Appearances can be deceiving

How to avoid “predatory” publishers

Michelle Dalton
Scholarly Communications Librarian, UCD Library

@mishdalton
orcid.org/0000-0001-5551-3565
“An *exploitative* open-access academic publishing business model that involves charging publication fees to authors *without* providing the editorial and publishing services associated with legitimate journals”

Source: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Predatory_open_access_publishing
“Predatory journals are driven by self-interest, usually financial, at the expense of scholarship”

• False or misleading information
• Deviation from best editorial & publication practices
• Aggressive, indiscriminate solicitation
• Lack of transparency

https://www.nature.com/articles/d41586-019-03759-y
Why “predatory”? 

• Deceptive / illegitimate / fraudulent may be more representative terms than “predatory”

• But “predatory” publishing seems to be in the mainstream now 😞
Beall’s List?

• “Blacklist” approach problematic

• What is “predatory” can be subjective

• “Predatory” behaviour can be a continuum rather than binary good/bad

Instead, critically evaluate the credentials of all publishers
Description

*Journal of Health Science* is an international, scholarly peer-reviewed journal (print and online) published bi-monthly by David Publishing Company, USA, since 2013. The journal publishes articles, reviews, etc., on any issues from the broadest range of Health Science traditions and that cross disciplinary boundaries, through which it tries to provide the latest information on developments in Health Science, and each issue is striving to bring you critical perspectives and cogent analyses. The journal is published in English. The e-journal provides free and open access to all of its content on our Website. Accepted papers will immediately appear online followed by the printed in hard copy.

Current columns namely

Nutrition and Dietetics, Epidemiology and Public Health, Disaster Management, Physiology and Counselling, Health Psychology and Behavior, Health and Rehabilitation, Exercise and Nutrition Sciences, Nursing Practice and Health Care, Health Policies and Administrations, Health Informatics, Environmental and Occupational Health. Community Heal/P>

*Journal of Health Science* is to be indexed in:

- InfoBase Index
- ★Universe Digital Library Sdn Bhd (UDLSB), Malaysia
- ★China National Knowledge Infrastructure (CNKI), China
- ★American Federal Computer Library Center (OCLC), USA
- ★Google scholar
- ★Academic Keys
- ★CiteFactor, USA
- ★J-Gate
- ★Electronic Journals Library (EZB), Germany
- ★getCITED
- ★Newjour
- ★Scientific Indexing Services
- ★CrossRef Search

Now, IBI Factor of Journal of Health Science for the year 2015 is 3.46, as rated by InfoBase Index.

2014 points in Polska Bibliografia Naukowa (PBN) are 3.
Rubrics & Checklists
Choose the right journal for your research
Reference this list for your chosen journal to check if it is trusted.

- Do you or your colleagues know the journal?
  - Have you read any articles in the journal before?
  - Is it easy to discover the latest papers in the journal?

- Can you easily identify and contact the publisher?
  - Is the publisher name clearly displayed on the journal website?
  - Can you contact the publisher by telephone, email, and post?

- Is the journal clear about the type of peer review it uses?

- Are articles indexed in services that you use?

- Is it clear what fees will be charged?
  - Does the journal site explain what these fees are for and when they will be charged?
Check List

Organizers & Sponsors

- Are you aware of the society or the association organizing this conference?
- Can you easily identify the venue of the conference?
- Is it the first time this conference has been held?
- Have you or your colleagues attended this conference before?
- Is it clear what fees will be charged (conference fee, registration fees, ...) and if these will be waived if you are accepted as a speaker?
- Are any sponsors involved in the conference?
- Are you aware of any of them, especially with industry-related fields such as Engineering & Biomedical research?
- Did you check the conference website? Can you find all the information presented in a proper way such as the attendance fees, submission date, conference date, editorial committee, program details, venue?
- Have you read any papers from this conference proceedings before?

Agenda & Editorial Committee

- Is there clear information about the timeline and the agenda for the conference?
- Do the scope and objectives of the conference fit your field and core interest or not?
- Have you heard of the Keynote speakers?
- Is the Editorial Committee listed on the website?
- Have you heard of the Editorial Committee members before?
- Is the Committee clear about the editorial control over presentations and the type of peer-review it uses?

Conference Proceedings

- Is the Organizing Committee clear about where the proceedings will be published?
- Does the conference make it clear which indexing services it can guarantee published proceedings and to which indexers it will submit the proceedings for evaluation?
- Is the publisher of the proceedings a member of a recognized industry initiative such as COPE, DOAJ, OASPA?
- Refer also to Think. Check. Submit. check list for more details about publishing in the right journal at http://thinkchecksubmit.org/check/.
If any of the following statements are true, **do not submit your work.** These are tactics commonly used by deceptive publishers:

- Publication is guaranteed
- You received a spam-like unsolicited email invitation to publish work *(Note: these are different in nature than emails received from organizations or societies you belong to or have published with in the past)*
- The articles published in the journal do not match the journal’s title and stated scope

**Common Practices of Deceptive Publishers**

While there is no single criterion that points to whether or not a publication is legitimate, the following are some of the typical practices used by deceptive publishers. An accumulation of negative indicators can point to a deceptive publisher.

**PROCESS AND TIMELINE**

Much of this information can be found in author guidelines or instructions. This information should be clearly presented and address quality control processes, style/formatting, copyright, and other journal policies (such as corrections and retractions).

- Publication is guaranteed
- The time of submission to publication is unexpectedly short
- The peer review process is unclear, lacking information, or not apparent

**ARTICLE PROCESSING CHARGES (APCs)**

Many open access journals ask for Article Processing Charges (APCs), and this is an acceptable practice. Legitimate journals will always ask for payment after acceptance, and their fees are clear and easily available.

- APC payment is required before acceptance
  
  *APCs are generally paid post-acceptance but pre-publication. You should not be asked to pay for an APC before the peer-review process begins. These charges should be clearly listed on the journal’s website.*

https://onesearch.library.utoronto.ca/deceptivepublishing
## Journal Evaluation Rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Good (3)</th>
<th>Fair (2)</th>
<th>Poor (1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1. Journal evaluation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Web search for the journal</strong></td>
<td>The journal is within the top 5 entries on the first page of search results and there are no scam alert postings.</td>
<td>The journal is on the first page of search results but not within the top 5 entries and there are no scam alert postings.</td>
<td>The journal is not on the first page of search results or there is at least one scam alert post about the journal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Journal name</strong></td>
<td>The journal name cannot be confused with another journal.</td>
<td>The journal being evaluated has a name similar to another journal but is able to be distinguished between the two.</td>
<td>The journal being evaluated is unable to be distinguished from another with a similar name.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Editorial board</strong></td>
<td>The editorial board is listed with their full names and institutional affiliation.</td>
<td>The editorial board is listed with their full names only (no affiliation).</td>
<td>There is no editorial board listed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Review process</strong></td>
<td>The journal states whether it is peer reviewed/edited and has a review policy listed.</td>
<td>The journal states whether it is peer reviewed/edited and has no review policy listed.</td>
<td>The journal does not state whether it is peer reviewed/edited and has no review policy listed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conflicts of interest</strong></td>
<td>The journal thoroughly and clearly states a conflicts of interest policy, including how it will handle potential conflicts of interest of editors, authors, and reviewers.</td>
<td>The journal states a conflicts of interest policy, but the description of how conflicts will be handled is unclear.</td>
<td>The journal does not state a conflicts of interest policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Journal website</strong></td>
<td>The journal website is competently designed and functional. (Examples: no broken links, easy navigation, no missing information.)</td>
<td>The journal website is adequately designed with passable functionality. (Examples: adequate navigation, few broken links, some missing information.)</td>
<td>The journal is poorly designed and is not functional. (Examples: broken links, poor navigation, missing information.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revenue sources</strong></td>
<td>The journal clearly states its business model. This includes any revenue sources, like author fees, subscriptions, advertising, reprints, institutional support, and organizational support.</td>
<td>The journal’s business model lacks clarity when stating its revenue sources, like author fees, subscriptions, advertising, reprints, institutional support, and organizational support.</td>
<td>The journal does not state its business model.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Journal archive</strong></td>
<td>The journal website contains an archive of its past issues with links to full text articles.</td>
<td>The journal website contains an archive but it may be incomplete or it does not contain links to full text articles.</td>
<td>The journal does not have an archive of its past issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Publishing schedule</strong></td>
<td>The journal clearly states how often its issues will be published each year and this agrees with the archive.</td>
<td>The journal does not state how often its issues will be published but it can be determined from the archive.</td>
<td>The journal does not state how often its issues will be published each year and it cannot be determined from the archive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Author fees</strong></td>
<td>The journal clearly states the amount of money an author will pay to have each article published.</td>
<td>The journal states that an author fee is required but does not note how much it is.</td>
<td>The journal does not state whether or not there are any author fees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Copyright information</strong></td>
<td>The journal clearly describes its copyright and licensing information on the journal's Web site, and licensing terms are indicated on the published articles (HTML/PDF).</td>
<td>Copyright and licensing information is not found on the journal's Web site and on any published articles.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Journal index</strong></td>
<td>The journal is indexed in more than one subject database. (Examples: ERIC, Google Scholar, Web of Science, PsycINFO)</td>
<td>The journal is indexed in one subject database. (Example: ERIC)</td>
<td>The journal is not indexed in a subject database.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access to journal articles</strong></td>
<td>The journal provides full text access to all published articles.</td>
<td>The journal provides full text access to some published articles.</td>
<td>The journal does not provide full text access to any published articles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of articles published</strong></td>
<td>The journal has published more than 10 articles.</td>
<td>The journal has published between 6 and 10 articles.</td>
<td>The journal has published 5 or fewer articles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 2. Publisher evaluation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Web search for the publisher</strong></td>
<td>The publisher is within the top 5 entries on the first page of search results and there are no scam alert postings.</td>
<td>The publisher is on the first page of search results but not within the top 5 entries and there are no scam alert postings.</td>
<td>The publisher is not on the first page of search results or there is at least one scam alert posting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Publisher information</strong></td>
<td>Information about the ownership/management of the journal and contact information about the publisher is clearly identified.</td>
<td>Information about the ownership/management of the journal or contact information about the publisher is clearly identified.</td>
<td>Information about the ownership/management of the journal and contact information about the publisher is not available.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[http://digitalcommons.lmu.edu/librarian_pubs/40](http://digitalcommons.lmu.edu/librarian_pubs/40)
16 Principles of Transparency & Best Practice in Scholarly Publishing

Peer review process
Governing Body
Editorial team/contact info
Author fees
Copyright
Identification of & dealing with allegations of research misconduct
Ownership & management
Web site
Name of journal
Conflicts of interest
Access
Revenue sources
Advertising
Publishing schedule
Archiving
Direct marketing

doi.org/10.24318/cope.2019.1.12
Outreach & Education

Practical Workshop with real examples e.g. “spot the red flags”

Promote a “Think Check Submit” culture as part of broader critical evaluation initiatives

Reuse / repurpose existing CC BY resources

Advocate for the many reputable OA journals
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