

Nanopublication – AI-fabricated citations exposing peer review's failure and journal profit incentives

by Arnaud Quercy

This is a news/discussion piece about AI-fabricated citations, fraudulent academic papers, peer-review failure, and journal publishing economics; the ideamorphism framework's vocabulary (emission, ouverture, codex, diffraction, transliteration) addresses artistic idea-transmission and has nothing to say about citation fraud, detection systems, or publisher incentive structures.

DECLINED – NO-PURCHASE [1]

PROPOSITIONAL GRID [2]

Read this grid. “Not evaluated” does **not** mean the source has nothing to say about that proposition. It means **the reading did not instruct it**. That is not a result, and it counts in no denominator. A silence, by contrast, is a finding: the reading touched the proposition without concluding, or noted its absence itself.

Not evaluated (37) – P1, P2, P3, P3a, P4, P5, P6, P7, P8, P9, P10, P11, P12, P13, P14, P14a, P14b, P15, P16, P16a, P17, P18, P18a, P19, P19a, P20, P21, P22, P23, P24, P25, P26, P27, P28, P29, P30, P31

Overall verdict: DECLINED:no-purchase – taxonomy of the August 2026 pass, predating the move to relational verdicts. Kept as metadata: the gap between the two forms is data, not residue. This reading’s judgement is in the grid above.

Reading of 2026-07-21 · model claude-sonnet-5 · source 48,146 chars · 1 attempt(s)

FIRST PASS – KEPT AS WRITTEN

Reading produced by the T50 RSS pass, before the boundary lens. It is reproduced UNCORRECTED. Keeping it is the point: without it, a changed title is just a changed title – with it, what the second pass refused becomes legible.

Title it carried : « AI Flooding Academic Journals and the Dilution of Epistemic Diffraction »

This is a structural case of the DILUTION CRISIS. Academic journals are designed as ouvertures for peer diffraction – each submis-

sion should pass through reviewers' epistemic frameworks and generate new understanding. Machine-generated papers with false affiliations and incoherent content are emissions that produce zero diffraction: they pass through the system unaltered (or rejected wholesale), creating no creation in the receiver. The platform (journal submission) becomes a dilution engine: maximum emission (thousands of garbage submissions), minimum diffraction (none). The codex of academic rigor – the intentional invariant that makes peer review meaningful – is erased. What remains is recognition-only: accept or reject. The manifesto's warning applies precisely: 'More art than ever. Less creation than ever.' Here: more papers than ever. Less knowledge than ever.

T50 RSS assessment · 2026-07-21 · remplacée par boundary-lens-2026-08

REFERENCES

[1] A Scene from the AI Flooding of Academic Journals. Daily Nous, 2026-07-21. <https://dailynous.com/2026/07/20/a-scene-from-the-ai-flooding-of-academic-journals/>

[2] Quercy, A. (2026). The 31 Propositions of Ideamorphism. <https://ideamorphism.org/en/publications/2026/03/the-31-propositions-of-ideamorphism.html>

EPISTEMIC PROFILE

Claim type	boundary reading
Voice	third person analysis
Epistemic status	no purchase
Methodology	Boundary-finding lens applied to one source, model claude-sonnet-5, 1 attempt(s), traceability check passed.

CHECKSUM (SHA-256)

97eeb21747365e1066263db226a626a43e3b6e0b24010c36ac85d54b762bb3d7

Licensed under Creative Commons Attribution 4.0

International (CC BY 4.0)

Author Arnaud Quercy

Asset code IDS-RNI0075

Identifier NAN-RDG000131

Version 1

Published 2026-08-05

ISSN: applied for – U.S. ISSN Center, Library of Congress

© 2026 Ideamorphic Studies

Published by Art Quam Anima Publishing New York,
an assumed name of AQA Publishing LLC

c/o Northwest Registered Agent, 418 Broadway Ste N
Albany, NY 12207, USA
+1 917-764-5470

NY DOS ID 7624376 · Assumed Name ID 7658709

publishing.artquamanima.com

Last updated: 2026-08-15

Persistent URI: <https://ideamorphism.org/en/nanopubs/2026/08/IDS-RNI0075-ai-fabricated-citations-exposing-peer-reviews-failure-and-jo.pdf>