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1. Introduction: “the problem outline”

There are many Open Access Journals which publish papers and ask a fee for that [named APC (Article Processing Charge) or a similar acronym]. They are classified as “*Predatory publishing, sometimes called write-only publishing[[](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Predatory_publishing%22%20%5Cl%20%22cite_note-1) or deceptive publishing*” (from Wikipedia); “*they are regarded as predatory because scholars are tricked into publishing with them, although some authors may be aware that the journal is poor quality or even fraudulent*” (from Wikipedia), “*According to one study, 60% of articles published in predatory journals receive no citations over the five-year period following publication*” (from Wikipedia),

This last statement is important because many researchers use *citations of papers and books as index of the Quality of the methods given in those papers and books*: according to the author this is a very BAD attitude, because citations depend many times on the readers that are unable to evaluate the scientificity of the ideas given in the papers [39-116]. On the contrary, they should use the correct (*Scientific*) way to analyse the data and make decisions about the methods suggested.

Unfortunately, Universities generate the need of publishing papers, because they ask for publications to become professors. This author had the opportunity to analyse many of those papers and many times when he asked to the applicants (for professorship) “Why did you write such a statement…” he received the reply either “My colleague wrote that,,,” or “I found it in Wikipedia” or “I read it in that book…”: in spite of their incompetence, they were promoted to become professors!

See this from A. Einstein who wrote, in his last years of life: *«An Academic career poses a person in an embarrassing position, asking him to produce a great number of scientific publications; only strong personalities can resist to this seduction toward the superficiality… I am very grateful to Marcel Grossmann if I had the fortune not to be in this hard position.»*

The author met several professors who wrote wrong papers and were teaching wrong ideas to their students, using wrong books. [10-24]

Another wrong attitude is found on the web: Open Access Journals are criticised because they are “means for tricking people” (asking fees for publishing papers). For example, for Science Publishing Group, they say either [1] ′′*Science Publishing Group is another scam Open Access journal publisher or academic vanity press.....* *the journals put out by the Science Publishing Group are not read by scientists and have no impact factor.*′′ or [2] ′′*They will distribute it globally and pretend it is real research, for a fee. It’s untrue? And parts are plagiarized? They’re fine with that. Welcome to the world of science scams, a fast-growing business that sucks money out of research, undermines genuine scientific knowledge, and provides fake credentials for the desperate.*′′

In my opinion, the bad quality of the paper published does not depend on the *fee*, asked by the OA Publishers (OAP), but on the very low quality of the *authors* and of the *Peer Reviewers*; the same happens for ′′well reputed and trusted magazines and journals′′ [see the long bibliography of Fausto Galetto].

Due to that, the author stated the SPQR Principle [«*Semper Paratus ad Qualitatem et Rationem* (′′Always Ready for Quality and Rationality′′)»] as the way to analyse papers and books [112]; it seems that very few people have been taking care of Quality of Methods. To the author knowledge, they are Deming, Juran, Gell-Mann, Shewhart [3-8]. Fausto Galetto would like to know somebody else who did that... It is not surprising that professors, researcher, managers, scholars and students learn wrong ideas, in the Quality field, BECAUSE we have a very widespread book with many wrong concepts {e.g., D. C. Montgomery falls in *contradiction*! He spreads wrong concept on Quality [9, 10]}. Is Wiley & Sons an OAP (Open Access Publisher)? *See the Formula 1 Race in Bahrain* (*December 6 2020*): Bottas 4 pt., Russell 3 pt., Vettel 0 pt., Leclerc 0 pt.: Mercedes had lower “quality” than Ferrari!!!

The Quality Engineering Group (QEG, comprising several professors) of a University suggests the Montgomery books to students; therefore it is not a surprise that the case analysed in [112] has various problems [11, 12]. In the web you can find: ««*Welcome to the website of the* ***Quality Engineering Group****. ... The research group ... deals with research areas related to Quality Engineering. In particular current research interests are in the areas of Statistical Process Control, Service Quality Management and Industrial Metrology. The group is working also on Bibliometrics and Performance Indicators. This website was created with the goal of promoting the research activities carried out by the group*.»» ***Fantastic...*** See Ref.

QEG members think that *Bibliometrics* is very important for quality of papers.... See § 7 and the References (Galetto papers)

You can find the drawbacks of *Bibliometrics* in the F. Galetto paper [97] ′′Bibliometrics: Help or Hoax for Quality? (there you some ideas of QEG!!!).

In the paper [112] we analysed a case taken from a QEG book [32] (published by Springer-Verlag London; is that an OAP?); it was a very interesting application of DOE (Design Of Experiments) to Large-Scale Metrology settings. There we did not have the data; that was a situation where many times a reader is: the *conclusions* of the authors are given and the reader must ′′Take it or leave it′′, *without any possibility of verifying them*! It is the same in [33, a QEG paper] (IEEE Trans Instrum Meas is OAP?)

The wrong documents [from 9 to 31] are not published by OAP (Open Access Publishers): the publishers do not ask the fee to the authors, they ask the fee to the readers! As for OAP the Quality of the documents depends on the authors....You see that in the papers [111] *Six Sigma Hoax: The Way Professionals Deceive Science*, and [112] *The SPQR (*«*Semper Paratus ad Qualitatem et Rationem*»*) Principle in Action*.

In order not to be cheated, the only way left to the reader is to use his own intelligence together with the SPQR Principle...

Readers **do** apply SPQR to understand clearly the issue, remembering the Quality Tetralogy that must be in the mind of every Scholar…. (see figure 1)

The present paper (as many others of this author, in References) is offered to Managers, to Students (aiming at becoming Future Managers), to Young Researchers (aiming at becoming Scientific Researchers), to Scholars (aiming at learning Scientific ideas), and to Professors who want to learn the BASICS of Decisions based on the Scientific Analysis of problems and solutions in order to make Quality Decisions in their work of practical Research, Theoretical Research and Management.

It aims at showing in some detail the several aspects related to Management of Quality and Problems Solving, because only good methods are crucial for suitable decision taking. Decision-making is something which concerns everybody, both as maker of the decision (after either a serious or non-serious analysis) and as sufferer of the decision of other people (as well, after either a serious or non-serious analysis by them).

Often we need data to decide: we analyse them to decide and we must take into account the consequences of our decisions; unfortunately always the data are affected by variability (they are uncertain to us) and therefore we need to consider uncertainties in detail and introduce them into the analysis for “*decision-making under uncertainty*”.

The worst thing a reader may encounter is when he does not have the data to analyse: many situations are like that!

R. Levi, Professor Emeritus and S. Rossetto, Dean of the Fourth School of Engineering of Politecnico di Torino, Italy) [both appreciated the Montgomery book..., as done by the QEG members, who teach the following formula (with wrong attached statement)

====== ***MEDITATE*** ===SPQR===**ΙΧΣ**====****



!!!] *QEG fellows suggest Montgomery books to students [!!!] BUT they do not know that* the previous formula DOES NOT depend on the Central Limit Theorem!!!!!!! (as any good student knows!!!).

===========================****

*The negative considerations [1, 2] on the Open Access Publishers (OAP) are valid also for other publishers*: see several F. Galetto papers e.g, “Comment on: 'New Practical Bayes Estimators for the 2-parameters Weibull distribution, *IEEE Transactions on Reliability vol.37*, 1988”, “(1989) Quality of methods for quality is important, *EOQC Conference*, Vienna”, “(1990) Basic and managerial concerns on Taguchi Methods, *ISATA*, Florence”, “Managerial Issues for Design of Experiments, *4th AMST 96*, Udine, 1996”, “Quality Education on Quality for Future Managers, *1st* *Conference on TQM for HEI* (*Higher Education Institutions*), Tolone, 1998”, “Quality Function Deployment, Some Managerial Concerns, *AITEM99*, Brescia, 1999”, “Quality Education for Professors teaching Quality to Future Managers, *3rd Conf. on TQM for HEI*, Derby, UK, 2000”, “Quality, Bayes Methods and Control Charts, 2nd ICME 2000 Conference, Capri, 2000”, “Looking for Quality in "quality books", 4th Conf. on TQM for HEI, Mons, Belgium, 2001”, Galetto, F., Quality and Control Carts: Managerial assessment during Product Development and Production Process, AT&T (Society of Automotive Engineers), Barcelona, 200”, “Fuzzy Logic and Control Charts, 3rd ICME 2002 Conference, Ischia, 2002”, “Analysis of "new" control charts for Quality assessment, 5th Conf. on TQM for HEI, Lisbon, Portugal, 2002”, “Quality and “quality magazines”, 6th Conf. on TQM for HEI, Oviedo, Spain, 2003”, “Statistics for Quality and “quality magazines”, 5th ENBIS, Newcastle, 2005”, “Service Quality: Fuzzy Logic and Yager Method; a scientific analysis, IFIP TC 7, Politecnico di Torino, 2005”, “Fuzzy Logic and Quality Control: a scientific analysis, IPSI 2006, Amalfi, 2006”, “Does "Peer Review" assure Quality of papers and Education?, 8th Conf. on TQM for HEI, Paisley, Scotland, 2006”, “The Pentalogy, VIPSI, Belgrado, 2009”, “The Pentalogy Beyond, 9th Conf. on TQM for HEI, Verona, 2010”.

J. Juran highlighted the content of the paper “(1989) ′′Quality of methods for quality is important′′, *EOQC Conference*, Vienna”,

**2.** **A first case of a Non-OAP paper**

We wrote in the previous section the statement ′′*Therefore the negative considerations [1, 2] on the Open Access Publishers are valid also for other publishers*: see several F. Galetto papers ....′′.

We prove here that Non-Open Access Publishers (NOAP) have the same problems of the OAP: the cause is the incompetence of the authors and of the Peer Reviewers (Referees). For many years, Galetto’s papers proved that.

Here we consider only the first of two of them: both are related to the Quality Engineering Group of Turin Politecnico... I invited them many times to be scientific... without any success!

According to prof. F. Franceschini [a member of QEG!], papers published in *Trusted Quality Magazines* are, by definition, good papers: many times that is not true.

The papers considered were **found by chance while looking for other papers and for other ideas**.

Let's stand-back a bit and meditate, starting from a managerial point of view, using *published documents (found in magazines used by managers and professionals, and suggested to students)*, and analysing them using the SPQR Principle.

We start with the paper "Learning curves and p-charts for a preliminary estimation of asymptotic performances of a manufacturing process" [*Total Quality Management* Franceschini F. (2002)]. Franceschini suggests [as the QEG does] Montgomery book to his students and the data (non-conformity) he uses in the paper are from the Montgomery book; 30 samples (with 50 sample size) and 24 samples are used: [surely *Total Quality Management* is a journal of NOAP (of a Non-Open Access Publisher)]

The same author is an author of [126]…

Considering all the samples one finds the following Control Chart (figure 3, taken from Montgomery book)

The QEG member F. Franceschini, cheated by the data, decided to interpolate the data with a curve whose equation was p=a/t + c; the coefficients are estimated by the formulae

$\hat{a}=\frac{\overbar{p\_{1}}-\overbar{p\_{2}}}{^{1}/\_{\overbar{t\_{1}}}-^{1}/\_{\overbar{t\_{2}}}}$ and $\hat{c}= \overbar{p\_{1}}-\hat{a}/\overbar{t\_{1}}$

with variance



and



The “barred” values are the means of the defective proportions; $\overbar{p\_{1}} $with suffix 1 is the mean computed from the 1st 30 samples, while $\overbar{p\_{2}}$ with suffix 2 is the mean computed from the 2nd 24 samples!!!! Therefore we have ***only*** two values for the proportion p (the mean of the nonconformity proportion of the 1st 30 samples and the mean of the nonconformity proportion of the 2nd 24 samples) and ***only*** two mean values for the time t (of the 1st 30 samples and of the 2nd 24 samples): the estimates of the parameters ′′a′′ and ′′c′′ are easily found. Since there are 30 proportions pi for the 1st 30 samples and 24 proportions pi for the 2nd 24 samples we can ′′accept′′ (by the Central Limit Theorem) that the two “estimators” of two mean proportions are normally distributed.

From that, any sensible researcher (who knows the Basics of Statistics) can compute the Confidence Intervals (CI) of the parameters estimates.

The QEG member F. Franceschini ***did not*** compute them!

IF he had computed the CI (assuming normal distribution) he would have found that the value 0 belongs to both of them: therefore, according to Franceschini formulae, *the parameters estimates are not significantly different from 0*!!!

Therefore, pretending that the formula **p=a/t + c** provides the asymptotic defectiveness is **nonsense**: the QEG member F. Franceschini did not realise that.... Look at the figure 4 with 40 more samples... that show QEG nonsense!!! It is taken from the Montgomery book.

Do you agree that the QEG fellow was wrong?

The referee of the paper could not find what students can find. If you look at the future data (given in Montgomery book) you find different results … [see the figure 4]

Would it be better, on the contrary, to **put SPQR in action?**

′′Quality of Quality Methods is important′′ (F. Galetto), as it was appreciated by J. Juran at Vienna EOQC Conference!

Since *Total Quality Management* is surely a *trusted* journal of a Non-Open Access Publisher it is clear that Quality of papers depends on the authors and not on the publishers.

Therefore it is not true that only “*Predatory publishing,… because scholars are tricked into publishing with them, although some authors may be aware that the journal is poor quality or even fraudulent*” (from Wikipedia), provide their readers with poor quality papers!!!

**3.** **A second case of a non OAP paper**

QEG member have been very active on Control Charts; they invented firstly the “*Qualitometro I method* (1998) *… in order to evaluate and check on-line service quality*” because “*there is now a strong need for proper evaluation tools”*, [Franceschini, Romano, Rossetto, 1998-1999-2000]. Later (1999 and 2000) it was presented and discussed “*a new proposal for data processing that enhances elaboration capabilities of Qualitometro I. This new procedure, named Qualitometro II, is able to manage information given by customers on linguistic scales, without any arbitrary and artificial conversion of collected data. Collecting and treating data by means of the Qualitometro II eases this process providing a method for performing elaboration closer to customers fuzzy thoughts. … Qualitometro II method can be interpreted as a Group Decision Support Tool for service quality design/redesign … able to handle information expressed on linguistic scales, without any artificial numeric scalarization.*” Hence they introduce a “*new instrument that can fulfil the formal properties of a linguistic scale and allow for the expression of the variety in the decisional logic of the evaluator. … The fuzzy operator that is used allows for this flexibility in the decision logic.*” (underlinement is due to F. Galetto). In 2005 QEG member invented the *Qualitometro III method* in papers related to ′′Ordered Samples Control Charts for Ordinal Variables′′ (*Quality and Reliability Engineering International*)... They write: “*The paper presents a new method for statistical process control when ordinal variables are involved. This is the case of a quality characteristic evaluated by on ordinal scale. The method allows a statistical analysis without exploiting an arbitrary numerical conversion of scale levels and without using the traditional sample synthesis operators (sample mean and variance). It consist of different approach based on the use of a new sample scale obtained by ordering the original variable sample space according to some specific ‘dominance criteria’ fixed on the basis of the monitored process characteristics. Samples are directly reported on the chart and no distributional shape is assumed for the population (universe) of evaluations*”.

It very interesting to notice that some students of Turin Politecnico, L. Perri (2002), E. Mori (2006) and J. Baucino (2008) found the drawbacks of fuzzy sets in control charts for services and other Control Charts [in books and papers]: using those rules for analysing the process behaviour one can find that they provide at least 20% out of control events for random data (which are by definition) "uniformly distributed" on the scale points: such data must be "in control" by definition!!! (F. Galetto 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005, L. Perri 2002)

It is clear that there is something wrong in the way of using fuzzy sets in control charts for services.

There is not space for showing how much wrong are the fuzzy ideas applied to Quality. [see References]

We only mention that those wrong ideas come from Yager (1981) "A new methodology for ordinal multiobjective decision based on fuzzy sets", where he invented a method to avoid the "*tyranny of numbers*" because "*… forcing the decision maker to supply information with greater precision than he is capable of providing. This may lead to incorrect answers…*".

Quality Engineering, International Journal Of Production Research and Decision Sciences, Information and Control, Inf. Science, Quality and Reliability Engineering International are surely ***trusted*** journals published by Non\_Open Access Publishers.

Nevertheless they published wrong papers.

QEG authors think that *citations of papers and books is an index of the Quality of the methods given in those papers and books*: according to the author this is a very BAD attitude. On the contrary they should use the correct (*Scientific*) way to analyse the data and make decisions about the methods suggested.

It is natural that those (authors) professors teach wrong ideas to their students. [126]

Compare the F. Galetto findings opposite to what it is found in the web where Open Access Journals are criticized because they are “means for tricking people” (asking fees for publishing papers).

It is very clear that the bad quality of the papers published do not depend on the *fee*, asked by the OA Publishers (OAP), but on the very low quality of the *authors* and of the *Peer Reviewers*; the same happens for ′′well reputed and trusted magazines and journals′′ [from 85 to 95, 126].

**4.** **Control Charts with exponentially distributed data. MINITAB wrong**

This part is originated by the inability of “experts” participating to the author post at site iSixSigma [113]: <https://www.isixsigma.com/topic/control-charts-non-normal-distribution> related to control charts; the author wrote: “*I would like to get solution to the cases shown in the file. THANKS in advance. Fausto Galetto, with the attachment: [ISIXSIGMA-INSIGHTS\_Two-cases-for-Master-Black-Belts-dec-2019.docx](https://www.isixsigma.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/12/ISIXSIGMA-INSIGHTS_Two-cases-for-Master-Black-Belts-dec-2019.docx%22%20%5Co%20%22ISIXSIGMA-INSIGHTS_Two-cases-for-Master-Black-Belts-dec-2019.docx)*”

The cases were related to control charts where the *data are exponentially distributed*. The first of the two was taken from the book of D. C. Montgomery *Introduction to Statistical Quality Control*; the author knew about that since 1996; Montgomery dealt it wrongly in all the later editions of the book.

The discussants at the post did not wanted to accept that the Montgomery’s solution was wrong because he finds that the process is in control, when actually the process is Out Of Control; they raised the fact that F. Galetto had to write a paper and publish it in a “Good Journal”, after being “Peer Reviewed”. One of them suggested using the Minitab Software and using the “*T Charts*”, assuming that T Charts are the good method to deal with “rare events”. At that point the author found that Minitab “*T Charts*” were ***wrong***.

The author informed of the problem the discussants and Minitab Inc. State College, Pennsylvania; Minitab Inc. was asked to provide the theory of the wrong T Carts.

After several e-mails exchanged with Minitab Inc. we had the following conclusion (for MINITAB19):

*From MINITAB:*

1. *Discussing the topic of the theory behind the T charts are not covered by our free technical support,*
2. *and I would refer you to consult with your favourite statistician*
3. *or you can pay us for tutoring through our [Statistical Consulting](http://www.minitab.com/en-us/training/statistical-consulting/%22%20%5Ct%20%22_blank) service.* (**pay for** a Wrong Method!!!)

to which the author replied (…***same problem Minitab20!***):

1. *KEEP YOUR WRONG METHODS!*
2. *AND SELL TO YOUR CUSTOMERS WITH ERRORS.....*
3. *AND MAKE THEM "TAKE WRONG DECISIONS"*

One of the discussants suggested to read the paper [114] and wrote: *Joel Smith has a good paper on t charts Control charts for Nonnormal data are well documented…* [114]

Unfortunately, that paper “Peer Reviewed” and written by Minitab Inc. authors has wrong formulae for the Control Limits of the T Charts.

Again the discussants at the post did not wanted to accept that the Joel Smith (statistician at Minitab Inc.) paper had wrong formulae for the T Chart limits and again challenged Fausto Galetto to write a paper and publish it in a “Good (Trusted) Journal”, after being “Peer Reviewed”.

Then, here we are.

We ask the reader to get the basic ideas about the Shewhart Control Charts and the Individual Control Charts [7, 8]; moreover the basic ideas about the RIT (Reliability Integral Theory) [102-108] which is able to find the correct control limits of charts with exponentially distributed data; thirdly we will see some applications dealt wrongly in the literature and the right ones dealt with RIT: RIT was devised by the author in 1975 (45 years ago) well before the T Charts invention.

Ignorance is flooding and overflowing (due to incompetent professionals)!!!

In order to deal with the problems mentioned, we consider a case found as Example 7.6 in the Montgomery book 7th edition, Wiley & Sons; he writes “*A chemical engineer wants to set up a control chart for monitoring the occurrence of failures of an important valve. She has decided to use the number of hours between failures as the variable to monitor*”. Here are the data (exponentially distributed), named *lifetime*; (we used Minitab 19 to see the arising problems):

Since the data are few (20) and exponentially distributed one cannot use the usual formulae based on the Normal distribution. If one would [wrongly] do use formulae he would find the following figure 5

Montgomery, copying from Nelson, decided to transform the data from the Exponential distribution to the Weibull distribution and considered the transformed data as Normally distributed; so he used the usual formulae for the control limits (figure 6):

From figure 6, Professor Montgomery that the “Process is In Control”: he is in error, as we will see.

The same type of error is provided by MINITAB, with its T Charts. Another wrong method, publicized by E. Santiago, J. Smith in their wrong paper “Control charts based on the Exponential Distribution, Quality Engineering, 25:2, 85-96”.

Certainly Quality Engineering is a reputed and trusted Journal, “Peer Reviewed”… that publishes wrong papers…

Notice the qualifications of the authors.

E. Santiago is a technical training specialist and J. Smith is a statistician: they are working at Minitab, Inc.; both have good qualifications. The paper was Peer Reviewed with this acknowledgement: “*The authors thank Dr. W. H. Woodall, whose comments and careful examination of the article greatly improved our presentation. We also thank two anonymous referees whose comments helped to improve our presentation.*”

So this is the situation we are confronted with: qualified authors, one qualified reader (*Dr. Woodall*), qualified Referees and several other qualified readers.

None of them found that the paper *has WRONG Formulae for the Control Limits!*

These “wrong formulae are used by Minitab”, as well!

The authors did not pay any APC (Article Processing Charge) to a “*Predatory Journal*” with “*poor quality or even fraudulent*” and with the risk of “*According to one study, 60% of articles published in predatory journals receive no citations over the five-year period following publication*”.

Was their paper good? NO!

As a matter of fact, using RIT [102-108], one finds that the “Process is Out Of Control”; see figure 8 and 9. The green horizontal line (in figure 8 with logarithmic scales) intercepts the ordinate axis at the Mean of the data; the abscissas of the points of interceptions of the green horizontal line with the Upper and Lower lines are the Lower and Upper Control Limits of the T Chart.

Moreover the Ranges are “Out Of Control”: they too are Exponentially distributed (see figure 9)! [104, 105]

In the figure 9 the points (data) below the Lower Control Limit indicate “***Process Out Of Control***”!

Other reputed authors Kittlitz, Schilling, Nelson, Woodall, Xie, Goh, Kuralmani, Ranjan, Zhang, published in other **trusted Journal**s and ***made the same errors*** [115-123]: *Journal of Quality Technology, Kluwer Academic Publisher, Reliability Engineering & System Safety, chapter 16 in the book Engineering Statistics (Pham Editor): Springer-Verlag, International Journal of Production Research, IIE Transactions, Computers and Industrial Engineering.*

Reader, what is ***your honest conclusion***?

**5.** **Estimation from Incomplete Samples**

Often, in the Reliability Test (and field), we have “INCOMPLETE samples” of data: we have time to failure data and data (named *suspensions*) related to NON\_failed items.

RIT provides the solution for estimating the MTTF, the failure rate, the Reliability, …

GENERALLY the Statistics books do not consider the case of “INCOMPLETE samples”; they consider and provide only formulae for the “COMPLETE samples” (in the reliability field, all the data refer to failures).

Many and many professors do not know the Reliability theory, EVEN THOUGH they teach Reliability.

To grasp the reality, LOOK at this exam exercise the author used to give to his student: it is taken from a reliability book (3 incompetent [Italian] authors!!!! in the References) and refers to a reliability test where the time to failure distribution is assumed NORMAL!!!! Do not mind about the Italian language: It is translated for you. Macchina di prova=item on test, Tempo al guasto (ore)= Time To Failure (hours). 40 TTF are collected: the sample is complete (all the item failed). THREE incompetent professors say



[translation: **If some of items do not fail it is not possible to use that datum. This generates data that cannot be considered but that in any case generate experimental costs**]

***The THREE SUPER\_incompetent professors are highly rated in the so called <<<scientific community>>>!!!!!!***

Here is the Exam Exercise:

***=====Esercizio n. 12* MOLTO ISTRUTTIVO** ***relativo ad un libro sull’Affidabilità di 3 BMWisti***.Analyse the data of reliability tests …: THREE incompetent professors say, ***proving their whole IGNORANCE (they say that if some items do not fail by the end of the test the***  **“suspended items” can NOT be considered in the computations)**

**YOU suppose that the test is truncated at 400 h: estimate the MTTF, WITHOUT neglecting the “suspended items”.** (the data are time to failure: data > 400 must be considered as non\_failed at 400) ***BMWisti means ….***



**Poor students** cheated and deceived by the professors they met and to be met….! **YOU are guilty, because you do not use your brain! "Can you be better than the great professorSSSSSSS?"**

***Excerpt 1*** *(An exam exercise given by Galetto to his students)*

Obviously the students could not be as stupid as those professors, to pass the test! Is so good one of the 3 authors **Director of the Master on ****, met at the SIX SIGMA lessons?’ **HE** knows and teaches **wrong ideas. *Nevertheless*** he is …. PhD, Visiting Prof. at MIT, author of 9 books, Master Black Belt, …., director of a Master on ******, …, Winner of the G. Taguchi Award on Robust Engineering, ….

LET’S HOPE that all those incompetent professors will consider their duty to teach **scientifically**, in order to satisfy the learning need of their students and of the whole society. See Deming, Gell-Mann, Galetto Fausto (figure 1), …

Is there any Quality in wrong teaching?

Teaching must be scientific for future managers, as Deming, Gell-Mann and Galetto say (figure 1).

If those three incompetent prof. had studied the Theory they should have found the books about RIT and then …

**6. Open Access versus Non-Open Access**

We wrote previously the statement ′′*Therefore the negative considerations [1, 2] on the Open Access Publishers are valid also for other publishers*: see several F. Galetto papers ....′′. See References.

We proved that NOAP (Non-Open Access Publishers) have the same problems of the OAP: the cause is the incompetence of the authors and of the Peer Reviewers (Referees). All the F. Galetto papers proved that, for many years. It has been very clear that the bad quality of the papers published do not depend on the *fee*, asked by the OA Publishers (OAP), but on the very low quality of the *authors* and of the *Peer Reviewers*; the same happens for ′′well reputed magazines and journals′′ [from 85 to 95, 126].

**Inspection Plan with wrong detection** [126] (from a QEG article in Research Gate): the author read the formula, about a random variable X the mean value **E(X)**=p**β** where

1. “**p** is the probability that a product is REALLY defective”
2. “**α** is the probability that a product REALLY ***NON\_defective*** is WRONGLY detected as *defective*”
3. “**β** is the probability that a product REALLY ***defective*** is WRONGLY detected as ***NON\_defective***”

In my opinion, **E(X)** cannot be the above formula.

What do the Research Gate experts think? *NO answer*!

[126] ′′Uncertainty evaluation in the prediction of defects and costs for quality inspection planning in low-volume productions′′, *The International Journal of Advanced Manufacturing Technology (2020) 108:3793–3805*

Now it is evident the title of this paper: *Quality of papers stems from authors and Quality of teaching stems from professors*.

**7. Conclusion (using SPQR)**

We showed that, using Logic, Science and the SPQR Principle, we can understand if a ′′proposed method′′ is to be used or it must be refused.

While attending (as an ′′intelligent pupil′′) a Post-Graduate University course on DOE (2001), provided by ′′*Montgomery fans*′′ (someone of the QEG was teaching there!) Fausto Galetto had the opportunity to experience the incapability of teaching ′′scientifically′′ the matter they were dealing; at that time the author invented the *Disquality Vicious Circle* ′′Presumption-Ignorance-Presumption- Ignorance′′ because the lecturers were unable to teach ′′scientifically′′... (Figure 11, published on 2008).

The author, for many years, with papers in many Conferences [34-101, 111], and with several books [102-110], tried to diffuse the idea that decision-making has to be based on Scientific Methods. See also [124, 125: from a. to gg., 126] in Academia.edu and Research Gate.

He thinks that the readers (Professors, Managers, Researchers, Scholars) must stay with STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics), i.e. LOGIC to prevent and avoid DISquality! (see the Quality Tetralogy[104-112])

Since "*Quality of Methods for Quality is important*" [50] and there are methods misleading (e.g. Taguchi Methods, Bayes Methods, ...) it is better that MANAGERS, Students, Researchers, professors and sholars BE EDUCATED ON QUALITY**,** always thinking to Deming statements from his very good book *Out of Crisis.*

 *Experience alone, without theory, teaches management nothing about what to do to improve quality and competitive position, nor how to do it. (pag. 19)*

 *It is a hazard to copy. It is necessary to understand the theory of what one wishes to do or to make. (pag. 129)*

 ***The result is that hundreds of people are learning what is wrong.*** *(pag. 131)*

 ***I make this statement on the basis of experience, seeing every day the devastating effects of incompetent teaching and faulty applications.*** *(pag. 131)*

There are two fundamental principles to use fully the thinking ability of people:

**F1** Reality does exist in spite of human beings' willingness and ability to recognize it.

**F2** Variation is in everything and everywhere, all the time.

From F2 we derive that «“variation” is NOT the enemy of Quality», as several “intelligent (are they ????)” people say! Variation is in every phenomenon and is important: **if life was developing for millions of years that was merit of the VARIATION!** The sons of relatives have more problems than the sons of NON\_relatives… **[Biodiversity](https://www.greenfacts.org/glossary/abc/biodiversity.htm) is the foundation of [ecosystems](https://www.greenfacts.org/glossary/def/ecosystem-services.htm) to which human [well-being](https://www.greenfacts.org/glossary/wxyz/well-being.htm) is intimately linked.**

Every “FG’s opinion” is based on this long experience in the Quality Field: *they are not only opinions, they are hard facts*. See the figures and the papers: Fausto Galetto, during the “students’ defence of their final thesis” (to get their degree in Engineering), used to open the written thesis at a “random” page and to ask the future graduate what he meant with some statements found in there. From 90% to 98% of the students did not know how to provide any answer to the questions: moreover, 50%-60% said “*I copied it from the web!*” That was not the biggest problem: it always astonished me the fact that the *(Professors) Referees of the theses did not know the matter/answer themselves*! These are *hard facts*, not opinions; the same facts were found by Deming and Gell-Mann…, and Einstein…

SPQR was used by Galileo Galilei and by the great scientist Isaac Newton when he said “*If I have seen farther than others, it is because I have stood on the shoulders of giants*”; the process of Science is such that the discoveries of one people generation serve for the next one, by knowledge accumulation. A. Einstein did the same. This is true for any discipline (e.g. Logic, Mathematics, Physics, Probability, Statistics, Medicine, Economics, Reliability…): any building needs *sound foundations*.

When using other people words (like those of Newton, Galilei, Einstein, Deming, Gell-Mann…) the author tries to show that very great scholars have been providing correct hints to the readers in order to help them increasing their knowledge…

The Knowledge-Making process and the Knowledge itself must have Quality got through Quality Tools and Methods; this is depicted in the figure 12, *Quality Tools and Quality Methods to avoid the Disquality*.

Notice that figures 10, 11, 12 were completely disregarded by QEG when they, based on an idea by Kosmulski, who (2011) proposed to classify a paper as “successful” when receiving more citations than those made; they decided (in their paper “An informetric model for the success-index” appeared on *Scientometrics*, 2012) to propose to classify a publication as “successful” when it receives more citations than a specific comparison term (*CT*). In the intention of the QEG authors *CT* should be a suitable estimate of the number of citations that a publication – in a certain scientific context and period of time – should potentially achieve. According to this definition, the *success*-index is defined as the number of successful papers, among a group of publications examined, such as those associated to a scientist or a journal. QEG gave particular emphasis to a theoretical sensitivity analysis of the *success*-index (s-index). See [126] and think…

The F. Galetto paper [97] shows the many drawbacks of this QEG attitude.

This shows that the Open Access Publishers are not the problem: the problems are generated by incompetent authors even though when they go to “good (so called!) publishers”...

Other cases are found in Research Gate documents listed, after [125, 126], from a. to gg. (for the interested reader)…

Any sensible Scholar must take into account that the Scientific Attitude provides good results, using the SPQR Principle.

Doing that any serious scholar can see the drawbacks both of Open Access Publishers (OAP) and Non-Open Access Publishers (NOAP): the bad quality of the paper published does not depend on the *fee*, asked by the OA Publishers (OAP), but on the very low quality of the *authors* and of the *Peer Reviewers*; the same happens for ′′well reputed magazines and journals′′ (NOAP).

We saw that several NOAP Journal published papers of the Quality Engineering Group (QEG, comprising several professors suggesting the Montgomery books to students; therefore it is not a surprise that the case we analyse here has various problems [11, 12, 126]). QEG advertises: ««*Welcome to the website of the* ***Quality Engineering Group****. ... The research group ... deals with research areas related to Quality Engineering. In particular current research interests are in the areas of Statistical Process Control, Service Quality Management and Industrial Metrology. The group is working also on Bibliometrics and Performance Indicators. This website was created with the goal of promoting the research activities carried out by the group*.»» Fantastic... See Ref.

Remember Deming, Juran, Gell-Mann, Shewhart [3-8] and A. Einstein who wrote: *«An Academic career poses a person in an embarrassing position, asking him to produce a great number of scientific publications; only strong personalities can resist to this seduction toward the superficiality… I am very grateful to Marcel Grossmann if I had the fortune not to be in this hard position.»* It is not surprising that professors, researcher, managers, scholars and students learn wrong ideas, in the Quality field, BECAUSE we have a very widespread book with many wrong concepts {e.g., D. C. Montgomery falls in *contradiction*! He spreads wrong concept on Quality [9, 10, 11, 13]}. Is the publisher Wiley & Sons an OAP?

We think that all the relevant concept about Quality are embodied in the following figure (13)

εQ conveys the idea that Quality must be considered in every place, every activity and every time with IO and GE (ideas of Galilei and Einstein).

Every scholar must change his mind ($μετα'νοια$, metanoia is a word of Deming) to devise good methods ($με^{'}ϑοδος$) as in the following permanent sequence

$$⇒ μετα^{'}νοια⇒με^{'}ϑοδος ⇒ μετα^{'}νοια⇒$$

$$⇒με^{'}ϑοδος⇒ μετα^{'}νοια⇒με^{'}ϑοδος ⇒$$

Why professors do not follow it?
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