Additional file 3 | Examples of category of problems

Academic or ethical violation (69.82%)

Example 3.1:	"*After a thorough investigation we have strong reason to believe that the peer review process was compromised."* – Likely fraudulent peer review
Example 3.2:	"*This article is one of a series of very similar meta-analyses written by different authors that were published in 2014 and 2015, … The articles have the same structure, with the figures in the same order. The appearance of the figures and parts of the text are also similar.*" – Likely plagiarism
Example 3.3:	"*In addition, we checked the original files submitted by the authors and found that the files were edited by MedChina, a company previously alleged to be involved in the sale of articles...*" – Likely ghost authorship

Methodological flaw (42.60%)

Example 1.1:	*"...parameters in the meta-analysis software were set incorrectly, leading to misleading data plots and erroneous conclusions regarding group differences.*" – Faulty analysis
Example 1.2:	"*The article states in the Methods section that the analysis was done on adult in-hospital patients. However, the studies analyzed used outpatient cohorts.*" – Inappropriate pooling (involve both in-hospital patients and outpatients)
Example 1.3:	"*After publication of this article…, concerns were raised about aspects of the methods applied and whether the included studies adhered to the reported inclusion and exclusion criteria...*" – Methodological flaw and problems in evidence selection

Writing or reporting problems (11.24%)

Example 2.1:	"*The retraction has been agreed because the article is not yet ready for publication and an early version without revisions was published in error*." – Premature version
Example 2.2:	"*The article inappropriately mentions other cancers and genes, including gastric cancer in the abstract and "breast cancer" and "IFN-γ gene" in Figure 1 in the eligibility exclusion box, whereas the article is about diabetic nephropathy (DN) and VEGF.*" – Errors in reporting
Example 2.3:	"*We also found that the authors note there is publication bias, but they do not account for this in their analysis or discussion.*" – Missing in reporting