

## **Comparison of VABB-SHW version IX with Cabells Journal Blacklist and Directory of Open Access Journals**

Report to the Authoritative Panel  
6 December 2018

Joshua Eykens, Raf Guns, and Tim C.E. Engels

## 1 Introduction

During the summer of 2018, Flanders (and the rest of the world) experienced considerable media upheavals around the issue of open access (OA) scholarly publishing. The OA model continues to remain a matter of debate among scholars, librarians, policy makers, and the public. On the one hand, OA scholarly publishing promises to expand the reach of research findings and close the gap of ‘information inequality’ across nations. It has, for instance, been argued that academic initiatives that involve OA publishing could harness ‘multiple perspectives on solving durable and pressing problems around sustainability’ in a sense that more students of these problems are able to join the debate (Lincoln 2012, 1453). On the other hand, much attention has also been paid to the controversial matter of OA publishers whose standards and ethics can be questioned. The periodicals that fall under this claim have been called *predatory open access* (POA) journals. For the sake of simplicity, we will use the same terminology but note that it has been criticized (Eriksson & Helgesson, 2018).

As a consequence of the appearance of POA journals, *blacklists* of such journals and publishers have been created in the past. Blacklists contain names of publishers and titles of journals that ought to be avoided because of questionable standards. This practice, however, faces a lot of criticism (see for example Bloudoff-Indelicato 2015). As a consequence, different approaches also exist. The Directory of Open Access Journals (henceforth DOAJ), for example, takes a more ‘positive’ stance and aims to cover all the world’s OA journals maintaining the best scholarly publishing practices. This practice is referred to as *whitelisting*.

The key issue in this controversy remains the contrasting view on which conclusions can (and will) be drawn when facing seemingly low publishing standards (or other questionable practices linked to scholarly publishing). To give one example, the adequate use of good academic English is typically seen as an inevitable part of current internationally oriented scholarly publishing. However, journals (or journal websites) that contain language errors do not necessarily have fraudulent intentions. To put it differently, if one encounters low language standards, this does not always mean that a journal can singlehandedly be considered as a POA journal. Moreover, some argue that such (language-based) criteria are biased towards scholarly publishers from developed countries (Berger and Cirasella 2015). In contrast, there are also practices such as claiming to carry out peer review while in reality no peer review takes place. Such practices clearly indicate the ‘predatory’ nature of a journal or publisher.

As we will see, the range on which scholarly journal publishing can be judged is broad (e.g., Beall 2015). Our example of language quality shows that the distinction between low(er)-quality journals and POA journals is not entirely straightforward. Decisions on whether a journal is to be considered POA is often a matter of mutually reinforcing characteristics.

Of interest for this report is to what extent malpractices within OA scholarly publishing is a matter of concern for Flemish academia. To address this question, we study to what extent scholarly communication of social science and humanities (SSH) scholars within Flanders resides in outlets of questionable quality. Since 2013 ECOOM-UAntwerp has organised comparisons of the annual lists of journals submitted to VABB-SHW with blacklists and whitelists. Specifically, the previous screenings used the following lists:

- versions IV-V: Beall’s list(s) as blacklist (Rahman, Dexters, & Engels 2014; Rahman & Engels 2015),
- versions VI–VII: Beall’s list(s) as blacklist, DOAJ as whitelist (Rahman, Guns, & Engels 2015; Sile, Guns, & Engels 2017),

- version VIII: Cabells Journal Blacklist as blacklist, DOAJ as whitelist (Eykens, Guns, & Engels 2018).

This report results from a comparison of the list of journals submitted to the Authoritative Panel (in Dutch ‘Gezaghebbend Panel’ or GP) of the VABB-SHW<sup>1</sup> (Vlaams Academisch Bibliografisch Bestand voor de Sociale en Humane Wetenschappen). ECOOM-Antwerp submitted this list of journals to the GP in July 2018 (publications from years 2008-2017) and compared it with, firstly, Cabells Journal Blacklist (consulted between 15 September and 9 October 2018) and, secondly, the list of journals indexed in DOAJ (consulted on 15 October 2018).

## 2 Data sources

### 2.1 Cabells Journal Blacklist (CJB)

Cabells Journal Blacklist (CJB) is a commercial service provided by Cabells Scholarly Analytics. The review board working on CJB makes use of an extensive list of pre-specified criteria which are used to identify deceptive, fraudulent, and/or predatory journals. Misra *et al.* (2017) argue that the use of such criteria – by a team of professionals (and an additional ‘violations report’ when the journal is consulted) – allows for ‘lesser bias in selecting the journals’. The list of criteria can be found in Appendix A.

The 65 criteria<sup>2</sup> are grouped in 8 categories. We present a list of the categories, with the number of criteria they consist of, and a short description of what they are about.

- A. **Integrity (12 criteria):** Relates to the journal’s ethics. Does the publisher abide to standard publishing or research ethics?
- B. **Peer review (10 criteria):** Does the journal have adequate procedures for editorial control and peer review?
- C. **Website (6 criteria):** Relates to the information displayed on the website. Is it deceptive, wrong or unclear?
- D. **Publication practices (15 criteria):** Closely relates to research and publishing ethics, but focuses on the actual process of publishing, the techniques to attract authors, and statements about the management of the journal and its content.
- E. **Indexing and metrics (2 criteria):** Is the journal using misleading or wrong metrics?
- F. **Fees (6 criteria):** Does the publisher focus on payments and/or not communicate about them clearly prior to manuscript submission?
- G. **Access and copyright (5 criteria):** Does the journal (or its publisher) communicate clearly on the access granted and the copyright policy that is being carried out?
- H. **Business practices (9 criteria):** Relates to the marketing techniques used by the publisher or the journal’s editorial team.

The criteria grouped under each category could be characterized as indicators ranging from completely fraudulent to vague or questionable practice. To give an example, under integrity we find criterion A9 (insufficient resources are spent on preventing and eliminating author misconduct) which is quite subjective – what is enough? Two other criteria of the integrity category apply to hijacked journals (A2 and A8 respectively). These two are completely fraudulent and point to the deceptive marketing techniques used by predatory publishers. As we will see, when making use of the violation reports of

---

<sup>1</sup> VABB-SHW is the Flemish Academic Bibliographic database of the Social Sciences and Humanities. For an overview of the design of this database, see Verleysen *et al.* (2014).

<sup>2</sup> The website lists only 64 criteria (see: <https://www2.cabells.com/blacklist-criteria>), but the violation reports contain an additional one (defined as H9).

CJB for evaluation purposes, it seems advisable to consider the co-occurrences of the criteria per journal or, additionally, group them by publisher.

## **2.2 The Directory of Open Access Journals (DOAJ)**

In 2003 DOAJ was set up 'to increase the visibility and ease of use of open access scientific and scholarly journals, thereby promoting their increased usage and impact' ('About DOAJ', 2016). This directory aims to provide full coverage of OA scholarly journals that can warrant the quality of the content. If a journal is listed in DOAJ, it meets a certain threshold of quality. For a journal to be included in DOAJ it has to correspond to the 'Principles of Transparency and Best Practice in Scholarly Publishing' (2015). This set of 16 principles is the result of a collaboration between DOAJ, the Committee on Publication ethics (COPE), the Open Access Scholarly Publishers Association (OASPA), and the World Association of Medical Editors (WAME). These principles also refer to various aspects of publishing (peer-review process, publishing schedule, etc.).

In 2013, DOAJ has received critical remarks regarding its inclusion criteria. In a 'sting' experiment, Bohannon (2013) created and submitted 304 variations of an article of obviously low quality. Submissions were done with an invented name and affiliation. The acceptance rate for the journals that were listed in DOAJ at the time and completed the article review process, was 45%. However, following these findings, DOAJ introduced more selective inclusion criteria for journals (Van Noorden 2014). Moreover, all journals that were previously included in DOAJ had to reapply for inclusion under stricter criteria. Over 40% of journals were rejected or failed to reapply; these are no longer included in DOAJ.

The analysis reported here is based on the DOAJ list of journals from 15 October 2018. At that point DOAJ contained 12,182 journals.

## **3 Work procedure**

Comparing VABB-SHW (version IX) with CJB and DOAJ was done by listing all ISSNs of the journals (n = 13,759) submitted by ECOOM-UAntwerp to the GP in July 2018. These are the journals in which scholars affiliated to an SSH unit at a Flemish university have published during the time period 2008–2017. Within this list, 10,545 journals have been previously identified as peer-reviewed: 2,915 are selected by the GP and 7,630 are indexed in WoS. 2,748 journals have been classified by the GP as non-peer-reviewed. Finally, 466 journals appear in the list for the first time, and therefore their status of peer-review is yet to be decided.

The comparison of the journal lists was conducted in October 2018. The procedure consisted of three steps. First, if more than one ISSN was recorded in VABB-SHW for a given journal, each ISSN was verified. During the second step, the set of ISSNs was compared with CJB. The third step consisted of checking the ISSNs which appeared on Cabells' blacklist with the DOAJ respectively. Only those journals whose ISSN matched with the ISSN of a journal on CJB were retained as potentially POA. Contrary to the screening of VABB-SHW VIII (Eykens, Guns & Engels 2018), we have checked both journals indexed in WoS and journals not indexed in WoS.<sup>3</sup>

Subsequently, for the cases in which a match was found, we consulted the violation report provided by Cabells and listed each journal's violations. As previously mentioned, the evaluation of the journals has been carried out by in-house specialists of Cabells Scholarly Analytics. The appendix contains an

---

<sup>3</sup> For the screening of VABB-SHW VIII, journals indexed in WoS (excluding the Emerging Sources Citation Index) were not checked because of lack of time. Moreover, their inclusion in VABB-SHW does not affect the Flemish funding system: publications in these journals are counted in the WoS-publications parameter of the BOF-key.

overview of the journals that were found on the CJB and lists the respective criteria from their violation reports.

## 4 Findings

The results of our analysis are presented in three parts. First, we analyse the number of journals (and their publishers) that are found in both VABB-SHW version IX and the CJB (4.1). In the second part, DOAJ is added to this comparison (4.2). Third, we present a comparison of our findings to last year's results (4.3).

### 4.1 Comparison of VABB-SHW with Cabells Journal Blacklist

The comparison of VABB-SHW IX with CJB yields a set of 89 journals (Table 1). The total number of publications in these journals is 145 which accounts for only 0.19% of the number of journal publications submitted to this version of VABB-SHW. 19 out of 89 journals are considered as peer-reviewed in VABB-SHW; they contain 50 out of 145 publications (34.48%). Of the 19 journals which are currently considered as peer-reviewed, 7 are indexed by Clarivate Analytics in the AHCI, SSCI and/or SCIE indexes of the WoS. Four other journals are indexed in the ESCI of WoS.

58 journals are considered non peer-reviewed, and the remaining 12 have not yet been classified by the GP. The list of the 89 journals can be found in appendix B. The list includes the following characteristics: title, VABB-SHW status, ISSN, EISSN, indexing status, the number of publications in VABB-SHW, the name of its publisher, and a list of violations that were reported for each individual journal.

**Table 1** Number of VABB-SHW IX journals identified in Cabells Journal Blacklist

VABB-SHW Status	All journals	Match with CJB 2018	Match with CJB 2018 and in AHCI, SSCI and/or SCIE	Match with CJB 2018 and in ESCI
Peer-reviewed	10,545	19	7	4
Non peer-reviewed	2,748	58	0	0
Peer-review status undecided	466	12	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>13,759</b>	<b>89</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>4</b>

31 different publishers make up the list of 89 journals that were found, with some of them accounting for multiple (up to 19) journals (Table 2). It should be noted in advance that journals published by the same publisher very often exhibit the same violations (cf. Table 1 in appendix B). 19 publishers, however, only appear with one periodical.

**Table 2** List of publishers and number of their journals in VABB-SHW IX

Publisher	Number of journals	In previous report
OMICS International	19	YES
Canadian Center of Science and Education	11	YES
Academic Journals	10	YES
Sciedu Press	7	YES
David Publishing Company	6	YES

Macrothink Institute	4	YES
World Scientific and Engineering Academy and Society	4	YES
Center for Promoting Ideas	3	YES
American Research Institute for Policy Development	2	YES
Serials Publications	2	YES
World Research Journals	2	NO
Asian Economic and Social Society (AESS)	1	YES
Asian Online Journals	1	NO
Better Advances Press	1	YES
Betty Jones & Sisters Publishing	1	NO
CIRWORLD	1	YES
ECOZONE Publishing House	1	NO
European Center of Sustainable Development	1	NO
Fundamental Journals	1	YES
Global Advanced Research Journals	1	YES
Global Journals, Inc.	1	YES
Humanities, Management	1	YES
International Academy Publishing	1	YES
National Academy of Management	1	NO
OAE Publishing, Inc.	1	YES
Redfame Publishing	1	YES
Scholarly Journals and Academic Conferences	1	YES
Science and Education Publishing (SciEP)	1	NO
Scientia Socialis	1	YES
WASET – World Academy of Science, Engineering, and Technology	1	NO
<b>Total</b>	<b>89</b>	

When comparing the list of publishers with the results presented in the previous report, we can observe that there are nine ‘newcomers’. The top five, which represent the largest part of the POA journals (56), consists of the same publishers as the one presented in the previous report.

Two journals included in VABB-SHW have an ISSN that matches with journals on CJB. Upon closer investigation, it turns out, however, that the journals in VABB-SHW are legitimate and are not related to the predatory journals (published by Premier Publishers). While CJB mentions that these journals use a ‘fake ISSN’, this is in fact a case of a hijacked ISSN. We have suggested to Cabells to make the distinction between non-registered ISSN and hijacked ISSN clearer.

Another journal (*International Journal of Civil, Environmental, Structural, Construction and Architectural Engineering*, published by WASET) is listed in CJB without ISSN and was therefore initially not retrieved. This case illustrates that metadata inconsistencies may cause some journals not to be matched.

#### 4.2 Comparison of VABB-SHW with Cabells Journal Blacklist and DOAJ

Of the 89 journals identified as potentially POA, only one journal was also found in DOAJ. This periodical (*Problems of Psychology in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century*) is published by Scientia Socialis Ltd. It has previously been classified as non-peer-reviewed (cf. appendix B, n° 79, p. 39). For VABB-SHW IX, only 1 article has been published in this journal, for which four violations are listed.

### 4.3 Number of publications in POA journals per year

Table 4 provides an overview of the distribution of publications identified as POA over the 10-year time window covered by VABB-SHW IX. We found 89 potentially predatory journals in VABB-SHW IX, which account for 145 publications. In contrast, for VABB-SHW VIII 65 journals were flagged as potentially predatory, with 91 publications in them (Table 5; cf. Eykens *et al.*, 2018). This substantial difference relates to several factors. First, two journals that were checked in the previous screening have since been added to CJB. Second, WoS journals were not checked for the previous report. This explains a difference of 7 journals. Third, 10 of the potentially predatory journals were not present in the previous VABB journal list. The latter have not yet been evaluated by the GP.

**Table 4** Number of publications in VABB-SHW IX that have appeared in a journal indexed in CJB across years

Year	Peer-reviewed	Non peer-reviewed	Undecided
2008	3	1	0
2009	7	6	0
2010	4	6	0
2011	4	8	0
2012	8	18	0
2013	7	9	0
2014	6	11	0
2015	5	12	0
2016	5	9	4
2017	0	1	11
<b>Total</b>	49	81	15

In addition, we want to highlight another subtle difference with the results presented in the previous report. There, we found that 69 out of 91 (75.82%) publications were in journals that were not regarded as peer-reviewed. For this screening round we observe a somewhat more even distribution: 55.86% of publications appeared in non-peer-reviewed journals. This year, 19 out of 89 (21.35%) identified journals have been classified as peer-reviewed by the GP. In the last screening, there were 9 (13.85%).

**Table 5** Overview of screenings and results

Publication time span	VABB-SHW edition	POA journals	Articles	Blacklist used	Other sources used
2003-2012	IV	62	59	Beall's list	WoS
2004-2013	V	109	138	Beall's list	WoS
2005-2014	VI	128	315	Beall's list	DOAJ (& WoS)

2006-2015	VII	185	501	Beall's list	DOAJ (& WoS)
2007-2016	VIII	65	91	Cabell's Journal Blacklist	DOAJ (& WoS)
2008-2017	IX	89	145	Cabell's Journal Blacklist	DOAJ (& WoS)

## 5 Limitations

With regard to the data and our analysis, three limitations should be highlighted. As stated in previous reports, journal lists are not static and often evolve rather quickly (Eykens *et al.* 2018). Journals may cease to exist, they can be withdrawn from (or added to) the DOAJ, the Web of Science, CJB, and so on. This requires the reader to pay close attention when interpreting the results. The comparison presented in this report only applies to the actual timeframe (period from 2008 to 2017).

The second limitation relates to the data gathered from CJB. CJB provides detailed violation reports, which can be helpful for decision making. The threshold applied by the in-house experts, however, is not clear. Some of the violations can be considered as less threatening than others, or allow for the reader's own (subjective) interpretation. Criterion C5, for example, relates to the spelling and grammar on the website. As noted in the introduction, this also remains a matter of debate, and can be interpreted differently from different angles. Similarly, what is being defined as obvious pseudo-science (cf. D1)?

With regard to the matching procedure, it should be emphasized that matching may not always be possible. During the screening presented in this report, we had difficulties with two journals. One of these used a hijacked ISSN. While the ISSN and the official journal it belongs to did appear in our database, the predatory journal that was advertising it did not. For the second case, CJB did not provide an ISSN. In addition, the title in the VABB journal list was different from the one in CJB. These cases were solved by qualitatively checking the results and a reporting by university staff.

## 6 Conclusion

Our analysis shows that SSH scholars in Flanders continue to publish in journals that are listed as predatory open access. The total number has increased compared to the previous edition. While there has been a steady rise over the past decade (cf. Sīle *et al.*, 2017), the comparison with CJB marks a steep decline from 185 journals in 2016 to 65 journals in 2017, and again an increase to 89 journals in 2018. Most likely, these more recent observations are mainly due to the change of data source and updates of the service, rather than an actual change in publication practices. Indeed, recently published results (Sorokowski *et al.* 2017) suggest that POA journals are far from gone from the academic landscape.

## References

Beall, Jeffrey. 2015. 'Criteria for Determining Predatory Open - Access Publishers'.  
<https://scholarlyoa.files.wordpress.com/2015/01/criteria-2015.pdf>

Beall, Jeffrey. 2017. 'What I learned from predatory publishers'. *Biochemica Media* 27 (2): 273 – 279.  
<https://doi.org/10.11613/BM.2017.02>

Berger, Monica & Cirasella, Jill. 2015. 'Beyond Beall's list: better understanding predatory publishers.' *College and research libraries news* 76 (3): 132-135.

Bloudoff-Indelicato, Mollie. 2015. 'Backlash after Frontiers journals added to list of questionable publishers'. *Nature* 526 (7575): 613.

Directory of Open Access Journals. 'About DOAJ'. <https://doaj.org/about> (accessed November 11, 2018)

Eriksson, Stefan & Gert Helgesson. 2018. 'Time to stop talking about 'predatory journals''. *Learned Publishing*, forthcoming. <https://doi.org/10.1002/leap.1135>

Eykens, Joshua, Raf Guns, & Tim C. E. Engels. 2018. 'Comparing VABB-SHW (version VIII) with Cabells Journal Blacklist and Directory of open access Journals'. <https://hdl.handle.net/10067/1481030151162165141>

Lincoln, S. Yvonna. 2012. 'The Political Economy of Publication: Marketing, Commodification, and Qualitative Scholarly Work'. *Qualitative Health Research* 22 (11): 1451 – 1459. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1049732312457713>

Mimouni, Michael, Eyal Braun, Francis B. Mimouni, Daniel Mimouni, & Eytan Z. Blumenthal. 2017. 'Beall's List Removed: What stands between us and open access predators?'. *The American Journal of Medicine* 130 (8): 371-372. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amjmed.2017.03.040>

Misra, D. Prasanna, Ravindran, Vinod Ravindran, Anupam Wakhlu, Aman Sharma, Vikas Agarwal, & Vir Singh Negi. 2017. 'Publishing in black and white: the relevance of listing of scientific journals'. *Rheumatology international* 37 (11): 1773-1778. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00296-017-3880-5>

Directory of Open Access Journals. 'Principles of Transparency and Best Practice in Scholarly Publishing'. <https://doaj.org/bestpractice> (accessed November 11, 2018)

Rahman, A. I. M. Jakaria, Nele Dexters, & Tim C. E. Engels. 2014. 'Predatory open access Journals in a Performance-Based Funding Model: Common Journals in Bealls List and in the VABB-SHW'. <http://hdl.handle.net/10067/1139870151162165141>

Rahman, A. I. M. Jakaria, & Tim C. E. Engels. 2015a. 'Predatory open access Journals in a Performance-Based Funding Model: Common Journals in Bealls List and in Version V of the VABB-SHW'. <http://hdl.handle.net/10067/1233590151162165141>

Rahman, A. I. M. Jakaria, Raf Guns, & Tim C. E. Engels. 2015b. 'Predatory open access Journals in a Performance-Based Funding Model: A Comparison of Journals in Version VI of the VABB-SHW with Beall's List and DOAJ'. <http://hdl.handle.net/10067/1300570151162165141>

Sîle, Linda, Raf Guns, & Tim C. E. Engels. 2017. 'Comparing VABB-SHW (version VII) with Beall's lists and DOAJ'. <http://hdl.handle.net/10067/1396540151162165141>

Sorokowski, Piotr, Emanuel Kulczycki, Agnieszka Sorokowska, & Katarzyna Pisanski. 2017. 'Predatory journals recruit fake editor'. *Nature News*, 543(7646), 481. <https://doi.org/10.1038/543481a>

Verleysen, Frederik, Pol Ghesquière, & Tim C. E. Engels. 2014. 'The objectives, design and selection process of the Flemish Academic Bibliographic Database for Social Sciences and Humanities (VABB-SHW)' in *Bibliometrics: Use and Abuse in the Review of Research Performance*, edited by Wim Blockmans, Lars Engwall, and Denis Weaire, 117-127, Portland Press.

## Appendix A. Full list of blacklist criteria

This list of blacklist criteria is taken from <https://www2.cabells.com/blacklist-criteria>.

<b>A. Integrity</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. The same article appears in more than one journal.</li><li>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).</li><li>3. Information received from the journal does not match the journal's website.</li><li>4. The journal or publisher claims to be a non-profit when it is actually a for-profit company.</li><li>5. The publisher hides or obscures relationships with for-profit partner companies.</li><li>6. The owner/Editor of the journal or publisher falsely claims academic positions or qualifications.</li><li>7. The journal is associated with a conference that has been identified as predatory.</li><li>8. The journal gives a fake ISSN.</li><li>9. Insufficient resources are spent on preventing and eliminating author misconduct (that may result in repeated cases of plagiarism, self-plagiarism, image manipulation, etc.).</li><li>10. The name of the journal references a country or demographic that does not relate to the content or origin of the journal.</li><li>11. The journal uses language that suggests that it is industry leading, but is in fact a new journal.</li><li>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.</li></ol>
<b>B. Peer Review</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. No editor or editorial board listed on the journal's website at all.</li><li>2. Editors do not actually exist or are deceased.</li><li>3. The journal includes scholars on an editorial board without their knowledge or permission.</li><li>4. The founder of the publishing company is the editor of all of the journals published by said company.</li><li>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.</li><li>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.</li><li>7. Gender bias in the editorial board.</li></ol>

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>8. Little geographical diversity of board members and claim to be international.</li> <li>9. Inadequate peer review (i.e., a single reader reviews submissions; peer reviewers read papers outside their field of study; etc.).</li> <li>10. The journal's website does not have a clearly stated peer review policy.</li> </ol>
<p><b>C. Website</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The website does not identify a physical address for the publisher or gives a fake address.</li> <li>2. The journal or publisher uses a virtual office or other proxy business as its physical address.</li> <li>3. The website does not identify a physical editorial address for the journal.</li> <li>4. Dead links.</li> <li>5. Poor grammar and/or spelling.</li> <li>6. No way to contact the journal/only has web-form.</li> </ol>
<p><b>D. Publication practices</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The journal publishes papers that are not academic at all, e.g. essays by laypeople or obvious pseudo-science.</li> <li>2. No articles are published or the archives are missing issues and/or articles.</li> <li>3. Falsely claims indexing in well-known databases (especially SCOPUS, DOAJ, JCR, and Cabell's).</li> <li>4. Falsely claims universities or other organizations as partners or sponsors.</li> <li>5. Machine-generated or other "sting" abstracts or papers are accepted.</li> <li>6. No copyediting.</li> <li>7. The publisher displays prominent statements that promise rapid publication and/or unusually quick peer review (less than 4 weeks).</li> <li>8. Little geographical diversity of authors and the journal claims to be International.</li> <li>9. Similarly titled articles published by same author in more than one journal.</li> <li>10. The Editor publishes research in his own journal.</li> <li>11. Authors are published several times in the same journal and/or issue.</li> <li>12. The journal purposefully publishes controversial articles in the interest of boosting citation count.</li> <li>13. The journal publishes papers presented at conferences without additional peer review.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>15. The name of the publisher suggests that it is a society, academy, etc. when it is only a solitary proprietary</li> </ol>

	operation and does not meet the definition of the term used or implied non-profit mission.
<b>E. Indexing &amp; Metrics</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The journal uses misleading metrics (i.e., metrics with the words “impact factor” that are not the Thomson Reuters Impact Factor).</li> <li>2. The publisher or its journals are not listed in standard periodical directories or are not widely catalogued in library databases.</li> </ol>
<b>F. Fees</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The publisher or journal's website seems too focused on the payment of fees.</li> <li>2. The journal offers options for researchers to prepay APCs for future articles.</li> <li>3. The journal states there is an APC or other fee but does not give information on the amount.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>5. The author must pay APC or publication fee before submitting the article (specifically calls the fee a publication fee, not a submission fee).</li> <li>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.</li> </ol>
<b>G. Access &amp; Copyright</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. States the journal is completely open access but not all articles are openly available.</li> <li>2. No way to access articles (no information on open access or how to subscribe).</li> <li>3. No policies for digital preservation.</li> <li>4. The journal has a poorly written copyright policy and/or transfer form that does not actually transfer copyright.</li> <li>5. The journal publishes not in accordance with their copyright or does not operate under a copyright license.</li> </ol>
<b>H. Business Practices</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Emails from journals received by researchers who are clearly not in the field the journal covers.</li> <li>2. Multiple emails received from a journal in a short amount of time.</li> <li>3. Emails received from a journal do not include the option to unsubscribe to future emails.</li> <li>4. The journal has been asked to quit sending emails and has not stopped.</li> <li>5. No subscribers / nobody uses the journal.</li> <li>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.</li> </ol>

7. The journal's website does not allow web crawlers.
8. The journal copy proofs and locks PDFs.
9. The journal or publisher gives a business address in a Western country but the majority of authors are based in developing countries.

**Appendix B. List of journals found on Cabells Journal Blacklist and violations reports**

No	Journal title	ISSN (print)	EISSN (Electronic)	Publisher	Indexed in	VABB-SHW status	N publications
1	African Journal of Agricultural Research	1991-637X	n.a.	Academic Journals	SCIE	1	8
<p>A6 The owner/Editor of the journal or publisher falsely claims academic positions or qualifications.</p> <p>C2 The journal or publisher uses a virtual office or other proxy business as its physical address.</p> <p>D3 Falsely claims indexing in well-known databases (especially SCOPUS DOAJ JCR and Cabells).</p> <p>G3 No policies for digital preservation.</p>							
2	Scientific Research and Essays	1992-2248	n.a.	Academic Journals	SCIE	1	1
<p>A8 The journal gives a fake ISSN.</p> <p>C2 The journal or publisher uses a virtual office or other proxy business as its physical address.</p> <p>D2 No articles are published or the archives are missing issues and/or articles.</p> <p>D7 The publisher displays prominent statements that promise rapid publication and/or unusually quick peer review (less than 4 weeks).</p> <p>G3 No policies for digital preservation.</p>							
3	African Journal of Business Management	1993-8233	n.a.	Academic Journals	SSCI	1	2
<p>A6 The owner/Editor of the journal or publisher falsely claims academic positions or qualifications.</p> <p>B1 No editor or editorial board listed on the journal's website at all.</p> <p>C2 The journal or publisher uses a virtual office or other proxy business as its physical address.</p> <p>G3 No policies for digital preservation.</p>							
4	African Journal of Biochemistry Research	1996-0778	n.a.	Academic Journals	–	0	1
<p>B1 No editor or editorial board listed on the journal's website at all.</p> <p>C2 The journal or publisher uses a virtual office or other proxy business as its physical address.</p> <p>D2 No articles are published or the archives are missing issues and/or articles.</p> <p>D3 Falsely claims indexing in well-known databases (especially SCOPUS DOAJ JCR and Cabells).</p> <p>G3 No policies for digital preservation.</p>							













No.	Journal title	ISSN (print)	EISSN (Electronic)	Publisher	Indexed in	VABB-SHW status	N publications
24	Environment and Natural Resources Research	1927-0488	1927-0496	Canadian Center of Science and Education	–	0	1
	<p>A5 The publisher hides or obscures relationships with for-profit partner companies.</p> <p>C2 The journal or publisher uses a virtual office or other proxy business as its physical address.</p> <p>D7 The publisher displays prominent statements that promise rapid publication and/or unusually quick peer review (less than 4 weeks).</p> <p>G3 No policies for digital preservation.</p> <p>H2 Multiple emails received from a journal in a short amount of time.</p> <p>H6 The journal or publisher gives a business address in a Western country but the majority of authors are based in developing countries.</p>						
25	Sustainable Agriculture Research	1927-050X	1927-0518	Canadian Center of Science and Education	–	n.a.	1
	<p>A5 The publisher hides or obscures relationships with for-profit partner companies.</p> <p>C2 The journal or publisher uses a virtual office or other proxy business as its physical address.</p> <p>G3 No policies for digital preservation.</p> <p>H2 Multiple emails received from a journal in a short amount of time.</p> <p>H6 The journal or publisher gives a business address in a Western country but the majority of authors are based in developing countries.</p>						
26	Journal of Food Research	1927-0887	1927-0895	Canadian Center of Science and Education	–	0	2
	<p>A5 The publisher hides or obscures relationships with for-profit partner companies.</p> <p>C2 The journal or publisher uses a virtual office or other proxy business as its physical address.</p> <p>D7 The publisher displays prominent statements that promise rapid publication and/or unusually quick peer review (less than 4 weeks).</p> <p>G3 No policies for digital preservation.</p> <p>H2 Multiple emails received from a journal in a short amount of time.</p> <p>H6 The journal or publisher gives a business address in a Western country but the majority of authors are based in developing countries.</p>						
27	International Journal of Statistics and Probability	1927-7032	1927-7040	Canadian Center of Science and Education	–	0	1

No.	Journal title	ISSN (print)	EISSN (Electronic)	Publisher	Indexed in	VABB-SHW status	N publications
-----	---------------	--------------	--------------------	-----------	------------	-----------------	----------------

A5 The publisher hides or obscures relationships with for-profit partner companies.  
 C2 The journal or publisher uses a virtual office or other proxy business as its physical address.  
 D7 The publisher displays prominent statements that promise rapid publication and/or unusually quick peer review (less than 4 weeks).  
 G3 No policies for digital preservation.  
 H2 Multiple emails received from a journal in a short amount of time.  
 H6 The journal or publisher gives a business address in a Western country but the majority of authors are based in developing countries.

28	International Journal of Business and Social Science	2219-1933	2219-6021	Center for Promoting Ideas	–	0	1
----	--	-----------	-----------	----------------------------	---	---	---

A5 The publisher hides or obscures relationships with for-profit partner companies.  
 B2 Editors do not actually exist or are deceased.  
 B3 The journal includes scholars on an editorial board without their knowledge or permission.  
 C1 The website does not identify a physical editorial address for the journal.  
 C3 The website does not identify a physical address for the publisher or gives a fake address.  
 D14 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.  
 D3 Falsely claims indexing in well-known databases (especially SCOPUS DOAJ JCR and Cabells).  
 D7 The publisher displays prominent statements that promise rapid publication and/or unusually quick peer review (less than 4 weeks).  
 G3 No policies for digital preservation.

29	International Journal of Humanities and Social Science	2220-8488	2221-0989	Center for Promoting Ideas	–	0	5
----	--	-----------	-----------	----------------------------	---	---	---

A5 The publisher hides or obscures relationships with for-profit partner companies.  
 B2 Editors do not actually exist or are deceased.  
 B3 The journal includes scholars on an editorial board without their knowledge or permission.  
 C1 The website does not identify a physical editorial address for the journal.











No.	Journal title	ISSN (print)	EISSN (Electronic)	Publisher	Indexed in	VABB-SHW status	N publications
45	Journal of Software	1796-217X	n.a.	International Academy Publishing	–	0	2
46	Journal of Public Administration and Governance	2161-7104	n.a.	Macrothink Institute	–	n.a.	3
47	Environmental Management and Sustainable Development	2164-7682	n.a.	Macrothink Institute	–	1	2



No.	Journal title	ISSN (print)	EISSN (Electronic)	Publisher	Indexed in	VABB-SHW status	N publications
52	Journal of AIDS & Clinical Research	2155-6113	n.a.	OMICS International	–	n.a.	1
							<p>A5 The publisher hides or obscures relationships with for-profit partner companies.</p> <p>A7 The journal is associated with a conference that has been identified as predatory.</p> <p>B6 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.</p> <p>D7 The publisher displays prominent statements that promise rapid publication and/or unusually quick peer review (less than 4 weeks).</p> <p>E1 The journal uses misleading metrics (i.e. metrics with the words “impact factor” that are not the Thomson Reuters Impact Factor).</p> <p>F6 Surprise fees</p> <p>H1 Emails from journals received by researchers who are clearly not in the field the journal covers.</p> <p>H2 Multiple emails received from a journal in a short amount of time.</p>
53	Journal of Anesthesia & Clinical Research	2155-6148	n.a.	OMICS International	–	0	1
							<p>A5 The publisher hides or obscures relationships with for-profit partner companies.</p> <p>A7 The journal is associated with a conference that has been identified as predatory.</p> <p>B6 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.</p> <p>D7 The publisher displays prominent statements that promise rapid publication and/or unusually quick peer review (less than 4 weeks).</p> <p>E1 The journal uses misleading metrics (i.e. metrics with the words “impact factor” that are not the Thomson Reuters Impact Factor).</p> <p>F6 Surprise fees</p> <p>H1 Emails from journals received by researchers who are clearly not in the field the journal covers.</p> <p>H2 Multiple emails received from a journal in a short amount of time.</p>
54	Journal of Diabetes & Metabolism	2155-6156	n.a.	OMICS International	ESCI	1	1
							<p>A5 The publisher hides or obscures relationships with for-profit partner companies.</p> <p>A7 The journal is associated with a conference that has been identified as predatory.</p>





No.	Journal title	ISSN (print)	EISSN (Electronic)	Publisher	Indexed in	VABB-SHW status	N publications
59	Journal of Mass Communication & Journalism open access	2165-7912	n.a.	OMICS International	–	0	1
	<p>A1 The same article appears in more than one journal. openAccess</p> <p>A9 Insufficient resources are spent on preventing and eliminating author misconduct that may result in repeated cases of plagiarism self-plagiarism image manipulation etc. (no policies regarding plagiarism ethics misconduct etc. no use of plagiarism screens).</p> <p>D11 Authors are published several times in the same journal and/or issue.</p> <p>D7 The publisher displays prominent statements that promise rapid publication and/or unusually quick peer review (less than 4 weeks).</p> <p>E1 The journal uses misleading metrics (i.e. metrics with the words "impact factor" that are not the Thomson Reuters Impact Factor).</p> <p>G3 No policies for digital preservation. F6 Surprise fees</p> <p>H2 Multiple emails received from a journal in a short amount of time.</p>						
60	Journal of Clinical Trials	2167-0870	n.a.	OMICS International	–	0	1
	<p>A5 The publisher hides or obscures relationships with for-profit partner companies.</p> <p>A7 The journal is associated with a conference that has been identified as predatory.</p> <p>B6 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.</p> <p>D7 The publisher displays prominent statements that promise rapid publication and/or unusually quick peer review (less than 4 weeks).</p> <p>E1 The journal uses misleading metrics (i.e. metrics with the words "impact factor" that are not the Thomson Reuters Impact Factor).</p> <p>F6 Surprise fees</p> <p>H1 Emails from journals received by researchers who are clearly not in the field the journal covers.</p> <p>H2 Multiple emails received from a journal in a short amount of time.</p>						
61	Journal of Gerontology & Geriatric Research	2167-7182	n.a.	OMICS International	–	n.a.	1
	<p>A5 The publisher hides or obscures relationships with for-profit partner companies.</p>						





No.	Journal title	ISSN (print)	EISSN (Electronic)	Publisher	Indexed in	VABB-SHW status	N publications
66	Neuropsychiatry	1758-2008	1758-2016	OMICS International	SCIE	1	3
	<p>A5 The publisher hides or obscures relationships with for-profit partner companies.</p> <p>B10 The journal's website does not have a clearly stated peer review policy.</p> <p>C2 The journal or publisher uses a virtual office or other proxy business as its physical address.</p> <p>D3 Falsely claims indexing in well-known databases (especially SCOPUS DOAJ JCR and Cabells).</p>						
67	Clinical Investigation	2041-6792	n.a.	OMICS International	–	0	2
	<p>A5 The publisher hides or obscures relationships with for-profit partner companies.</p> <p>B10 The journal's website does not have a clearly stated peer review policy.</p> <p>C2 The journal or publisher uses a virtual office or other proxy business as its physical address.</p>						
68	Applied Economics and Finance	2332-7294	2332-7308	Redfame Publishing	–	0	1
	<p>A3 Information received from the journal does not match the journal's website.</p> <p>A5 The publisher hides or obscures relationships with for-profit partner companies.</p> <p>B10 The journal's website does not have a clearly stated peer review policy.</p> <p>D11 Authors are published several times in the same journal and/or issue.</p> <p>D7 The publisher displays prominent statements that promise rapid publication and/or unusually quick peer review (less than 4 weeks).</p>						
69	Journal of Global Research in Computer Science	2229-371X	n.a.	Research & Reviews (OMICS International)	–	1	1
	<p>A5 The publisher hides or obscures relationships with for-profit partner companies.</p> <p>B10 The journal's website does not have a clearly stated peer review policy.</p> <p>C2 The journal or publisher uses a virtual office or other proxy business as its physical address.</p>						
70	The Business Review, Cambridge	1553-5827	n.a.	Scholarly Journals and Academic Conferences	–	0	1
	<p>A10 The name of the journal references a country or demographic that does not relate to the content or origin of the journal.</p>						









No.	Journal title	ISSN (print)	EISSN (Electronic)	Publisher	Indexed in	VABB-SHW status	N publications
86	WSEAS Transactions on Acoustics and Music	1109-9577	n.a.	World Scientific and Engineering Academy and Society	–	0	2
87	WSEAS Transactions on Environment and Development	1790-5079	2224-3496	World Scientific and Engineering Academy and Society	–	0	3
88	WSEAS Transactions on Applied and Theoretical Mechanics	1991-8747	2224-3429	World Scientific and Engineering Academy and Society	–	0	2

No.	Journal title	ISSN (print)	EISSN (Electronic)	Publisher	Indexed in	VABB-SHW status	N publications
-----	---------------	--------------	--------------------	-----------	------------	-----------------	----------------

A4 The journal or publisher claims to be a non-profit when it is actually a for-profit company.  
A7 The journal is associated with a conference that has been identified as predatory.  
D15 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.  
G3 No policies for digital preservation.

89	International Journal of Civil, Environmental, Structural, Construction and Architectural Engineering	2010-376X	n.a.	WASET – World Academy of Science, Engineering and Technology	–	1	1
----	---	-----------	------	--	---	---	---

A4 The journal or publisher claims to be a non-profit when it is actually a for-profit company.  
A7 The journal is associated with a conference that has been identified as predatory.  
B1 No editor or editorial board listed on the journal's website at all.  
D5 Machine-generated or other "sting" abstracts or papers are accepted.  
D14 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.  
D15 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.