

Appendix 1

Cabell's Blacklist Violations

GENERAL INFORMATION

This policy establishes the criteria for identifying deceptive, fraudulent, and/or predatory journals for inclusion in Cabell's Blacklist. Cabell's Blacklist Review Board uses the following criteria to evaluate all journals suspected of deceptive, fraudulent, and/or predatory practices.

The following criteria are considered when evaluating a suspected journal (in red our comments on them):

- **Integrity**

1. The same article appears in more than one journal. [based on?]
2. Hijacked journal (defined as a fraudulent website created to look like a legitimate academic journal for the purpose of offering academics the opportunity to rapidly publish their research for a fee). [hard to see at first glance]
3. Information received from the journal does not match the journal's website. [not clear? What information: email, send to database?]
4. The journal or publisher claims to be a non-profit when it is actually a for-profit company. [take for granted? How checked: year report?]
5. The publisher hides or obscures relationships with for-profit partner companies. [what partnership? How do they find out? Seems very hard, is it a real criterion]
6. The owner/Editor of the journal or publisher falsely claims academic positions or qualifications.
7. The journal is associated with a conference that has been identified as predatory.
8. The journal gives a fake ISSN. [easily checkable]
9. Insufficient resources are spent on preventing and eliminating author misconduct (that may result in repeated cases of plagiarism, self-plagiarism, image manipulation, etc.). [what is insufficient? Quantifiable? => is there a code of conduct, are there plagiarized articles => is there a good way for retraction/correction]
10. The name of the journal references a country or demographic that does not relate to the content or origin of the journal.
11. The journal uses language that suggests that it is industry leading, but is in fact a new journal. [false suggestions]
12. The title of the journal is copied or so similar to that of a legitimate journal that it could cause confusion between the two. [is not a new criterion?]

- **Peer Review**

1. No editor or editorial board listed on the journal's website at all.
2. Editors do not actually exist or are deceased. [how do they check this]

3. The journal includes scholars on an editorial board without their knowledge or permission. [this is hard to check; do they ask individually? Authors can't contact as they cannot view the list]
4. The founder of the publishing company is the editor of all of the journals published by said company.
5. Evident data showing that the editor/review board members do not possess academic expertise to reasonably qualify them to be publication gatekeepers in the journal's field. [what is evident? When is it wrong, you can be from another field]
6. Have board members who are prominent researchers but exempt them from any contribution to the journal except the use of their names and/or photographs. [can't this also be an ambassador? Does not always have to be fraudulent]
7. Gender bias in the editorial board. [representation of the world, should this be a criterion?]
8. Little geographical diversity of board members and claim to be international. [not sure if problematic]
9. Inadequate peer review (i.e., a single reader reviews submissions; peer reviewers read papers outside their field of study; etc.). [second criterion is highly problematic; where does the information come from;]
10. The journal's website does not have a clearly stated peer review policy. (transparent and adequate see last point)

- **Website**

1. The website does not identify a physical address for the publisher or gives a fake address.
2. The journal or publisher uses a virtual office or other proxy business as its physical address. [this could be legit; but claiming to be from another country is problematic]
3. The website does not identify a physical editorial address for the journal. [is it a problem? More a reality]
4. Dead links. [amount of?]
5. Poor grammar and/or spelling. [good indicator, they will not spend much money on your article either; not if there is no cost maybe]
6. No way to contact the journal/only has web-form.

- **Publication Practices**

1. The journal publishes papers that are not academic at all, e.g. essays by laypeople or obvious pseudo-science.
2. No articles are published or the archives are missing issues and/or articles.
3. Falsely claims indexing in well-known databases (especially SCOPUS, DOAJ, JCR, and Cabell's). [very important! Note: Cabell's is not an indexing service and claiming to be on the Whitelist or not on the Blacklist can only be spotted and verified by Cabell and its subscribers]
4. Falsely claims universities or other organizations as partners or sponsors.
5. Machine-generated or other "sting" abstracts or papers are accepted. [valid point, even considering Springer]
6. No copyediting. [same as with website]

7. The publisher displays prominent statements that promise rapid publication and/or unusually quick peer review (less than 4 weeks). [meaning no rejection rate? Take discipline into account? Is it unrealistic? Version of record? More granular approach would be better]
8. Little geographical diversity of authors and the journal claims to be International.
9. Similarly titled articles published by same author in more than one journal. [better to check for plagiarism; otherwise not a strong one]
10. The Editor publishes research in his own journal. [integrity? Divided opinions]
11. Authors are published several times in the same journal and/or issue. [problematic; series, small fields]
12. The journal purposefully publishes controversial articles in the interest of boosting citation count. [what is controversial? How do you measure it?]
13. The journal publishes papers presented at conferences without additional peer review. [transparency of peer review procedure? How do you check it?]
14. The name of the publisher suggests that it is a society, academy, etc. when it is only a publisher and offers no real benefits to members.
15. The name of the publisher suggests that it is a society, academy, etc. when it is only a solitary proprietary operation and does not meet the definition of the term used or implied non-profit mission. [close to the previous one]

- **Indexing & Metrics**

1. The journal uses misleading metrics (i.e., metrics with the words “impact factor” that are not the Thomson Reuters Impact Factor). [easy to check]
2. The publisher or its journals are not listed in standard periodical directories or are not widely catalogued in library databases. [mentioned before]

- **Fees**

1. The publisher or journal's website seems too focused on the payment of fees. [what about for purpose low fee? It's spammy]
2. The journal offers options for researchers to prepay APCs for future articles. [valid]
3. The journal states there is an APC or other fee but does not give information on the amount. [valid]
4. The journal or publisher offers membership to receive discounts on APCs but does not give information on how to become a member and/or on the membership fees. [not valid/negotiations/personal vs institutional membership]
5. The author must pay APC or publication fee before submitting the article (specifically calls the fee a publication fee, not a submission fee). [valid]
6. The journal does not indicate that there are any fees associated with publication, review, submission, etc. but the author is charged a fee after submitting a manuscript. [can only be checked by complaints; do they check?]

- **Access & Copyright**

1. States the journal is completely open access but not all articles are openly available. [valid/registration ?]
2. No way to access articles (no information on open access or how to subscribe).

3. No policies for digital preservation. [this is dubious with normal journals as well; valid problem though]
4. The journal has a poorly written copyright policy and/or transfer form that does not actually transfer copyright. [valid]
5. The journal publishes not in accordance with their copyright or does not operate under a copyright license. [clear]

- **Business Practices**

1. Emails from journals received by researchers who are clearly not in the field the journal covers. [how do they measure]
2. Multiple emails received from a journal in a short amount of time. [spamming; hard to check]
3. Emails received from a journal do not include the option to unsubscribe to future emails. [that is not the case for one off; how do you check]
4. The journal has been asked to quit sending emails and has not stopped. [how to check this?]
5. No subscribers / nobody uses the journal. [pointless? Can it be measured with altmetrics/citations]
6. The journal or publisher operates in a Western country chiefly for the purpose of functioning as a vanity press for scholars in a developing country. [duplicate question]
7. The journal's website does not allow web crawlers. [not convinced; larger/legitimate publishers also do not always do this]
8. The journal copyproofs and locks PDFs. [drm is a no]