDS

Scientific integrity, research ethics, conceptual proximity, editorial decision-making, artificial intelligence, academic culture

Copyright © 2026 Aniela Pinto Kempka. This is an open-access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

INTRODUCTION

In recent years, the debate around scientific integrity has intensified, driven by technological, cultural, and editorial transformations that are continuously reshaping how knowledge is produced, shared, and assessed[1]. In the current landscape, this dynamic has accelerated further: Artificial intelligence (AI) began reshaping research routines, open-access publishing models expanded rapidly, and editorial workflows became faster, more automated, and increasingly complex[2,3]. These developments have opened valuable new possibilities for collaboration, dissemination, and efficiency, but they have also raised critical ethical questions around authorship, originality, transparency, and fairness in scientific practice[1,2].

ISSN: 2789-9446 (Online)
ISSN: 2789-9438 (Print)
https://doi.org/10.21124/tsp.2026.78.81

Received: 28 Nov. 2025
Accepted: 30 Apr. 2026
Published: 26 May, 2026

What stood out to me most this year, however, was not the technology itself nor the policies being updated to address it. It was the evolving and deeply human experience of trying to understand what integrity means in today's scientific world. Traditionally, scientific integrity referred to avoiding misconduct, plagiarism, data manipulation, or misrepresentation[4]. But the present moment reveals how much broader and more nuanced the concept has become: Beyond clearly defined misconduct to include 'grey zones' of questionable research practices and subtle ethical ambiguities. Today, integrity encompasses how we respond to grey spaces where research themes naturally converge and where institutional structures struggle to keep pace with evolving scientific environments[2,5].

In this context, the present opinion piece offers a personal reflection on the evolving dimensions of scientific integrity in 2025. Rather than presenting empirical data, it draws on lived academic experience to examine how integrity functions not merely as compliance with formal rules, but as a dynamic and relational practice shaped by human judgment. It emerges in everyday decisions: In how we interpret thematic proximity, how we navigate uncertainty, and how we respect the intellectual space of others, especially in fast-moving and interdisciplinary research environments.

This view aligns with a growing body of literature that frames research integrity as an ethical commitment embedded in daily academic life, not just in the avoidance of misconduct[6]. As researchers confront the implications of AI-generated content, increasingly interconnected agendas, and competitive publication pressures, the scope of integrity is expanding to include responsible interpretation, transparency, and contextual awareness[1,7-8]. In this sense, integrity must be seen as a shared responsibility involving not only individuals but also institutions, editors, and the broader research community[7].

The main aim is to argue that promoting integrity in the current research climate requires a dual focus: Robust structural mechanisms and conscious, ethical behavior from individual scientists. The principal findings emphasize the importance of personal responsibility, transparency in the use of AI tools, and the creation of supportive, trust-based research cultures. By articulating this study seeks to offer a thoughtful and accessible contribution to ongoing discussions about what it means to act with integrity in science, one that resonates beyond disciplinary boundaries and invites broader dialogue across the research community.

EVOLVING DEFINITIONS OF INTEGRITY

For many years, integrity seemed grounded in relatively clear principles: avoid plagiarism, handle data responsibly, credit contributions accurately, and communicate findings transparently. Yet 2025 made me realize how much broader and more nuanced this concept has become. Integrity now extends into the grey spaces where research themes naturally converge, where communication gaps create uncertainty, and where scientific environments evolve faster than the structural systems designed to guide them.

A MOMENT OF REFLECTION

This awareness became especially real for me this year, when I experienced a situation involving an unexpected proximity between developing research directions. What struck me was not the need to decide whether this convergence happened intentionally or unintentionally, an approach that rarely provides clarity. Instead, what stayed with me was the vulnerability researchers may feel when their work intersects with others in ways that are difficult to interpret. Conceptual proximity, regardless of how it arises, can create moments of hesitation and reflection. And this experience prompted me to think more deeply about the broader scientific ecosystem and the structures that support us as we navigate these moments.

STRUCTURAL COMPLEXITY AND ITS IMPACT

One of the important lessons of 2025 is that many integrity challenges do not stem from explicit wrongdoing. They arise from the complexity and speed of contemporary science. Fields grow quickly, ideas circulate widely, and technological tools accelerate workflows. These global dynamics make it more common for researchers to approach similar questions simultaneously, creating intersections that require sensitivity and thoughtful interpretation.

ROLE OF INDIVIDUAL RESPONSIBILITY

However, acknowledging structural complexity does not mean dismissing individual responsibility. If anything, 2025 reinforced the importance of remembering that the scientific enterprise is sustained not only by institutions but by the daily choices of each researcher. Ethics, respect, and care for the intellectual space of others remain essential expectations, foundational elements that ensure collaboration and coexistence even when scientific paths naturally intersect. Integrity begins with individual actions: Transparent communication, thoughtful interpretation of proximity, responsible planning, and an awareness of how our work interacts with the work around us.

Recognizing personal responsibility is not about assigning blame. It is about acknowledging that scientific culture is built collaboratively through individual conduct as much as through structural guidance. Even in contexts where interests overlap organically or when uncertainties arise from the pace of scientific growth, researchers are expected to approach these situations with respect, sensitivity, and maturity. When individuals uphold these values, the broader system institutions, journals, and funding agencies can function more effectively.

INTEGRITY IN EDITORIAL ECOSYSTEMS

These reflections naturally extend to the publishing landscape. In 2025, editors and reviewers across various fields faced increasing instances of manuscripts exploring overlapping themes. Some of these similarities stemmed from natural scientific expansion; others were influenced by AI tools that, while helpful, can unintentionally replicate narrative structures or rhetorical patterns common in the literature. This added yet another layer of nuance to editorial decision-making. Journals were challenged not only to evaluate novelty but also to interpret context fairly, ensuring that authors receive impartial and transparent assessments in fields marked by rapid parallel growth.

ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE AND ETHICAL TRANSPARENCY

Artificial intelligence, particularly, played a dual role. It's enhanced clarity, improved structure, and reduced barriers to scientific communication. At the same time, because AI learns from vast bodies of published text, it can reproduce common argumentative approaches, creating similarities that appear deeper than they truly are. This reality made it clear to me that transparency in AI use is now part of what integrity means. It is not a burden, nor an admission; it is a gesture of clarity that supports trust among authors, reviewers, and readers.

IMPORTANCE OF SUPPORTIVE RESEARCH CULTURES

Another key insight I gained this year is that integrity thrives in environments where researchers feel supported and safe. Around the world, scientific communities are recognizing the importance of open communication, especially when uncertainty arises. Integrity becomes stronger when questions can be explored without fear of misinterpretation, when dialogue is preferred over silence, and when scientific environments encourage curiosity not only about data, but also about the ethical dimensions of our work.

INTEGRITY AS A COLLECTIVE CULTURAL PRACTICE

What 2025 demonstrated is that integrity is no longer simply a matter of enforcing rules; it is a collective cultural practice. It requires empathy, clarity, and the willingness to interpret complex situations with

nuance. It grows when researchers trust that their concerns will be treated impartially. It strengthens when scientific communities understand that rapid expansion naturally creates moments of thematic proximity and when they develop both formal and informal mechanisms to approach these situations constructively.

LOOKING TOWARD 2026

Looking ahead to 2026, we have a meaningful opportunity to build on these lessons. Supporting integrity will require continued reflection and adaptation. This may involve encouraging transparent communication around uncertainties, refining expectations for AI use, equipping editorial teams to interpret thematic convergence with sensitivity, and fostering research cultures where clarity and empathy coexist with innovation and ambition. These efforts do not limit creativity; on the contrary, they expand its possibilities. When environments are grounded in respect and transparency, researchers feel more confident to explore new ideas, collaborate across disciplines, and share perspectives that enrich the scientific community.

CONCLUSION

Ultimately, 2025 reminded me that integrity evolves alongside science. As research methods change, as collaborations expand, and as technology becomes further embedded in our work, our understanding of ethical practice must evolve with them. Protecting integrity is not only about preventing clear violations, it is also about nurturing environments where doubts can be voiced openly, where similarities can be examined thoughtfully, and where trust remains at the heart of scientific progress. If we carry these reflections into 2026, we will enter the new year with a more compassionate, resilient, and mature vision of integrity, one grounded in shared responsibility and a deep respect for the values that sustain the scientific endeavor. Science advances because of people, people who care about their work, who care about fairness, and who believe that how we conduct research is just as important as what we discover.

SIGNIFICANCE STATEMENT

This perspective contributes to ongoing discussions on research integrity by reframing it as a dynamic, human-centered practice rather than solely a compliance-based framework. By reflecting on emerging challenges such as artificial intelligence use, thematic convergence, and evolving editorial ecosystems, the article highlights the need for transparency, contextual interpretation, and shared responsibility in contemporary science. The insights offered are relevant to researchers, editors, and institutions seeking to foster resilient and trust-based research cultures in rapidly changing scientific environments.

REFERENCES

1. Chen, Z., C. Chen, G. Yang, X. He, X. Chi, Z. Zeng and X. Chen, 2024. Research integrity in the era of artificial intelligence: Challenges and responses. Medicine, Vol. 103. 10.1097/md.0000000000038811.
2. da Silva, F.C.C., 2025. Scientific integrity in the age of AI and the challenges of transparency: Fraud, manipulation, and the new transparency challenges. SciELO Perspect.
3. Awulachew, M.T., 2025. AI and editorial workflows: Lessons from 2025. Editors Café.
4. Entradas, M., Y. Feng and I. Carneiro e Sousa, 2026. The 'shades of grey' in research integrity-researchers admit to questionable research practices that they do not perceive to be serious. PLoS ONE, Vol. 21. 10.1371/journal.pone.0339056.
5. Armond, A.C.V., K.D. Cobey and D. Moher, 2024. Research integrity definitions and challenges. J. Clin. Epidemiol., Vol. 171. 10.1016/j.jclinepi.2024.111367.
6. Hite, R.L., S. Shin and M. Lesley, 2022. Reflecting on responsible conduct of research: A self study of a research-oriented university community. J. Acad. Ethics, 20: 399-419.
7. Bouter, L.M., J. Tijdink, N. Axelsen, B.C. Martinson and G. ter Riet, 2016. Ranking major and minor research misbehaviors: Results from a survey among participants of four world conferences on research integrity. Res. Integrit. Peer Rev., Vol. 1. 10.1186/s41073-016-0024-5.
8. Owen, J.T., 2026. A case study: Rethinking "average intelligence" and the artificiality of AI in academia. AI Soc., 10.1007/s00146-026-02873-6.