

SOFTWARE

IMAGETWIN

24.07.2023

I confess that [I worked together](#) with the founder of [ImageTwin](#) some years ago, even encouraging him to found a company. I would have even been interested in a further collaboration but unfortunately the company has cut all ties.

Should we really pay now 25€ for testing a single PDF?

The screenshot shows a pricing table for the 'One Time Plan'. It features three columns representing different scan packages. Each column has a dark blue header with the number of scans, a white price box with the total price and per-scan cost, and a green button to purchase the package. Below the table, there is a red dotted line and the text 'price list 2023'.

Plan	Scans	Total Price	Price per Scan
1 Scan*	1	€ 25 ⁰⁰	€ 25.00 per Scan
10 Scans*	10	€ 175 ⁰⁰	€ 17.50 per Scan
20 Scans*	20	€ 250 ⁰⁰	€ 12.50 per Scan

price list 2023

My proposal in 2020 was to build an academic community with ImageTwin's [keypoint matching](#) approach. AI analysis and image depository would be a nice along with more comprehensive reports than just drawing boxes around duplicated image areas.

A [research paper](#) by new ImageTwin collaborators now finds

Duplicated images in research articles erode integrity and credibility of biomedical science. Forensic software is necessary to detect figures with inappropriately duplicated images. This analysis reveals a significant issue of inappropriate image duplication in our field.

Unfortunately the authors of this paper are missing the integrity nomenclature [flagging on-ly images that are expected to look similar](#).

Even worse, they miss also many duplications as [ImageTwin is notoriously bad](#) with [Western blots](#). Sadly, this paper erodes the credibility of forensic image analysis.

Oct 4, 2023

The story continues. Instead of working on a [well defined data set](#) and determining sensitivity, specificity, etc. of the ImageTwin approach, another preprint ([bioRxiv, Scholar](#)) shows that

Toxicology Reports published 715 papers containing relevant images, and 115 of these papers contained inappropriate duplications (16%). Screening papers with the use of ImageTwin.ai increased the number of inappropriate duplications detected, with 41 of the 115 being missed during the manual screen and subsequently detected with the aid of the software.

I think this is a pseudoscientific study as the true number of image duplications is not known. We cannot no more verify what ImageTwin does as it is behind a paywall contradicting basic scientific principles. The accompanying [news report by Anil Oza](#) makes it even worse.

It is just wrong that the software is “working at two to three times David’s speed” – it is 20 times faster but giving also numerous false positives. It is wrong that “Patrick Starke is one of its developers”(Starke is a sales person not a developer). So at the end, the Oza news report is just a PR stunt as confirmed on Twitter on the next day



imagetwin @ImageTwinAI · Oct 5



Thank you @AnilOza16 for covering a topic as important as scientific integrity and mentioning us.

We appreciate that our software has been valuable and impactful and we continue our work to bring in more improvements.

[#researchintegrity](#) [#publishing](#)

<https://twitter.com/ImageTwinAI/status/1709842276929728610>

Unfortunately ImageTwin has now been fallen back into the same league as [Acuna et al.](#) Not unexpected, Science Magazine [has choosen Proofig](#) for image testing, despite the nice [groupshot](#) of Starke and some other image sleuths.

CC-BY-NC Science Surf , accessed 30.03.2026, [click to save as PDF](#)
