

TYPICAL ERRORS OF AUTHORS OF MANUSCRIPTS OF MEDICAL SCIENTIFIC JOURNALS OF KHARKIV NATIONAL MEDICAL UNIVERSITY: ANALYSIS OF EDITORIAL PRACTICE 2025

Nakonechna O.A., Shevchenko A.S., Danylchenko S.I.

Kharkiv National Medical University, Kharkiv, Ukraine

Background. The editorial office of the scientific journals of Kharkiv National Medical University has described its procedures for handling manuscripts, the design requirements, and the ethical standards for reviewers. It remained unknown which shortcomings authors make most often and how they are distributed across manuscript sections.

Aim. To classify typical shortcomings of manuscripts based on the editorial practice of three university journals in 2025 and to assess the prevalence of each category.

Materials and Methods. The general population comprised 144 articles published in 12 issues of the three university journals in 2025. Of these, 116 manuscripts, or 80.6% of the annual output, were analysed. The data source was the comments of editors and reviewers recorded in working files. The indicator was the proportion of manuscripts with at least one comment of a given category. Proportions were calculated in Excel 2019 (Microsoft, USA). The investigation was a private initiative of the authors, without grant funding, and the topic was not registered in the state register of scientific topics.

Research Ethics. The study involved neither patients nor laboratory animals; therefore, ethics committee approval was not required. The material comprised published articles and working files with personal data of authors and reviewers, so the confidentiality requirements for peer review were observed: reports are not disclosed and observations are given without author names or article titles.

Results. The most common were shortcomings of the abstract (65%), abbreviations (58%), and keywords (56%), followed by reference formatting and presentation of tables and figures (48% each), incompleteness of "Materials and Methods" and information about the authors (43% each), microtypography (41%), the aim (30%), and research ethics (28%). The second layer comprises shortcomings of content: material in the wrong section (27%), unsupported conclusions (21%), incorrect statistics (20%), design flaws (19%). All manuscripts required language editing.

Conclusions. The aim of the study was achieved. A classification of five groups was constructed and the prevalence of each category assessed. Seven of the ten most common shortcomings can be eliminated by the author unaided, without altering any scientific statement. The frequencies are minimum estimates. Shortcomings of content are recorded predominantly by reviewers rather than editors, which makes peer review an independent rather than a duplicating stage of manuscript preparation.

Keywords: *publication ethics, double-blind peer review, academic integrity, article formatting, editorial practice, scientific periodicals.*

Відповідальний автор: Шевченко О.С.

✉ 4, пр. Науки, м. Харків,
61022, Україна.

E-mail: as.shevchenko@knmu.edu.ua

Corresponding author: Shevchenko A.S.

✉ 4, Nauky Ave., Kharkiv,
61022, Ukraine.

E-mail: as.shevchenko@knmu.edu.ua

© Наконечна О.А., Шевченко О.С.,
Данильченко С.І., 2026

CC BY-NC-SA

© Nakonechna O.A., Shevchenko A.S.,
Danylchenko S.I., 2026

**Цитуйте українською:** Наконечна ОА, Шевченко ОС, Данильченко СІ.

Типові помилки авторів рукописів медичних наукових журналів

Харківського національного медичного університету:

аналіз редакційної практики 2025 року.

Медицина сьогодні і завтра. 2026;95(3):16с. In press.

<https://doi.org/10.35339/msz.2026.95.3.nsd> [англійською].**Cite in English:** Nakonechna OA, Shevchenko AS, Danylchenko SI.

Typical errors of authors of manuscripts of medical scientific journals of Kharkiv

National Medical University: analysis of editorial practice 2025.

Medicine Today and Tomorrow. 2026;95(3):16p. In press.

<https://doi.org/10.35339/msz.2026.95.3.nsd>

Introduction

The editorial office of the scientific journals of Kharkiv National Medical University prepares three periodicals for publication: Medicine Today and Tomorrow, Experimental and Clinical Medicine, and Inter Collegas. In recent years the editorial office has consistently described its own procedures: the handling of manuscripts and published articles [1; 2], the requirements for manuscript design [3; 4], the ethical and professional requirements for the work of a reviewer [5], and a generalisation of editorial policies on adherence to ethical norms [6]. These documents rest on international frameworks: the recommendations of the International Committee of Medical Journal Editors [7], the Declaration of Helsinki of the World Medical Association [8], and the guidelines of the Committee on Publication Ethics for reviewers [9]. The present publication continues this series.

A description of procedures answers the question of how the editorial office works. It does not answer the question of what it works with. It has remained unknown which shortcomings authors make most often, how these are distributed across the sections of a manuscript, and which of them cost authors most. The practical weight of this question is not obvious only at first sight. Every shortcoming of design costs at least one cycle of correspondence between the editorial office and the author, and the requirements explicitly name three grounds for returning a manuscript to the authors before peer review [4]. Moreover, a reviewer's attention is a limited resource: time spent on comments about keywords

and automatic lists is not spent on assessing the design of the study.

The problem of typical shortcomings of manuscripts has been studied before. An analysis of reviewers' reports on 42 manuscripts submitted to medical journals of Africa and Asia showed that shortcomings of the "Materials and Methods" section were present in 85.7% of manuscripts, of the "Discussion" section in 71.4%, of the reference list in 69.0%, and of the "Introduction" and "Results" sections in 66.7% each [10]. A scoping review of retracted publications showed that only 5% of articles described methods of data capture and management and only 11% described data availability [11]. A survey of editors-in-chief and statistical reviewers of the highest-impact journals distinguished two groups of statistical problems: errors of analysis and sampling proper, and insufficient completeness of reporting [12]. A retrospective analysis of rejected manuscripts grouped the grounds for rejection into three areas: mismatch with the journal, flaws of the manuscript itself, and ethical issues [13].

These works rest predominantly on reviewers' reports or on surveys of editors. A continuous analysis of the working files of a single editorial office over a full annual cycle, covering both reviewers' comments and editors' corrections, was not found in the available literature.

A separate circumstance of recent years has been the spread of generative artificial intelligence. Language models have been shown to be capable of fabricating bibliographic descriptions of non-existent works: the share of fabricated sources ranged from

18% to 55% depending on the model, while among the real descriptions from 24% to 43% contained substantial errors [14]. For systematic reviews the rate of erroneous references exceeded 25% [15]. The response of the scientific community has been instruments of transparent disclosure: the Generative AI Delegation Taxonomy (GAIDeT) classifies the stages of a study at which such delegation is possible and retains responsibility with the human author [16].

The aim of the study was the classification of typical shortcomings of manuscripts based on the editorial practice of three scientific journals of Kharkiv National Medical University in 2025 and the assessment of the prevalence of each category.

Materials and Methods

The general population included all articles published in 12 issues of the three journals in 2025, with the exception of covers, contents, and the requirements for manuscripts. Their distribution by journal is given in *Table 1*. In total, 116 manuscripts, or 80.6% of the general population, were analysed: 39 of 48 in *Medicine Today and Tomorrow*, 42 of 52 in *Experimental and Clinical Medicine*, and 35 of 44 in *Inter Collegas*. Coverage across the three journals is comparable and ranges from 79.5% to 81.3%. The inclusion criterion was the availability of a working file of the manuscript with recorded comments.

The data source was the comments of editors and reviewers recorded in the working files of manuscripts at various stages of preparation. The unit of observation was the manuscript rather than the individual comment, and the indicator was the proportion of manuscripts in which

at least one comment of a given category was recorded. This approach was chosen because the number of comments of one type within a manuscript depends on the length of the article and is not a meaningful characteristic of the quality of preparation.

The list of categories was formed inductively: categories were identified by the content of the comments rather than according to a predefined scheme. Categories close in nature were combined into five groups according to the part of the manuscript they concern. The first group covers the metadata and the header of the article, that is, the elements the reader sees before the main text and by which the article is indexed in scientometric databases: the title, the abstract, the keywords, the abbreviations, and the information about the authors. The second group concerns the presentation of numerical data and microtypography. The third concerns the reference list and research integrity. The fourth concerns the mandatory sections provided for by the requirements. The fifth concerns the presentation of material: tables, figures, the formulation of the aim, and the style of exposition. Shortcomings of methodology and content are considered separately from the groups, since they have a different nature of recording.

Descriptive statistics were applied. For each category, the number of manuscripts in which at least one comment of that category was recorded and its share of the sample were calculated; shares are given as percentages rounded to whole numbers, and the shares in *Tab. 1* to one decimal place. Calculations were performed in Excel 2019 (Microsoft, USA).

Table 1. Distribution of the articles of the general population by journal and issue in 2025 (abs.; %)

Journal	2025-1	2025-2	2025-3	2025-4	Total	Share, %
Medicine Today and Tomorrow	10	13	13	12	48	33.3
Experimental and Clinical Medicine	9	14	15	14	52	36.1
Inter Collegas	10	14	11	9	44	30.6
Total	29	41	39	35	144	100.0
Share, %	20.1	28.5	27.1	24.3	100.0	–

The frequencies presented should be understood as minimum estimates; the real prevalence of shortcomings is higher. There are three reasons. First, part of the comments is conveyed to authors orally and does not remain in the document. Second, part of the corrections is entered by the editorial office directly into the text, and it is impossible to account for all of them. Third, each working file records only those comments that had been formulated as of that version of the manuscript; what is revealed at the next round of revision was not included in the count. The version number of a file is not a measure of the depth of revision: it shows only how many times the file moved between the editorial office and the author.

The investigation was conducted as a private initiative of the authors, did not receive funding from grant programmes, and the topic of the study was not officially registered in the state register of scientific topics.

Research Ethics

The study involved neither patients nor laboratory animals and does not constitute medical research involving human subjects; therefore, approval by an ethics committee was not required. The material comprised published articles and working manuscript files containing personal data of authors and reviewers; accordingly, the confidentiality requirements for peer review set out in the guidelines of the Committee on Publication

Ethics [9] and the editorial policies of the university journals on adherence to ethical norms [6] were observed.

Confidentiality was ensured as follows. The content of reviewers' reports and of the working correspondence with authors is not disclosed: all generalised observations on shortcomings are presented without the names of authors, article titles, or references to specific publications. Double blinding of peer review was not compromised, since the authors of the comments are not identified. Primary data were reduced to anonymised categories, and the unit of analysis is the manuscript without attribution. Published articles cited in the text are given solely as examples of the correct implementation of individual requirements; such citation indicates neither the presence nor the absence of other comments on these manuscripts at earlier stages of preparation.

Results

The first group of shortcomings, the metadata and the header of the article, proved to be the most common. Its composition and frequencies are given in *Table 2*.

A separate remark is due on the UDC index: the editorial office checks it not only for presence but also for correspondence in content to the topic of the article, and corrects it in the event of a discrepancy. Checking by the mere fact that an index is present is insufficient.

Table 2. Prevalence of shortcomings of metadata and the header of the article

Content of the shortcoming	Share of manuscripts, %
Abstract: length outside 2,200–2,500 characters; absence of structure; presence of references to sources; presence of data absent from the text of the article; non-identity in the two languages	65
Abbreviations: absence of repeated expansion; use only once; presence in the title, the aim, the conclusions, and the titles of tables; construction of an abbreviation by the author contrary to the spelling of the term in the English-language literature; absence of an "Abbreviations" section when 10 or more abbreviations are present	58
Keywords: repetition of words of the title; number outside 3–6; the first word not from the mandatory list; non-compliance with MeSH; non-identity in the two languages	56
Information about the authors: the corresponding author is not indicated; incomplete data; translation into English for all authors instead of one; incomplete affiliations	43
Automatic lists	18
Title of the article: non-identity in the two languages; mismatch with the results; presence of abbreviations	8
The type of article does not correspond to its content	5
The UDC index is absent, erroneous, or superfluous	5

Notes: MeSH – Medical Subject Headings, the controlled vocabulary of the United States National Library of Medicine; UDC – Universal Decimal Classification.

The second group concerns the presentation of numerical data. Its frequencies are given in *Table 3*.

The last two categories deserve separate attention. A discrepancy of numerical values between parts of the article means that the same value is presented differently in the abstract and in the results, in two tables, or in the text and in a figure. Each number looks plausible in itself, and the discrepancy can be detected only by directly collating all mentions of the indicator. Errors in the recalculation of percentages are more dangerous: if shares have been calculated from different denominators or the comparison groups have been transposed, an article may assert the opposite of what its own data show. In such cases the method of the editorial office is not to ask the authors to check the calculation but to perform it independently and show the authors the result.

A separate variety is implausible values, that is, values that fall outside the physiologically possible range or contradict the reference intervals given in the article itself. They point either to an error in the units of measurement or to an incorrectly formed control group. The use of arbitrary units for dimensionless quantities belongs here as well. Mention should also be made of an error that cannot be noticed visually: the use of the Cyrillic letter "p" instead of the Latin "p" in the designation of the significance level; it occurs in most manuscripts and is corrected by the editorial office without notifying the authors.

The third group concerns the reference list and research integrity (*Table 4*).

The manifestations of misconduct are heterogeneous, and combining them into a single category is incorrect. We distinguished eight varieties. The first is that the sources do not exist: the bibliographic descriptions look plausible, but the references lead to other works or lead nowhere. The second is that the sources exist but do not support the statements for which they are adduced; this is the most common variety, and it can be detected only by a selective check of key statements containing numerical data. The

third is distortion of the data of a cited source, when an author ascribes to a real work a range or a conclusion that is not in it, and sometimes the opposite of what is there. The fourth is a technical trace of the use of generative artificial intelligence in the hyperlinks of the reference list. The fifth is manipulative presentation of data, when the same indicator is given both from the target and from the general sample in order to alter the impression of its significance. The sixth is a misinforming sample, when certain group sizes are declared while the analysis is performed on a different subsample without explanation of the selection procedure. The seventh is a statement without statistical grounding, for example a conclusion about the stability of a trend from mean values alone, without confidence intervals and an assessment of dispersion. The eighth is self-plagiarism without a reference, when a manuscript coincides with a previous publication by the same authors at the level of methodology, design, and wording, while that publication is not mentioned in the reference list.

The fourth group concerns the mandatory sections of a *manuscript* (*Table 5*).

The fifth group concerns the presentation of material and the style of exposition (*Table 6*).

Shortcomings of methodology and content are considered separately from the five groups, since they have a different nature of recording. The frequencies given in *Table 7* are minimum estimates to a greater degree than the frequencies of the preceding groups.

The incompleteness of the "Materials and Methods" section concerns above all the description of statistical methods and software, the inclusion and exclusion criteria, the procedure of allocation to groups, the justification of the sample size, the description of the equipment and the scales applied, and the indication of the topic within which the work was performed. A particular case is a discrepancy between the methods declared and those actually applied: the section lists criteria whose statistics are absent from the text, or names a criterion that does not correspond to the number of groups compared.

Table 3. Prevalence of shortcomings in the presentation of numerical data

Content of the shortcoming	Share of manuscripts, %
In aggregate: the percent sign with or without a space contrary to the language of the text; a decimal point instead of a comma in Ukrainian-language text; a differing number of decimal places within a homogeneous array; the em dash; spaces around comparison signs; inappropriate quotation marks	41
Discrepancy of numerical values between parts of the article	12
The arithmetic of percentages does not add up	10

Table 4. Prevalence of shortcomings of the reference list

Content of the shortcoming	Share of manuscripts, %
Formatting not in the Vancouver style: transliteration of titles, active hyperlinks, the full form of the DOI, Epub notations, PMCID instead of PMID, unabbreviated dates, full stops after initials, automatic numbering, an incomplete bibliographic description	48
Absence of a DOI, a PMID, or a stable address; the link does not open	26
Signs of misconduct in the sources	14
Self-citation above 10% or self-plagiarism without a reference	8
The minimum number of sources is not met	6

Table 5. Prevalence of shortcomings of the mandatory sections

Content of the shortcoming	Share of manuscripts, %
The "Research Ethics" section is absent, empty, formal, or merged with the "Materials and Methods" section	28
The sections "Funding and Acknowledgements", "Authors' Contributions", and "Declarations" are absent or replaced by a set of sections from another journal	23
The "Prospects for Further Research" section describes the significance of what has been done instead of a plan for further work	5

Table 6. Prevalence of shortcomings of the presentation of material

Content of the shortcoming	Share of manuscripts, %
Tables and figures: insufficient resolution; unlabelled axes; superfluous or omitted numbering; the full form "Figure" instead of the abbreviated one; mismatch of headings with the description in the text; absence of numerical values above the bars; notes without expansion of abbreviations; superscript marks in a table not matching the notes	48
The aim: descriptive instead of analytical; two aims instead of one; discrepancy between the text and the abstract; presence of abbreviations; expansion of the aim into a whole section	30
Synopsis-like style instead of narrative; different spellings of the same term within one article	20
Need for language editing	100

Table 7. Prevalence of shortcomings of methodology and content

Content of the shortcoming	Share of manuscripts, %
The "Materials and Methods" section is incomplete	43
Material is placed in the wrong section; results are merged with the discussion	27
Conclusions do not follow from the data presented	21
Incorrect or inconsistent statistics	20
Design flaws and contradictions in the data	19
The "Discussion" section is absent	14

Incorrect statistics has at least seven varieties. The first is the use of a paired test for a between-group comparison: the paired Student t-test and the Wilcoxon test compare values within one group and cannot be used to compare groups with each other. The second is the use of the Student test with three or more groups. The third is the use of the Kruskal–Wallis test with only two groups. The fourth is a test of the distribution for normality that has no consequences: the methods state that data with a non-normal distribution are presented as the median with quartiles, while all tables give the mean with the standard deviation. The fifth is a direct comparison of final values in groups that differed significantly at the start of the study; in such a case the correct approach is a comparison of the increments or an analysis of covariance with the baseline level as a covariate. The sixth is multiple comparisons without a correction, without an estimate of effect size, and without confidence intervals. The seventh is building a conclusion on a result with an excessively wide confidence interval, which indicates the statistical instability of the estimate.

Conclusions that do not follow from the data likewise form several types. The most common is the presentation of an identified association as causal under a correlational study design. The second is the loss of a condition: the effect is shown only in a subgroup but is formulated for the whole sample. The third is an unsupported qualifier, when a programme or method is called validated although the article contains no data on validation. The fourth is a conclusion that contradicts the article's own text.

In the published corpus of 2025 there are examples of the correct implementation of each of the requirements, and they show that none of them is unattainable. A structured abstract of the proper length with all six elements [17–24]; an "Abbreviations" section where ten or more abbreviations are present [25–28];

a reference to the Declaration of Helsinki in the current edition [29–34]; a "Research Ethics" section with the number and date of the ethics committee protocol [35–41]; a description of statistical methods with an indication of the software, its version and developer [42–49]; a description of the limitations of the study [50]; a table of authors' contributions [51–58]; a declaration on the use of generative artificial intelligence [59–66].

Working files record not only shortcomings but also the way in which authors eliminate them. The revision of an article on the features of left ventricular remodelling in trained individuals is illustrative [67]. The reviewers pointed to the absence of an indexed measure of myocardial mass, the absence of an assessment of diastolic function, the absence of data on the reproducibility of measurements, the risk of a type I error under multiple comparisons, and the absence of a description of the limitations of the study. In the published text all these comments were addressed. The table was supplemented with the left ventricular mass index with data for all three groups. An assessment of diastolic function through the ratio of early to late ventricular filling velocities was added. A description of reproducibility was provided: ten random echocardiographic recordings were re-analysed by two independent investigators, and the intraclass correlation coefficient for the key parameters exceeded 0.9. Effect sizes according to Cohen with 95% confidence intervals were given. A separate subsection on the limitations of the study with four items was added. One comment was addressed not literally but in substance: instead of a correction for multiple comparisons the authors applied one-way analysis of variance with Tukey's post hoc test and two-way analysis to assess the influence of training orientation and sex, which is a more correct solution to the same problem.

A summary of the ten most common categories is given in *Table 8*.

Table 8. The ten most common shortcomings of manuscripts

Rank	Category	Share of manuscripts, %
1	Abstract	65
2	Abbreviations	58
3	Keywords	56
4	Reference formatting	48
5	Tables and figures	48
6	Incompleteness of the "Materials and Methods" section	43
7	Information about the authors	43
8	Numbers and microtypography	41
9	The aim	30
10	The "Research Ethics" section	28

Discussion

It is appropriate to compare the frequencies obtained with data from other editorial offices, although direct comparison is complicated by differences in method.

The greatest divergence is given by the "Materials and Methods" section. According to an analysis of reviewers' reports on manuscripts submitted to medical journals of Africa and Asia, shortcomings of this section are present in 85.7% of manuscripts [10]; in our sample, in 43%. The frequencies for the "Discussion" section diverge similarly: 71.4% against 14%, and for the "Results" section: 66.7% against 27%. We do not consider that this difference reflects a higher quality of the manuscripts submitted to the university journals. A more plausible explanation lies in the data source. The cited work analysed reviewers' reports exclusively, that is, documents specifically intended for the assessment of content. Our sample covers working files at various stages, and in some of them reviewers' comments had not yet been formulated at the moment of recording. In other words, both estimates are minimum ones, but they are understated in different ways.

This observation has significance of its own. Shortcomings of content, that is, design flaws, incorrect statistics, and unsupported conclusions, are recorded predominantly by reviewers. Shortcomings of design, that is, the abstract, keywords, abbreviations, and references, are recorded predominantly by editors. Both stages look at the same manuscript and see different

things. Peer review, therefore, does not duplicate editorial proofreading and cannot be curtailed without the loss of the layer of control that editorial checking does not provide. This is consistent with the description of the reviewer's role in the university journals, where the reviewer is expected not only to identify a problem but also to verify the academic value, the interpretation, and the presentation of the study [5].

As regards the abstract, by contrast, our data agree well with the literature. A scoping review of typical shortcomings of biomedical manuscripts identified the mismatch of the abstract with the content of the article as the most common general flaw [11]. In our sample the abstract likewise occupies first place, although the composition of shortcomings is broader and includes length, structure, and non-identity in the two languages. This may indicate that the abstract is systematically underrated by authors: it is written last, often in haste, and is not reread after changes have been made to the main text.

The statistical shortcomings identified in our sample coincide with the list given by editors-in-chief and statistical reviewers of the highest-impact journals [12]. There they are grouped into two areas: errors of analysis and sampling proper, and insufficient completeness of reporting. Our seven varieties are distributed between these two areas without remainder, which indicates the universality of the problem: it is specific neither to the language of the journal nor to its level.

A retrospective analysis of 1,293 rejected submissions in another specialised journal showed that 35% of manuscripts were rejected at the editorial stage and 65% after peer review; the three most common grounds for rejection were flaws of the protocol and methodology (44%), absence of a contribution to the literature (41%), and insufficient discussion (40%) [13]. That is, most manuscripts are screened out precisely on grounds of content and precisely with the participation of reviewers, which agrees with our observation on the distribution of roles between the editor and the reviewer.

Independent confirmation is also provided by a meta-analysis of interventions in the peer review process: training of reviewers did not improve the quality of the report, and the use of a checklist did not improve the quality of the final manuscript, whereas the addition of a reviewer with statistical expertise improved it, with a standardised mean difference of 0.58 (95% CI 0.19–0.98) [68]. A systematic review of the effects of editorial peer review indicates that convincing studies of its principal effects are lacking [69], while formal reporting guidelines do not by themselves ensure the quality of a manuscript [70]. This explains why detailed requirements for design produce a result whereas general requirements for the description of methods do not: the former are verified by a formal feature, the latter require expert assessment.

Comparison with the retrospective analysis of rejected manuscripts [13] shows another limit of our study. That analysis covered manuscripts that did not reach publication and grouped the grounds for rejection into three areas, including mismatch with the journal and ethical issues. Our sample consists of manuscripts that were published, that is, of those whose shortcomings proved corrigible. The most severe cases, manuscripts rejected because of fundamental flaws of planning or because of breaches of integrity, did not enter it. The frequencies obtained therefore characterise not the flow of submitted manuscripts but the flow of accepted ones.

Separate mention is due of shortcomings that have no quantitative expression but require a particular decision from the editorial office. In the whole sample we recorded a single case in which the editorial office required not the reformulation of a text but its removal: this concerned eugenic propositions in material of a historical character. Historical context does not legitimise such content, and its publication is admissible only within a separate critical discussion. This case illustrates the limit of editorial intervention: in the overwhelming majority of situations the editorial office proposes wording, and only in the presence of anti-humanistic content does it insist on removal.

The spread of generative artificial intelligence adds to the list of shortcomings a category that did not previously exist. Since the share of fabricated bibliographic descriptions in the responses of language models reaches one half, and a substantial part of the real descriptions contains errors in the publication data [14; 15], verification of the existence of a source has ceased to be a formality. Our experience confirms that such verification must be continuous rather than selective: a manuscript with fabricated sources is outwardly indistinguishable from a conscientious one.

Our study has four limitations. First, the frequencies presented are minimum estimates for the three reasons set out in the description of the method. Second, the sample consists of published manuscripts, so the most severe cases did not enter it. Third, the list of categories was formed inductively by a single editorial office, and its reproducibility by other teams has not been tested. Fourth, the distribution of frequencies by type of article was not analysed, although the profile of shortcomings in literature reviews probably differs from that in original research.

Conclusions

Based on the editorial practice of three scientific journals of the university in 2025, a classification of typical shortcomings of manuscripts comprising five groups was constructed and the prevalence of each category was assessed on a sample of 116 manuscripts.

The most common are shortcomings of design: the abstract, abbreviations, and keywords are present in more than half of the manuscripts, and reference formatting and the presentation of tables and figures in almost half. Seven of the ten most common shortcomings can be eliminated by the author unaided, without altering any scientific statement; they testify not to the quality of the study but to the fact that the author did not consult the requirements for manuscripts. Three of them, namely automatic lists, a disrupted order of citation, and an abstract length outside the established limits, cost authors a whole cycle of revision, since they are grounds for returning a manuscript before peer review.

The second layer of shortcomings is smaller in prevalence but more costly in consequences. Incorrect statistics, a gap between the aim and the conclusions, errors in the recalculation of shares, and fabricated sources lead to a situation in which a formally impeccable article may prove unreliable. At the same time, shortcomings of design consume the limited resource of the reviewer: time spent on comments about keywords and automatic lists is not spent on assessing the design of the study.

Shortcomings of content are recorded predominantly by reviewers, and shortcomings of design predominantly by editors. Peer review does not duplicate editorial proofreading; it reveals a different layer of shortcomings, and the curtailment of this stage cannot be compensated for by strengthening editorial checking.

The spread of generative artificial intelligence in scientific work requires the university to develop its own policy on its use, which would define the admissible limits of the delegation of tasks and the procedure for their disclosure by authors.

Prospects for Further Research

The next stage envisages continuous coding of manuscripts by categories of shortcomings with the maintenance of a "manuscript $\times$ category" table, which will make it possible, after the completion of 2026, to perform a full statistical analysis of the two-year corpus: to calculate confidence intervals for the shares, to compare the

profiles of the three journals, and to test the association of shortcomings of design and of content. It is also appropriate to test the reproducibility of the proposed classification on the materials of other editorial offices and to assess the agreement of the assignment of comments to categories by different experts. The analysis of the distribution of shortcomings by type of article requires separate attention, since the profile of literature reviews probably differs from that of original research. Of practical interest is an assessment of whether the number of cycles of revision decreases after authors are specifically informed about the most common shortcomings. Finally, the development of a university policy on the use of generative artificial intelligence in scientific work is a direct applied conclusion of this work.

Declarations

There is no conflict of interest. Two of the authors of this article are co-authors of publications listed in the references as a description of editorial procedures and as an example of good practice in revision; these publications are cited in view of their direct relevance to the subject of the study.

All authors have given their consent to the publication of the article under the terms of the Creative Commons BY-NC-SA 4.0 licence and of the public agreement with the editorial office, and to the processing and publication of their personal data.

The authors declare the use of generative artificial intelligence in the course of the study and the preparation of this manuscript. In accordance with the Generative AI Delegation Taxonomy (GAIDeT, 2025) [16], under full human supervision the following tasks were delegated: analysis of the corpus of working manuscript files, formation of the list of categories of shortcomings, calculation of shares, preparation of a draft of the text, and language editing. The instrument used: Claude (Anthropic). The concept of the study, verification of the reliability of the results, interpretation, and the final editing of the text were performed by the authors. Artificial intelligence is not an author and bears no responsibility for the results; responsibility for the final manuscript rests entirely with the authors.

Funding and Acknowledgements

The investigation was conducted as a private initiative of the authors, did not receive funding from grant programmes, and the topic of the study was not officially registered in the state register of scientific topics.

Authors' Contributions

Authors \ Contribution	A	B	C	D	E	F
Nakonechna O.A.	+			+		+
Shevchenko A.S.	+	+	+	+	+	+
Danylchenko S.I.	+		+	+	+	+

Notes:

A – concept;

B – design;

C – data collection;

D – statistical processing and interpretation of data;

E – writing or critical editing of the article;

F – approval of the final version for publication and agreement to be responsible for all aspects of the work.

References

1. Nakonechna OA, Shevchenko AS, Danylchenko SI, Korneyko IV. Procedure for handling manuscripts in the scientific journals of the Kharkiv National Medical University. *Medicine Today and Tomorrow*. 2025;94(2):127-47. DOI: 10.35339/msz.2025.94.2.nsd. [In Ukrainian].
2. Nakonechna OA, Shevchenko AS, Danylchenko SI, Korneiko IV. How articles are prepared for publication in the scientific journals of the Kharkiv National Medical University. *Experimental and Clinical Medicine*. 2025;94(2):154-74. DOI: 10.35339/ekm.2025.94.2.nsd.
3. Shevchenko AS, Danylchenko SI, KhNMU. Requirements for the design of manuscripts of scientific articles of journals of the Kharkiv National Medical University (in force from 01 July 2025). *Medicine Today and Tomorrow*. 2025;94(2):162-73. DOI: 10.35339/msz.2025.94.2.nsd-appendix1.
4. Shevchenko AS, Danylchenko SI, KhNMU. Requirements for the design of manuscripts of scientific articles of journals of the Kharkiv National Medical University (in force from 2 July 2025). *Medicine Today and Tomorrow*. 2025;94(3):171-82. DOI: 10.35339/msz.2025.94.4.req.
5. Shevchenko AS. Ethical and professional requirements for the reviewer of scientific periodicals of the Kharkiv National Medical University. *Medicine Today and Tomorrow*. 2023;92(1):69-78. DOI: 10.35339/msz.2023.92.1.sha. [In Ukrainian].
6. Shevchenko AS, Danylchenko SI. Adherence to ethical norms in scientific research and publications: Generalization of editorial policies of journals of Kharkiv National Medical University. *Experimental and Clinical Medicine*. 2025;94(3):172-81. DOI: 10.35339/ekm.2025.94.3.shd. [In Ukrainian].
7. International Committee of Medical Journal Editors. Recommendations for the conduct, reporting, editing, and publication of scholarly work in medical journals. ICMJE; 2023. Available at: <http://www.icmje.org/recommendations>
8. World Medical Association. World Medical Association Declaration of Helsinki: ethical principles for medical research involving human participants. *JAMA*. 2025;333(1):71-4. DOI: 10.1001/jama.2024.21972. PMID: 39425955.
9. COPE Council. COPE ethical guidelines for peer reviewers. Version 2. 2017. 10 p. DOI: 10.24318/cope.2019.1.9.
10. Ezeala CC, Nweke IN, Ezeala MO. Common errors in manuscripts submitted to medical science journals. *Ann Med Health Sci Res*. 2013;3(3):376-9. DOI: 10.4103/2141-9248.117957. PMID: 24116317.

11. Baldridge AS, Bellinger GC, Fleming OM, Rasmussen LV, Whitley EW, Welty LJ. The epidemiology of errors in data capture, management, and analysis: a scoping review of retracted articles and retraction notices in clinical and translational research. *J Clin Transl Sci*. 2024;8:e110. DOI: 10.1017/cts.2024.533. PMID: 39655037.
12. Fernandes-Taylor S, Hyun JK, Reeder RN, Harris AH. Common statistical and research design problems in manuscripts submitted to high-impact medical journals. *BMC Res Notes*. 2011;4:304. DOI: 10.1186/1756-0500-4-304. PMID: 21854631.
13. Yanik B, Evcik D, Geler Kulcu D, Koldas Dogan S, Bardak AN, Zateri C, et al. Why do manuscripts submitted to the Turkish Journal of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation get rejected? *Turk J Phys Med Rehabil*. 2023;69(4):535-40. DOI: 10.5606/tftrd.2023.13204.
14. Walters WH, Wilder EI. Fabrication and errors in the bibliographic citations generated by ChatGPT. *Sci Rep*. 2023;13(1):14045. DOI: 10.1038/s41598-023-41032-5. PMID: 37653117.
15. Chelli M, Descamps J, Lavoue V, Trojani C, Azar M, Deckert M, et al. Hallucination rates and reference accuracy of ChatGPT and Bard for systematic reviews: comparative analysis. *J Med Internet Res*. 2024;26:e53164. DOI: 10.2196/53164. PMID: 38776130.
16. Suchikova Y, Tsybuliak N, Teixeira da Silva JA, Nazarovets S. GAIDeT (Generative AI Delegation Taxonomy): a taxonomy for humans to delegate tasks to generative artificial intelligence in scientific research and publishing. *Account Res*. 2026;33(3):2544331. DOI: 10.1080/08989621.2025.2544331. PMID: 40781729.
17. Dinets A, Lurin I, Gorobeiko M, Hoperia V, Abdalla K, Lovin A. The relationship of microscopic invasion of papillary thyroid carcinoma in patients with obesity. *Medicine Today and Tomorrow*. 2025;94(2):59-66. DOI: 10.35339/msz.2025.94.2.dlg2.
18. Sorochan P, Prokhach N, Hromakova I, Kuzmenko O, Olkhovsky D, Barannikov K. Predictors of the intensity of the inflammatory response after radiofrequency ablation of liver metastatic lesions in colorectal cancer patients. *Medicine Today and Tomorrow*. 2025;94(2):67-81. DOI: 10.35339/msz.2025.94.2.sph. [In Ukrainian].
19. Kulish SA. Comparative assessment of the physicochemical and clinical-technological properties of a new acrylic-free plastic for removable denture bases. *Medicine Today and Tomorrow*. 2025;94(3):88-98. DOI: 10.35339/msz.2025.94.3.ksa.
20. Tieroshyna IF, Vasylieva OV, Mohylka OP, Perepolkina KM. Academic maladaptation of international students: psycho-emotional disturbances, social factors, and approaches to correction (literature review) *Medicine Today and Tomorrow*. 2025;94(3):99-109. DOI: 10.35339/msz.2025.94.3.tvn.
21. Bondarenko NP, Kurochka VV, Maidannyk IV, Chorna OO, Babenko MS. A modern view of the problem of endometriosis from a genetic point of view (literature review) *Medicine Today and Tomorrow*. 2025;94(3):110-21. DOI: 10.35339/msz.2025.94.3.bkm.
22. Martynenko NM, Trotsenko OV, Nesterenko RV. Evolution of medical pedagogy in Ukrainian lands (lecture). *Medicine Today and Tomorrow*. 2025;94(3):143-56. DOI: 10.35339/msz.2025.94.3.mtr.
23. Huk AA, Yeryomenko GV. Role of nursing interventions in preventing postoperative complications. *Inter Collegas*. 2025;12(2):60-3. DOI: 10.35339/ic.2025.12.2.huk.
24. Krasovska KO, Globina NI. Importance of infection control in increasing patient safety and preventing infections during healthcare (literature review). *Inter Collegas*. 2025;12(2):64-74. DOI: 10.35339/ic.2025.12.2.krg.
25. Lebedynets PV. Content of neurotrophic factor of the brain in the blood of patients with ischemic stroke depending on the severity of the disease. *Medicine Today and Tomorrow*. 2025;94(2):17-23. DOI: 10.35339/msz.2025.94.2.lpv. [In Ukrainian].
26. Zharova IO, Antonova HP. Questionnaire-based assessment for monitoring the condition of female pole-acrobatics athletes: cluster and correlation analyses. *Inter Collegas*. 2025;12(2):6-20. DOI: 10.35339/ic.2025.12.2.zan.

27. Dunaieva IP. Liraglutide as a means of modifying cardiometabolic risk in patients with arterial hypertension and concomitant obesity. *Inter Collegas*. 2025;12(2):21-8. DOI: 10.35339/ic.2025.12.2.dun.
28. Boichenko A, Gonchar M, Shevel D, Chunikhovska E, Stepanova K. Phenotypes of persistent pulmonary hypertension in newborns (clinical observations). *Inter Collegas*. 2025;12(2):53-9. DOI: 10.35339/ic.2025.12.2.bgs.
29. Spiridonov A. Selection of a surgical treatment method for meningiomas of the superior sagittal sinus. *Medicine Today and Tomorrow*. 2025;94(2):24-31. DOI: 10.35339/msz.2025.94.2.spa. [In Ukrainian].
30. Svitlychna YuV, Lupyr AV. Correlation of the severity of olfactory disorders in predicting the severity of pneumonia caused by SARS-CoV-2. *Medicine Today and Tomorrow*. 2025;94(2):32-46. DOI: 10.35339/msz.2025.94.2.svl. [In Ukrainian].
31. Tokar PY. Comprehensive analysis of the providence of oncogynecologists in the regions of Ukraine in 2015–2020, 2022 and 2023: Resource disparities, epidemiological consequences and management challenges in counteracting cervical cancer. *Medicine Today and Tomorrow*. 2025;94(3):61-8. DOI: 10.35339/msz.2025.94.3.tok.
32. Svitlychna YV, Shushliapina NO, Lupyr AV, Bondarenko YD. Analysis of the relationship between nasal mucosa mucociliary clearance parameters and the duration and severity of nasal obstruction. *Medicine Today and Tomorrow*. 2025;94(3):69-78. DOI: 10.35339/msz.2025.94.3.ssl.
33. Ihnatieva AG, Yurchyshyn SM. Combined technique of lower eyelid reconstruction using a rotational upper eyelid flap, cartilage and mucosal grafts: a clinical case of functional and aesthetic restoration. *Medicine Today and Tomorrow*. 2025;94(3):122-30. DOI: 10.35339/msz.2025.94.3.ihy.
34. Stroiev M, Lytvinenko M, Mokriakova M, Marchenko I. Treatment and rehabilitation of a patient with multiple fractures of the lower legs and feet after blast injury: a clinical case. *Medicine Today and Tomorrow*. 2025;94(3):131-42. DOI: 10.35339/msz.2025.94.3.slm.
35. Bilyi OM, Palchyk SM, Krasnoselskyi MV, Slobodianiuk OV. Addressing key clinical issues during neoadjuvant polychemotherapy in patients with secondary-edematous breast cancer using magnetic resonance imaging. *Medicine Today and Tomorrow*. 2025;94(3):7-15. DOI: 10.35339/msz.2025.94.3.bps.
36. Oros PM, Lutz VV, Oros MM, Lutz VV, Bulecza BA. Analysis of stroke incidence depending on changes in society and the external environment according to the data of the Mukachivo Central District Hospital for the years 2019, 2020, 2023, 2024 *Medicine Today and Tomorrow*. 2025;94(3):50-60. DOI: 10.35339/msz.2025.94.3.olo.
37. Stognii A, Piatykov V. Efficacy of minimally invasive posterior interbody stabilization with distraction cages in lumbar spondylolisthesis. *Inter Collegas*. 2025;12(3):33-41. DOI: 10.35339/ic.2025.12.3.spi.
38. Panchenko MV, Honchar OM, Panchenko HY, Kitchenko IV. Peculiarities of immunological disorders and the development of complications in patients with uveitis of tuberculous etiology. *Inter Collegas*. 2025;12(3):42-8. DOI: 10.35339/ic.2025.12.3.pho.
39. Zharova IO, Antonova HP. The impact of a physical therapy algorithm on the subjective assessment of functional asymmetries in pole sports acrobats: a pilot study. *Experimental and Clinical Medicine*. 2025;94(3):7-16. DOI: 10.35339/ekm.2025.94.3.zan. [In Ukrainian].
40. Drumi DA, Polyakova SI, Artyomov OV, Lytvynenko MV, Vinner NV, Chebotarova SO, Yavorsky BI, Larson LN. Clinical and histomorphological characteristics of medium and large-sized uveal melanoma stages T1–3 after failure of organ-preserving treatment. *Experimental and Clinical Medicine*. 2025;94(3):77-86. DOI: 10.35339/ekm.2025.94.3.dpa. [In Ukrainian].
41. Lisovskyi RR, Mokrov K.O. Assessment of structural parameters of muscle tissue in wounded military with sarcopenia and consequences of transtibial amputation under the influence of physical therapy. *Experimental and Clinical Medicine*. 2025;94(3):98-110. DOI: 10.35339/ekm.2025.94.3.lim. [In Ukrainian].

42. Dunaieva IP. Mathematical modeling of the risk of cardiometabolic comorbidity development: a multi-biomarker approach. *Experimental and Clinical Medicine*. 2025;94(2):17-25. DOI: 10.35339/ekm.2025.94.2.dun. [In Ukrainian].
43. Kovalyova OM, Zhuravlyova AK, Ivanchenko SV. Clinical aspects of dilated cardiomyopathy. *Experimental and Clinical Medicine*. 2025;94(2):26-40. DOI: 10.35339/ekm.2025.94.2.kzi. [In Ukrainian].
44. Solovei S, Barabanov O. Using motor imagery for movement intention detection in individuals with limb motor function impairments (literature review). *Experimental and Clinical Medicine*. 2025;94(2):55-65. DOI: 10.35339/ekm.2025.94.2.sob. [In Ukrainian].
45. Dinets A, Lurin I, Gorobeiko M, Hoperia V, Abdalla K, Lovin A. The relationship of papillary thyroid carcinoma size with overweight or obesity. *Experimental and Clinical Medicine*. 2025;94(2):97-104. DOI: 10.35339/ekm.2025.94.2.dlg.
46. Svitlychna YuV, Shushliapina NO. Diagnostic and prognostic significance of clinical blood parameters in patients with olfactory disorders in SARS-CoV-2-associated pneumonia. *Experimental and Clinical Medicine*. 2025;94(2):105–115. DOI: 10.35339/ekm.2025.94.2.svs. [In Ukrainian].
47. Dinets A, Lurin I, Gorobeiko M, Hoperia V, Abdalla K, Lovin A. Association of overweight and obesity with papillary thyroid carcinoma. *Inter Collegas*. 2025;12(2):80-4. DOI: 10.35339/ic.2025.12.2.dlg.
48. Hryhoruk VV, Davidenko DA. Statistical characteristics of groups of elderly patients with gonarthrosis against the background of overweight or obesity. *Inter Collegas*. 2025;12(2):85-9. DOI: 10.35339/ic.2025.12.2.hrd.
49. Pryima N, Bezditko T. Dynamics of cardiovascular diseases among Kharkiv residents during the war in 2022 and 2023. *Inter Collegas*. 2025;12(2):90-5. DOI: 10.35339/ic.2025.12.2.prb.
50. Lebedynets PV, Tovazhnyanska OL. The physical and chemical state of blood leukocyte membranes in patients with acute ischemic stroke depends on the severity of the disease. *Experimental and Clinical Medicine*. 2025;94(2):79-88. DOI: 10.35339/ekm.2025.94.2.let. [In Ukrainian].
51. Tokar P.Yu. Regional disparities in staffing and the qualification index of gynecologic oncologists in Ukraine: statistical portrait and human resource development scenarios (2015–2020, 2022–2024). *Experimental and Clinical Medicine*. 2025;94(3):17-26. DOI: 10.35339/ekm.2025.94.3.tpy.
52. Oros MM, Bulecza, BA. The mental state of internally displaced persons during wartime: a study of depressive, anxiety, and post-traumatic symptoms. *Experimental and Clinical Medicine*. 2025;94(3):37-48. DOI: 10.35339/ekm.2025.94.3.orb. [In Ukrainian].
53. Savielieva NM, Shelest MYe. The relationship between serum galectin-3 levels and dysglycaemia in comorbid cardiometabolic pathology depending on heart failure phenotypes. *Experimental and Clinical Medicine*. 2025;94(3):49-59. DOI: 10.35339/ekm.2025.94.3.ssh. [In Ukrainian].
54. Kubrak MA, Zavgorodniy SM, Danilyk MB, Bachurin AV. Perioperative changes in the health status of patients with acute bowel obstruction of tumor genesis. *Experimental and Clinical Medicine*. 2025;94(3):60-8. DOI: 10.35339/ekm.2025.94.3.kzd. [In Ukrainian].
55. Aravitska MG, Lapkovskiy EY, Sheremeta LM, Mykhailiuk IO, Ostapyak ZM. Effectiveness of a physical therapy program on the manifestations of asthenia and cancer-related fatigue in patients with the consequences of oncologic knee joint endoprosthesis replacement. *Experimental and Clinical Medicine*. 2025;94(3):69-76. DOI: 10.35339/ekm.2025.94.3.als. [In Ukrainian].
56. Dukhovych DV, Semchuk NO, Ilnytskyi NR. Effectiveness of physical therapy interventions for the correction of unilateral spatial neglect in older adults after stroke. *Experimental and Clinical Medicine*. 2025;94(3):87-97. DOI: 10.35339/ekm.2025.94.3.dsi. [In Ukrainian].
57. Biletska OM, Latohuz SI, Garyachiy YeV. Adaptive role of the thyroid system and iodine in low triiodothyronine syndrome: clinical significance and rehabilitation strategies (literature review, part 1). *Experimental and Clinical Medicine*. 2025;94(3):111-27. DOI: 10.35339/ekm.2025.94.3.blg. [In Ukrainian].

58. Usevych IA, Oleshko VF, Kovalyuk TV, Maidannyk IV, Rossovska MYe. Rethinking the prevention of preeclampsia in the context of contemporary concepts of pathogenesis (literature review) *Experimental and Clinical Medicine*. 2025;94(3):128-50. DOI: 10.35339/ekm.2025.94.3.uok. [In Ukrainian].
59. Shushliapina NO, Kalashnyk-Vakulenko YM, Bondarenko YD. Symptomatic treatment of dysosmia in rhinological pathology of functional and viral (SARS-CoV-2) origin. *Inter Collegas*. 2025;12(3):26-32. DOI: 10.35339/ic.2025.12.3.skb.
60. Gonchar MO, Omelchenko OV, Kulikova KT, Shestopalova DD, Sukhorukova AO. Assessment of the quality of life in children with irritable bowel syndrome under social stress in Ukraine (pilot study). *Inter Collegas*. 2025;12(3):61-6. DOI: 10.35339/ic.2025.12.3.gok.
61. Ashcheulova TV, Herasymchuk NM, Ambrosova TM, Kochubiei OA, Herasymchuk US. Cardiovascular-kidney-metabolic syndrome (literature review). *Inter Collegas*. 2025;12(3):67-76. DOI: 10.35339/ic.2025.12.3.aha.
62. Romanenko H. The use of positron emission tomography and computed tomography with 18F-fluorodeoxyglucose as a selection criterion for surgical treatment in children with drug-resistant epilepsy (literature review). *Inter Collegas*. 2025;12(3):77-82. DOI: 10.35339/ic.2025.12.3.roh.
63. Oros MM, Lutz VV, Bulecza BA. Creutzfeldt-Jakob Disease (clinical case). *Inter Collegas*. 2025;12(3):83-7. DOI: 10.35339/ic.2025.12.3.olb.
64. Martynenko NM, Trotsenko OV, Nesterenko RV. Traditional public communities in Ukraine (lecture). *Inter Collegas*. 2025;12(3):88-97. DOI: 10.35339/ic.2025.12.3.mtn.
65. Samoilov YL, Hnatiuk VV Morphological study of the gastroprotective effect of a new tablet pharmaceutical composition based on a dry extract of *Acorus calamus* leaves with quercetin. *Medicine Today and Tomorrow*. 2025;94(3):31-49. DOI: 10.35339/msz.2025.94.3.sah.
66. Naguliak H. Regenerative cosmetology in dermatological practice: the use of exosomes and growth factors in skin regeneration. *Medicine Today and Tomorrow*. 2025;94(3):79-87. DOI: 10.35339/msz.2025.94.3.nhi.
67. Burdina VR, Danylchenko SI, Golovchenko IV, Morozenko DV, Shevchenko AS, Cherkova NV, Dushik LN. Features of left ventricular remodeling in trained individuals depending on the orientation of the training process. *Inter Collegas*. 2025;12(4):10p. In press. DOI: 10.35339/ic.2025.12.4.bdg.
68. Bruce R, Chauvin A, Trinquart L, Ravaud P, Boutron I. Impact of interventions to improve the quality of peer review of biomedical journals: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *BMC Med*. 2016;14:85. DOI: 10.1186/s12916-016-0631-5. PMID: 27287500.
69. Jefferson T, Rudin M, Brodney Folse S, Davidoff F. Editorial peer review for improving the quality of reports of biomedical studies. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2007;(2):MR000016. DOI: 10.1002/14651858.MR000016.pub3. PMID: 17443635.
70. Schulz KF, Altman DG, Moher D; CONSORT Group. CONSORT 2010 statement: updated guidelines for reporting parallel group randomised trials. *BMJ*. 2010;340:c332. DOI: 10.1136/bmj.c332. PMID: 20332509.

Наконежна О.А., Шевченко О.С., Данильченко С.І.

ТИПОВІ ПОМИЛКИ АВТОРІВ РУКОПИСІВ МЕДИЧНИХ НАУКОВИХ ЖУРНАЛІВ ХАРКІВСЬКОГО НАЦІОНАЛЬНОГО МЕДИЧНОГО УНІВЕРСИТЕТУ: АНАЛІЗ РЕДАКЦІЙНОЇ ПРАКТИКИ 2025 РОКУ

Актуальність. Редакція наукових журналів Харківського національного медичного університету описала власні процедури роботи з рукописами, вимоги до їх оформлення та етичні норми для рецензентів. Залишалося невідомим, яких саме недоліків автори припускаються найчастіше та як вони розподіляються за розділами рукопису.

Мета. Класифікувати типові недоліки рукописів за матеріалами редакційної практики трьох журналів університету за 2025 рік та оцінити поширеність кожної категорії.

Матеріали та методи. Генеральна сукупність – 144 статті, опубліковані у 12 номерах трьох журналів університету за 2025 рік. З них проаналізовано 116 рукописів, або 80,6 % річного обсягу. Джерелом даних були зауваження редакторів і рецензентів у робочих файлах. Показником була частка рукописів зі щонайменше одним зауваженням певної категорії. Частки обчислено в Excel 2019 (Microsoft, США). Дослідження проведено як приватна ініціатива авторів, без грантового фінансування, а тема не була зареєстрована в державному реєстрі наукових тем.

Етика дослідження. Дослідження не передбачало участі пацієнтів чи лабораторних тварин, тому схвалення етичного комітету не потребувало. Матеріалом були опубліковані статті та робочі файли, що містять персональні дані авторів і рецензентів, тому дотримано вимог щодо конфіденційності рецензування: відгуки не розкриваються, а спостереження наведено без імен авторів і назв статей.

Результати. Найпоширенішими виявилися недоліки анотації (65 %), аббревіатур (58 %) та ключових слів (56 %), далі – оформлення джерел і подання таблиць та рисунків (по 48 %), неповнота «Матеріалів і методів» та відомостей про авторів (по 43 %), мікротипографіка (41 %), мета (30 %), етика дослідження (28 %). Другий пласт становлять недоліки змісту: матеріал не в тому розділі (27 %), необґрунтовані висновки (21 %), некоректна статистика (20 %), вади дизайну (19 %). Усі рукописи потребували мовного редагування.

Висновки. Мету дослідження досягнуто. Побудовано класифікацію з п'яти груп і оцінено поширеність кожної категорії. Сім із десяти найпоширеніших недоліків автор здатний усунути самостійно, не змінюючи жодного наукового твердження. Частоти є мінімальними оцінками. Змістові недоліки фіксуються переважно рецензентами, а не редакторами, що робить рецензування самостійною, а не дублювальною ланкою підготовки рукопису.

Ключові слова: публікаційна етика, подвійне засліплене рецензування, академічна доброчесність, оформлення статей, редакційна практика, наукова періодика.

Received: 10 Jun 2026.

Accepted: 29 Sep 2026.

Published: 30 Sep 2026.

Information about the Authors

Nakonechna Oksana A. – MD, DMEdSc, Professor, Vice-Rector for Research of Kharkiv National Medical University, Ukraine; Editor-in-Chief of the scientific journal "Medicine Today and Tomorrow"; Member of the Editorial Board of the scientific journal "Experimental and Clinical Medicine".

Postal Address: 4, Nauky ave., Kharkiv, 61022, Ukraine.

E-mail: oa.nakonechna@knmu.edu.ua

ORCID: 0000-0002-2614-1587.

Shevchenko Alexander S. – MD, MM,E&P, Editorial Coordinator of the Scientific Periodicals of Kharkiv National Medical University, Ukraine.

Postal Address: 4, Nauky ave., Kharkiv, 61022, Ukraine.

E-mail: as.shevchenko@knmu.edu.ua

ORCID: 0000-0002-4291-3882.

Danylchenko Svitlana I. – MD, PhD, Docent, Editor of the Scientific Periodicals of Kharkiv National Medical University, Ukraine; Member of the Editorial Board of the scientific journal "Experimental and Clinical Medicine".

Postal Address: 4, Nauky ave., Kharkiv, 61022, Ukraine.

E-mail: si.danylchenko@knmu.edu.ua

ORCID: 0000-0001-5312-0231.