TSP Trends in Scholarly Publishing

OPEN ACCESS

Trust, Transparency, and Accountability: The Three Pillars of Ethical Scholarly Publishing

[1,2]*Kaushik Bharati*
[1]*UNESCO, New Delhi, India*
[2]*Asian Council of Science Editors, Dubai, United Arab Emirates*

Corresponding Author: Kaushik Bharati (dr.kaushik.bharati@gmail.com)

ABSTRACT

Scholarly publishing is central to the creation, validation, and dissemination of knowledge. Its legitimacy depends on trust in the research record, transparency in editorial and research processes, and accountability of all actors involved. These principles have evolved alongside changes in scientific practice, publishing technologies, and societal expectations. This perspective article examines trust, transparency, and accountability as interlinked pillars of scholarly publishing, tracing their historical roots, contemporary manifestations, and emerging challenges. Understanding their dynamic interaction is essential for safeguarding research integrity and sustaining confidence in scholarly communication.

KEYWORDS

Scholarly publishing, trust, transparency, accountability

Copyright © 2026 Kaushik Bharati. 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

Scholarly publishing involves social and ethical responsibility between researchers, publishers, institutions, and the wider public. This association relies on confidence that published research is conducted rigorously, evaluated fairly, and communicated responsibly. Early sociological analyses of science emphasized that the credibility of knowledge production rests on shared norms rather than coercive enforcement mechanisms. Over time, these norms became institutionalized through peer review, editorial oversight, and professional standards, shaping modern scholarly publishing. In an era of rapid digital dissemination and increasing scrutiny of research practices, reaffirming the principles of trust, transparency, and accountability has become imperative.

TRUST AS THE FOUNDATION OF SCHOLARLY COMMUNICATION

Trust is the cornerstone upon which scholarly communication is built. Traditionally, the normative structure of science highlighted communalism, universalism, disinterestedness, and organized skepticism as essential to sustaining confidence in scientific claims. Thus, although trust functions as the moral and procedural infrastructure of scholarly communication, the COVID-19 pandemic exposed multiple stress fractures in this normative architecture. The urgency to generate evidence, combined with the hyper-visibility of biomedical research, created conditions in which trust was repeatedly undermined, both through high-profile retractions[1] and the proliferation of predatory publishing practices[2,3].

ISSN: 2789-9446 (Online)
ISSN: 2789-9438 (Print)
https://doi.org/10.21124/tsp.2026.49.54

Received: 08 Jan. 2025
Accepted: 24 Feb. 2026
Published: 01 Mar. 2026

Therefore, it is vital that researchers report findings honestly and that the scholarly community evaluates them critically. Furthermore, the advent of citation indexing further reinforced trust by enabling systematic tracing of intellectual influence and verification of scholarly claims.

Peer review emerged as the primary institutional mechanism through which trust is operationalized. While it is not immune to bias or error, peer review remains a central process for validating research quality[4]. Trust in journals and publishers is therefore closely linked to perceptions of editorial independence and ethical governance. The proliferation of low-quality or deceptive journals has demonstrated that trust must be actively maintained through robust standards rather than assumed by reputation alone.

TRANSPARENCY IN RESEARCH AND PUBLISHING PROCESSES

Transparency strengthens trust by allowing scrutiny of how knowledge is produced and evaluated. However, in this context, there are several challenges and limitations of transparency initiatives. These include (i) data privacy[5,6], (ii) intellectual property[7,8], and (iii) resource inequities[9] across countries. As science became more complex and collaborative, calls for open science and data sharing[10,11] grew louder, emphasizing that research claims should be accompanied by sufficient methodological detail to permit assessment and replication. Formal transparency initiatives gained momentum with the development of uniform manuscript requirements and reporting standards[12].

The introduction of structured reporting guidelines, such as the Consolidated Standards of Reporting Trials (CONSORT) for randomized controlled trials, marked a significant advance in transparent reporting[13]. Subsequent initiatives addressing systematic reviews and evidence synthesis further expanded expectations for disclosure[14]. Transparency has also extended to the publishing process itself, with journals increasingly requiring declarations of conflicts of interest and funding sources[15].

Digital publishing has enabled additional layers of openness, including trial registration[16], open-access dissemination[17], and sharing of protocols and data. These practices reduce selective reporting and publication bias while allowing readers to better evaluate the robustness of findings. However, transparency must be balanced against ethical, legal, and practical constraints, particularly in sensitive or proprietary research contexts.

ACCOUNTABILITY ACROSS THE SCHOLARLY ECOSYSTEM

Accountability ensures that trust and transparency are supported by mechanisms that address error and misconduct. Authors are accountable for the accuracy and originality of their work, reviewers for the fairness and confidentiality of their assessments, and editors for safeguarding the integrity of the scholarly record. The emergence of formal ethical guidance, notably through organizations dedicated to publication ethics, has clarified expectations and procedures for addressing breaches[18].

Corrective mechanisms such as retractions and corrections serve as visible expressions of accountability, signaling a commitment to maintaining the reliability of the literature. Importantly, accountability extends beyond individual actors. Institutions and funders increasingly share responsibility for ensuring responsible research practices, particularly in relation to reporting completeness, data accessibility, and avoidance of waste[19].

INTERDEPENDENCE OF TRUST, TRANSPARENCY, AND ACCOUNTABILITY

Trust, transparency, and accountability function not as isolated principles but as mutually reinforcing elements of a coherent system. Transparency enhances trust by making research processes visible, while accountability assures that transparency is meaningful rather than symbolic. Conversely, failures in accountability can undermine trust even in highly transparent systems.

Trust, transparency, and accountability are increasingly operationalized as interdependent pillars of ethical scholarly publishing through concrete editorial and governance reforms. One of the most visible integrations is open peer review, where reviewer identities and reports are published alongside articles. This model enhances transparency of editorial decision-making, holds reviewers accountable for the quality and tone of critiques, and strengthens reader trust in the rigor of evaluation processes[20]. Complementing this, data-sharing mandates and open science policies adopted by many biomedical journals require deposition of datasets, statistical code, and data availability statements. Such practices allow independent verification and reproducibility, thereby reinforcing both accountability and public trust in published findings[21].

Governance frameworks such as the *COPE-DOAJ Principles of Transparency and Best Practice in Scholarly Publishing* provide structured operational standards, including disclosure of peer-review processes, conflict-of-interest declarations, editorial board transparency, and clearly defined misconduct procedures. These mechanisms institutionalize accountability while making journal operations visible and trustworthy to authors and readers alike[22]. Similarly, the registered reports publishing model introduces peer review at the protocol stage, with in-principle acceptance before data collection. By locking methodological pathways and publishing results irrespective of outcome, this approach minimizes publication bias and enhances credibility[23].

In clinical research, *mandatory trial registration and results reporting*, championed by the International Committee of Medical Journal Editors (ICMJE), further exemplify the integration of the three pillars. Prospective registration ensures transparency of study intent, while compulsory results disclosure holds investigators accountable and prevents selective publication, thereby fostering public and professional trust[24].

Collectively, these initiatives demonstrate that ethical publishing is most effective when transparency of processes, accountability of stakeholders, and trust in outputs are embedded within enforceable editorial workflows rather than remaining aspirational ideals.

CONTEMPORARY ISSUES AND CHALLENGES

The contemporary scholarly publishing landscape presents new challenges to these foundational principles. Some of these are highlighted below.

GLOBAL NORTH-GLOBAL SOUTH DISPARITIES

Scholarly communication is marked by persistent *Global North-Global South* disparities in knowledge production, validation, and dissemination. Publishing infrastructure, high-impact journals, and indexing systems remain concentrated in the Global North, shaping research agendas and privileging Northern epistemologies while positioning Southern contexts as data sources rather than knowledge leaders[25]. Financial inequities further widen the gap: while paywalls restrict readership in low-resource settings, article processing charges (APCs) in open-access publishing shift barriers to authors, limiting participation from underfunded institutions[26]. Authorship and collaboration imbalances, often termed "foreign gaze", can marginalize local expertise and leadership despite substantial on-ground contributions[27]. Language dominance, particularly of English, compounds inequity by influencing peer review, acceptance, and citation visibility[28]. Collectively, these structural, economic, and linguistic asymmetries shape whose knowledge is amplified globally and whose remains peripheral.

ETHICAL GOVERNANCE IN THE AGE OF DIGITAL AND AI-ASSISTED PUBLISHING

This aspect has become central to safeguarding research integrity, transparency, and public trust. The integration of generative AI in manuscript drafting, peer review, and editorial workflows raises concerns regarding authorship accountability, data fabrication, plagiarism, and algorithmic bias. Clear disclosure

of AI use, robust authorship criteria, and continued human oversight are therefore essential governance pillars. Emerging evidence suggests that generative AI systems can meaningfully influence scientific knowledge production and interpretation, necessitating structured ethical frameworks and editorial vigilance[29]. Publishers and journals are increasingly adopting AI-use policies aligned with international bodies such as the ICMJE and COPE, emphasizing responsibility, traceability, and reproducibility.

Algorithmic tools used in editorial screening must also be audited to prevent discriminatory or epistemic biases that could disadvantage underrepresented research communities. Ethical governance further extends to clinical and data-intensive research, where transparency in AI-supported analyses and secure data-sharing practices remain critical[30]. Strengthening digital ethics thus involves privacy safeguards, disclosure mandates, and accountability mechanisms embedded across the publishing lifecycle. As AI capabilities expand, governance frameworks must evolve in parallel to balance technological efficiency with the foundational values of scholarly communication, namely, credibility, fairness, and accountability[31,32].

REBUILDING TRUST AMID PREDATORY PRACTICES AND RESEARCH MISCONDUCT

This has become an urgent priority in contemporary scholarly publishing. The proliferation of predatory journals, characterized by deceptive peer review, opaque publication fees, and aggressive solicitation, has significantly undermined confidence in scientific credibility and distorted the global evidence base[33,34]. Alongside this, high-profile cases of fabrication, falsification, and plagiarism have exposed systemic vulnerabilities in editorial screening and peer-review systems, contributing to a growing number of article retractions[1].

Strengthening trust requires multi-layered governance mechanisms, including stricter journal indexing criteria, transparent and accountable peer-review models, and mandatory data-sharing policies. The deployment of plagiarism detection and image-forensics tools further enhances editorial vigilance. Equally important is capacity building among researchers, particularly early-career scholars, to improve awareness of predatory publishing and responsible authorship practices. Institutional research-integrity cells, funding-agency mandates, and open-science initiatives collectively reinforce accountability and reproducibility. Ultimately, rebuilding trust depends on shared responsibility across authors, reviewers, editors, publishers, and regulators to uphold ethical stewardship and restore public confidence in scholarly communication.

CONCLUDING REMARKS AND CALL TO ACTION

Reinforcing trust, transparency, and accountability in scholarly publishing demands coordinated, sustained action from all stakeholders, which is briefly highlighted below:

- Authors must commit to ethical authorship, data integrity, and full disclosure of conflicts of interest and AI use
- Reviewers should uphold rigor, impartiality, and confidentiality, while embracing transparent or open peer-review models where appropriate
- Editors and publishers must strengthen screening systems, enforce research-integrity standards, and ensure clarity in editorial decision-making, retractions, and corrections
- Institutions and funders should facilitate research-ethics training, mandate data-sharing frameworks, and incentivize quality over quantity in academic evaluation
- Indexing agencies and professional bodies should tighten journal accreditation criteria and actively delist predatory entities
- Technological innovations like AI-assisted plagiarism detection, image forensics, and audit trails should be deployed responsibly, with human oversight

In conclusion, it is important to foster an inclusive publishing ecosystem that supports researchers from underrepresented regions through mentorship, fee waivers, and capacity building. Ultimately, safeguarding scholarly credibility is a shared moral and professional obligation. Collective vigilance, ethical leadership, and global collaboration must now translate principles into practice, ensuring that the future of publishing remains credible, equitable, and worthy of public trust.

SIGNIFICANCE STATEMENT

This article highlights the interdependent roles of trust, transparency, and accountability as the foundational pillars of ethical scholarly publishing. By examining contemporary challenges, including AI integration, predatory journals, and Global North-South disparities, it provides actionable insights to strengthen research integrity, foster equitable participation, and sustain public confidence in the scientific record.

REFERENCES

1. Fang, F.C., R.G. Steen and A. Casadevall, 2012. Misconduct accounts for the majority of retracted scientific publications. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A., 109: 17028-17033.
2. da Silva, J.A.T., 2020. An alert to COVID-19 literature in predatory publishing venues. J. Acad. Librarianship, Vol. 46. 10.1016/j.acalib.2020.102187.
3. Vervoort, D., X. Ma and M.G. Shrime, 2020. Money down the drain: Predatory publishing in the COVID-19 era. Can. J. Public Health, 111: 665-666.
4. Rennie, D., 1986. Guarding the guardians: A conference on editorial peer review. JAMA, 256: 2391-2392.
5. Ohmann, C., R. Banzi, S. Canham, S. Battaglia and M. Matei *et al*., 2017. Sharing and reuse of individual participant data from clinical trials: Principles and recommendations. BMJ Open, Vol. 9. 10.1136/bmjopen-2017-018647.
6. Vlahou, A., D. Hallinan, R. Apweiler, A. Argiles and J. Beige *et al*., 2021. Data sharing under the general data protection regulation: Time to harmonize law and research ethics? Hypertension, 77: 1029-1035.
7. Haeussler, C., 2011. Information-sharing in academia and the industry: A comparative study. Res. Policy, 40: 105-122.
8. Walport, M. and P. Brest, 2011. Sharing research data to improve public health. Lancet, 377: 537-539.
9. Tennant, J.P., F. Waldner, D.C. Jacques, P. Masuzzo, L.B. Collister and C.H.J. Hartgerink, 2016. The academic, economic and societal impacts of open access: An evidence-based review. F1000Research, Vol. 5. 10.12688/f1000research.8460.3.
10. Pisani, E., P. Aaby, J.G. Breugelmans, D. Carr and T. Groves *et al*., 2016. Beyond open data: Realising the health benefits of sharing data. BMJ, Vol. 355. 10.1136/bmj.i5295.
11. Besançon, L., N. Peiffer-Smadja, C. Segalas, H. Jiang, P. Masuzzo and C. Smout *et al*., 2021. Open science saves lives: Lessons from the COVID-19 pandemic. BMC Med. Res. Methodol., Vol. 21. 10.1186/s12874-021-01304-y.
12. ICMJE, 2010. Uniform requirements for manuscripts submitted to biomedical journals: Writing and editing for biomedical publication. J. Pharmacol. Pharmacother., 1: 42-58.
13. Schulz, K.F., D.G. Altman, D. Moher and CONSORT Group, 2010. Consort 2010 statement: Updated guidelines for reporting parallel group randomised trials. BMC Med., Vol. 8. 10.1186/1741-7015-8-18.
14. Page, M.J., J.E. McKenzie, P.M. Bossuyt, I. Boutron and T.C. Hoffmann *et al*., 2021. The PRISMA 2020 statement: An updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. BMJ, Vol. 372. 10.1136/bmj.n71.
15. COPE, 2000. Committee on publication ethics (COPE): Guidelines on good publication practice. Clin. Oncol., 12: 206-212.
16. Bhatt, A., 2008. Registration of clinical trials: An idea whose time has come!. Indian J. Pharmacol., 40: 47-48.
17. Joseph, H., 2013. The open access movement grows up: Taking stock of a revolution. PLoS Biol., Vol. 11. 10.1371/journal.pbio.1001686.

18. Graf, C., E. Wager, A. Bowman, S. Fiack, D. Scott-Lichter and A. Robinson, 2007. Best practice guidelines on publication ethics: A publisher's perspective. Int. J. Clin. Pract., 61: 1-26.
19. Chan, A.W., F. Song, A. Vickers, T. Jefferson and K. Dickersin *et al*., 2014. Increasing value and reducing waste: Addressing inaccessible research. Lancet, 383: 257-266.
20. Ross-Hellauer, T., L.M. Bouter and S.P.J.M. Horbach, 2023. Open peer review urgently requires evidence: A call to action. PLoS Biol., Vol. 21. 10.1371/journal.pbio.3002255.
21. Schueller, S., F. Mikelis, T. Eliades and D. Koletsi, 2024. Indicators of transparency and data sharing in scientific writing in published randomized controlled trials in orthodontic journals between 2019 and 2023: An empirical study. Eur. J. Orthodontics, Vol. 46. 10.1093/ejo/cjae064.
22. Choi, H.W., Y.J. Choi and S. Kim, 2019. Compliance of "principles of transparency and best practice in scholarly publishing" in academic society published journals. Sci. Ed., 6: 112-121.
23. Chambers, C.D., 2013. *Registered reports*: A new publishing initiative at *Cortex*. Cortex, 49: 609-610.
24. de Angelis, C., J.M. Drazen, F.A. Frizelle, C. Haug and J. Hoey *et al*., 2004. Clinical trial registration: A statement from the international committee of medical journal editors. N. Engl. J. Med., 351: 1250-1251.
25. Shieber, S.M., 2009. Equity for open-access journal publishing. PLoS Biol., Vol. 7. 10.1371/journal.pbio.1000165.
26. Frank, J., R. Foster and C. Pagliari, 2023. Open access publishing-noble intention, flawed reality. Social Sci. Med., Vol. 317. 10.1016/j.socscimed.2022.115592.
27. Abimbola, S., 2019. The foreign gaze: Authorship in academic global health. BMJ Global Health, Vol. 4. 10.1136/bmjgh-2019-002068.
28. Amano, T., V. Ramírez-Castañeda, V. Berdejo-Espinola, I. Borokini and S. Chowdhury *et al*., 2023. The manifold costs of being a non-native English speaker in science. PLoS Biol., Vol. 21. 10.1371/journal.pbio.3002184.
29. Stokel-Walker, C. and R. van Noorden, 2023. What ChatGPT and generative AI mean for science. Nature, 614: 214-216.
30. Char, D.S., N.H. Shah and D. Magnus, 2018. Implementing machine learning in health care-addressing ethical challenges. N. Engl. J. Med., 378: 981-983.
31. Madhavi, V., 2025. Academic writing in the age of AI: Opportunities, challenges, and best practices. Trends Scholarly Publ., 4: 8-14.
32. Onuoha, C.E., 2025. Impact of artificial intelligence (AI) on the quality, efficiency, and transparency of the scholarly publishing process. Trends Scholarly Publ., 4: 15-21.
33. Shen, C. and B.C. Björk, 2015. 'Predatory' open access: A longitudinal study of article volumes and market characteristics. BMC Med., Vol. 13. 10.1186/s12916-015-0469-2.
34. Grudniewicz, A., D. Moher, K.D. Cobey, G.L. Bryson and S. Cukier *et al*., 2019. Predatory journals: No definition, no defence. Nature, 576: 210-212.