similarity_report 2025-09-29T11:48:41+00:00

Plagiarism Report

MPS Limited

Document Details

Submission ID
trn:oid:::2945:20655590

Submission Date
Sep 29, 2025, 5:17 PM GMT+5:30

Download Date
Sep 29, 2025, 5:19 PM GMT+5:30

File Name
PlagiarismReport.docx

File Size
31.2 KB

4 Pages

1,383 Words

7,228 Characters

34% Overall Similarity

The combined total of all matches, including overlapping sources, for each database.

Match Groups

- **8** Not Cited or Quoted 24%
  Matches with neither in-text citation nor quotation marks
- **1** Missing Quotations 4%
  Matches that are still very similar to source material
- **3** Missing Citation 6%
  Matches that have quotation marks, but no in-text citation
- **0** Cited and Quoted 0%
  Matches with in-text citation present, but no quotation marks

Top Sources

- 34% Internet sources
- 11% Publications
- 0% Submitted works (Student Papers)

Integrity Flags

0 Integrity Flags for Review

Our system's algorithms look deeply at a document for any inconsistencies that would set it apart from a normal submission. If we notice something strange, we flag it for you to review.

A Flag is not necessarily an indicator of a problem. However, we'd recommend you focus your attention there for further review.

Match Groups

- **8** Not Cited or Quoted 24%
  Matches with neither in-text citation nor quotation marks
- **1** Missing Quotations 4%
  Matches that are still very similar to source material
- **3** Missing Citation 6%
  Matches that have quotation marks, but no in-text citation
- **0** Cited and Quoted 0%
  Matches with in-text citation present, but no quotation marks

Top Sources

- 34% Internet sources
- 11% Publications
- 0% Submitted works (Student Papers)

Top Sources

The sources with the highest number of matches within the submission. Overlapping sources will not be displayed.

1 Internet

intl.molbiolcell.org **24%**

2 Internet

www.jove.com **6%**

3 Internet

www.pubmedcentral.nih.gov **3%**

ArcArticle iThenticate

By **Kim Yasutis**

Title: A mock manuscript for the purpose of showing how to read an iThenticate report.

ABSTRACT

Most of this document will contain dummy text, which will be used to represent non-plagiarized work. In some places, illustrative examples have been placed in the manuscript to show representative examples of text that overlaps (i.e., is plagiarized) or is similar to previously published work. For exam° the following sentence was cofld verbatim from a manuscript published by Yasutis et al., (2000) in Molecular Biology of the Cell. "We identified a conserved domain in the C-terminus of Zds2p consisting of amino acids 813-912 (hereafter referred to as ZH4 for gds homology 4) that is required for regulation of Sweip-dependent polarized bud growth." Most of the "plagiarized" text, unless otherwise attributed, will come from that manuscript. THE REST OF THIS ABSTRACT IS DUMMY TEXT SO THAT THE iTHENTICATE PROGRAM DOES NOT FLAG IT AS PLAGIARIZED.

INTRODUCTION

This is the dummy text for the introduction section. It is tempting, when setting up the background information for your manuscript, to use the exact or similar wording of articles that you have read during your research. However, this practice should be avoided as it is considered plagiarism. For ample, the following 2 sentences are directly copied from the manuscript mentioned in the abstract. <Among the cell cycle mechanisms that regulate the progression of these events are checkpoints that arrest or retard the cell cycle when activated in response to cellular damage or perturbation. The entry into mitosis, for example, is regulated by a checkpoint at GUM that is a key DNA damage and cell size surveillance step>. As you can see, this text is correctly flagged by the iThenticate system as being highly similar to a previously published text. If you would like to convey this information in your manuscript, a best practice is to revise the concept in your own words AND ensure that you have referenced the manuscript in which you found the intellectual information (the primary source would be best). For example, this text could be rewritten as follows: <Checkpoints regulate progression of the cell cycle by arresting cells in response to damage or other perturbing events (Reference Author Name, Year)>. While less common in the sciences, it may be necessary to provide a quote from previously published text verbatim. At which point, quotation marks should be used and the proper reference should also be given, as in the following example, "There is nothing either good or bad, but thinking makes it so" (Shakespeare's Hamlet).

The rest of the Introduction is either gibberish or text derived from (Yasutis et al., 2000). THIS PART OF THE TEXT IS MEANT TO BE REPEATED GIBBERISH SO THAT THE ITHENTICATE PROGRAM DOES NOT FLAG IT AS OVERLAPPING TEXT. THIS PART OF THE TEXT IS COMPLETELY FAKE AND MEANT TO BE GIBBERISH 50 THAT THE ITHENTICATE PROGRAM DOES NOT FLAG IT AS OVERLAPPING TEXT. THIS PART OF THE TEXT IS COMPLETELY FAKE AND MEANT TO BE GIBBERISH SO THAT THE

ITHENTICATE PROGRAM DOES NOT FLAG IT AS OVERLAPPING TEXT. THIS PART OF THE TEXT IS COMPLETELY FAKE AND MEANT TO BE. GIBBERISH SO THAT THE ITHENTICATE PROGRAM DOES NOT FLAG IT AS OVERLAPPING TEXT. "Although recent work has revealed that the DNA replication checkpoint controlled by Rad53p crosstalks with the G2/M checkpoint (Enserink et al., 2006)." The S. cerevisiae G2/M checkpoint is active in cells that fail to form a bud, leading to the idea that it is a bud morphogenesis checkpoint (Lew and Reed, 1995).1

The following is from Yasutis et a102013) published in Cell Cycle. Its purpose is to add similarity to this document for iThenticate to flag. Misregulation of mitotic entry can often lead to oncogenesis or cell death. Recent research has focused on discovering the signaling pathways that feed into the core checkpoint control mechanisms dependent on Cdk and PP2A. Herein, we review the conserved mechanisms of the G2/M transition, including recently discovered upstream signaling pathways that link cell growth and DNA replication to cell cycle progression. Critical consideration of the human, frog and yeast models of mitotic entry frame unresolved and emerging questions in this field, providing a prediction of signaling molecules and pathways yet.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The methods section is a common place to find text with high similarity. Many journals have slightly relaxed standards for what is considered plagiarism in the methods section as it is often very difficult to accurately describe a commonly used technique in different ways. Even so, care should be taken to ensure proper attribution and not simply copying the text from previous manuscripts, en your own. For example, the following text in a new manuscript would be considered plagiarism' ast strains and plasmids used in this study are listed in Tables 1 and 2. Yeast were grown at 25°C unless indicated otherwise. S. cerevisiae of the 5288C background were grown in rich medium (YPID) or in synthetic complete medium (SC) lacking a specific amino acid or uracil (Sherman et al., 1986). Strains of the BF264-15DU background (used in GAL induction experiments) were grown as described below. All yeast media contained 2% glucose as a carbon source unless otherwise specified. Yeast transformations were performed as in Kozminski et al. (2006)." even though it comes from a paper that I have written previously. A best practice in this case would be for me to say that we followed a previously described method, give the reference, and add text that describes any deviations from that method.

The following is an example of text that would likely be considered to be fine, even though it is highly similar to previously published text, because it describes a very common procedure_ Western blots were washed three time frith TBS containing 0.1% (vol/vol) Tween 20 (Sigma-Aldrich) for 15 min. Prima antibodies were used at room temperature overnight at 1:1000 dilution. Secondary antibodies were used at room temperature for 30 min at 1:5000 dilution. Blots were incubated with Su perSignal for 5 min and then exposed to film.

RESULTS

The results section should be the region with the lowest amount of text that is similar to previously published works. Text that overlaps with previous publications in this section is looked at with even more suspicion than in any other section, although the Conclusion and Abstract sections come at a close second. As an example, the following text found in a new manuscript would likely flag the manuscript for desk rejection and, possibly, banning from the journal because it clearly describes results that have already been published. 'Using a degenerate PCR approach, we introduced random mutations in ZDS2 between codons 821 and 906 and screened, on the basis of colony size, a zds1 strain background, for alleles that confer a growth defect at 37°C. We found in this study that one allele identified in the screen, zds2-3R863H,V868A, had a temperature-dependent bud morphology phenotype. At 25°C, zds1 zds2-3 cells formed buds with a wild-type morphology.'

DISCUSSION

The discussion, like the introduction, is a place where many authors accidentally (or deliberately) reuse text from previously published manuscripts (either their own or another author's). Neither self-plagiarism nor plagiarism of other authors is generally considered to be acceptable to a journal. An additional thing to note is that it is generally not considered to be acceptable to "rephrase" a plagiarized sentence by merely dropping in a few synonyms, and the iThenticate system will generally catch these attempts as well. For example, consider the following sentence: "The paralogs ZDS1 and ZDS2 negatively regulate the Swe1p-dependent G2/M checkpoint and CDC55, which encodes a regulatory subunit of PP2A, is required for this regulation.", which iThenticate correctly highlights as previously published material. An ethical journal would expect an author to revise this sentence in their own words (as well as reference the original article to ensure that the original author received attribution credit for their work). The following would be a poor attempt at this revision: "ZDS1 and ZDS2 negatively modulates the Swe1p-necessary G2/M checkpoint and CDC55, a regulatory subunit of PP2A, is needed for this regulation." A better revision would be as follows: Yasutis et al. (2000) showed that ZDS1 and ZDS2 are negative regulators of Swe1p and that the PP2A regulatory subunit CDC55 plays a key role in this regulation.