



TASHKENT MEDICAL ACADEMY

100 TMA
ANNIVERSARY



Journal of Educational and Scientific Medicine



Issue 3 (1) | 2023



OAK.UZ
Google Scholar

Science Education Commission of the Cabinet
Ministry of the Republic of Uzbekistan

ISSN: 2181-3175

About Predatory Publishing – What It is & How To Recognize It?

F.L. [Azizova](#)¹, A.O. [Okhunov](#)², N.Sh. [Khudaibergenova](#)³

ABSTRACT

This review article is devoted to the concept, history, and methods of recognizing predatory logs. Such journals, as usual, are published in the open-access mode. They are a periodical and claim the status of scientific journals. However, at the heart of these types of journals is a key element of an unfair model of scientific publishing, which involves charging authors of manuscripts without providing full editorial or publishing services (including a full peer review system) accepted in real scientific journals (open and limited access). The article describes the history of the study of the issue, and methods for identifying such publications in order to increase the vigilance of young scientists.

Keywords: scientific publications, scientific journals, publications and citations, predatory journals

Predatory publishing, also write-only publishing [1,2] or deceptive publishing [3], is an exploitative academic publishing business model that involves charging publication fees to authors without checking articles for quality and legitimacy, and without providing editorial and publishing services that legitimate academic journals provide, whether open access or not. The phenomenon of «open access predatory publishers» was first noticed by Jeffrey Beall, when he described «publishers that are ready to publish any article for payment» [4]. However, criticisms about the label «predatory» have been raised [5]. A lengthy review of the controversy started by Beall appears in The Journal of Academic Librarianship [6].

Predatory publishers are so regarded because scholars are tricked into publishing with them, although some authors may be aware that the journal is poor quality or even fraudulent but publish in them anyway. New scholars from developing countries are said to be especially at risk of being misled by predatory publishers [8-10]. According to one study, 60% of articles published in predatory journals receive no citations over the five-year period following publication [11,12].

Beall's List, a report that for 5 years was regularly updated by Jeffrey Beall of the University of Colorado until January 2017 [13], set forth criteria for categorizing publications as predatory [14]. A demand by Frontiers Media to open a misconduct case against Beall, which was launched by his university and later closed

¹ Professor, MD, PhD, Vice-Rector for Research and Innovation, Tashkent Medical Academy, Tashkent, Uzbekistan

² Professor, MD, PhD, Head of the Department of General and Pediatric Surgery, Tashkent Medical Academy, Tashkent, Uzbekistan

³ PhD, Senior Lecturer, Department of General and Pediatric Surgery, Tashkent Medical Academy, Tashkent, Uzbekistan

with no findings, was one of several reasons Beall may have taken his list offline, but he has not publicly shared his reasoning [13, 15]. After the closure, other efforts to identify predatory publishing have sprouted, such as the paywalled Cabell's blacklist [16], as well as other lists (some based on the original listing by Beall).

In March 2008, Gunther Eysenbach, publisher of an early open-access journal, drew attention to what he called the «black sheep among open access publishers and journals» [17] and highlighted in his blog publishers and journals which resorted to excessive spam to attract authors and editors, criticizing Bentham Science Publishers, Dove Medical Press, and Libertas Academica. In July 2008, Richard Poynder's interview series brought attention to the practices of new publishers who were «better able to exploit the opportunities of the new environment» [18]. Doubts about honesty and scams in a subset of open-access journals continued to be raised in 2009 [19, 20].

Concerns for spamming practices from these journals prompted leading open-access publishers to create the Open Access Scholarly Publishers Association in 2008 [21]. In another early precedent, in 2009 the Improbable Research blog found that Scientific Research Publishing's journals duplicated papers already published elsewhere [22]; the case was subsequently reported in Nature [23]. In 2010, Cornell University graduate student Phil Davis (editor of the Scholarly Kitchen blog) submitted a manuscript consisting of computer-generated nonsense (using SCIgen) which was accepted for a fee (but withdrawn by the author) [24]. Predatory publishers have been reported to hold submissions, hostage, refusing to allow them to be withdrawn and thereby preventing submission to another journal [25, 26].

Predatory publishing does not refer to a homogeneous category of practices. The name itself was coined by American librarian Jeffrey Beall who created a list of «deceptive and fraudulent» Open Access (OA) publishers which was used as a reference until withdrawn in 2017. The term has been reused since for a new for-profit database by Cabell's International [16]. On the one hand, Beall's list as well as Cabell's International database do include truly fraudulent and deceptive OA publishers, that pretend to provide services (quality peer review) that they do not implement, show fictive editorial boards and/or ISSN numbers, use dubious marketing and spamming techniques or even hijacking known titles [27]. On the other hand, they also list journals with subpar standards of peer review and linguistic correction [28]. The number of predatory journals thus defined has grown expo-

nentially since 2010 [29, 30]. The demonstration of existing unethical practices in the OA publishing industry also attracted considerable media attention [31].

A 2020 study has found hundreds of scientists say they have reviewed papers for journals termed «predatory» — although they might not know it. An analysis of Publons has found that it hosts at least 6.000 records of reviews for more than 1.000 predatory journals. «The researchers who review most for these titles tend to be young, inexperienced and affiliated with institutions in low-income nations in Africa and the Middle East» [32].

In 2013, John Bohannon, a staff writer for the journal Science and for popular science publications, tested the open access system by submitting to a few such journals a deeply flawed paper on the purported effect of a lichen constituent, and published the results in a paper called, «Who's Afraid of Peer Review?». About 60% of those journals, including journals of Elsevier, SAGE, Wolters Kluwer, and several universities, accepted the faked medical paper. PLOS ONE and Hindawi rejected it [31].

In 2015, four researchers created a fictitious sub-par scientist named Anna O. Szust and applied on her behalf for an editor position in 360 scholarly journals. Szust's qualifications were dismal for the role of an editor; she had never published a single article and had no editorial experience. The books and book chapters listed on her CV were made-up, as were the publishing houses that published the books.

One-third of the journals to which Szust applied were sampled from Beall's List of predatory journals. Forty of these predatory journals accepted Szust as editor without any background vetting and often within days or even hours. By comparison, she received minimal to no positive response from the «control» journals which «must meet certain standards of quality, including ethical publishing practices» [33]. Among journals sampled from the Directory of Open Access Journals (DOAJ), 8 of 120 accepted Szust. The DOAJ has since removed some of the affected journals in a 2016 purge. None of the 120 sampled journals listed in Journal Citation Reports (JCR) offered Szust the position [34-36].

SCIgen, a computer program that randomly generates academic computer science papers using context-free grammar, has generated papers that have been accepted by a number of predatory journals as well as predatory conferences.

Recognizing common characteristics of predatory publishers can help to avoid them [44]. Complaints that

are associated with predatory open-access publishing include:

- ✳ Accepting articles quickly with little or no peer review or quality control [45], including hoax and non-sensical papers [24, 46, 47].
- ✳ Notifying academics of article fees only after papers are accepted [45].
- ✳ Aggressively campaigning for academics to submit articles or serve on editorial boards [48].
- ✳ Listing academics as members of editorial boards without their permission [14, 49], and not allowing academics to resign from editorial boards [14, 50].
- ✳ Appointing fake academics to editorial boards [51].
- ✳ Mimicking the name or website style of more established journals [50].
- ✳ Making misleading claims about the publishing operation, such as a false location [14].
- ✳ Using ISSN [14] improperly.
- ✳ Citing fake [52, 53] or non-existent impact factors.
- ✳ Boasting about being «indexed» by academic social networking sites (like ResearchGate) and standard identifiers (like ISSNs and DOIs) as if they were prestigious or reputable bibliographic databases [54].
- ✳ Favoritism and self-promotion in peer review [55].
- ✳ Predatory publishers have also been compared to vanity presses [56, 57].

In 2015, Jeffrey Beall used 26 criteria related to poor journal standards and practices, 9 related to journal editors and staff members, 7 related to ethics and integrity, 6 related to the publisher's business practices, and 6 «other» general criteria related to publishers [58]. He also listed 26 additional practices, which were 'reflective of poor journal standards' and were not necessarily indicative of predatory behaviour.

In 2016, researchers Stefan Eriksson and Gert Helgesson identified 25 signs of predatory publishing [59]. They warn that a journal will not necessarily be predatory if they meet one of the criteria, «but the more points on the list that apply to the journal at hand, the more sceptical you should be». The full list is quoted below:

1. The publisher is not a member of any recognized professional organisation committed to best publishing practices (like COPE or EASE).
2. The journal is not indexed in well-established electronic databases (like MEDLINE or Web of Science).
3. The publisher claims to be a «leading publisher» even though it just got started.
4. The journal and the publisher are unfamiliar to you and all your colleagues.

5. The papers of the journal are of poor research quality, and may not be academic at all (for instance allowing for obvious pseudo-science).

6. There are fundamental errors in the titles and abstracts, or frequent and repeated typographical or factual errors throughout the published papers.

7. The journal website is not professional.

8. The journal website does not present an editorial board or gives insufficient detail on names and affiliations.

9. The journal website does not reveal the journal's editorial office location or uses an incorrect address.

10. The publishing schedule is not clearly stated.

11. The journal title claims a national affiliation that does not match its location (such as «American Journal of ...» while being located on another continent) or includes «International» in its title while having a single-country editorial board.

12. The journal mimics another journal title or the website of said journal.

13. The journal provides an impact factor in spite of the fact that the journal is new (which means that the impact cannot yet be calculated).

14. The journal claims an unrealistically high impact based on spurious alternative impact factors (such as 7 for a bioethics journal, which is far beyond the top notation).

15. The journal website posts non-related or non-academic advertisements.

16. The publisher of the journal has released an overwhelmingly large suite of new journals on one occasion or during a very short period of time.

17. The editor-in-chief of the journal is editor in chief also for other journals with widely different focus.

18. The journal includes articles (very far) outside its stated scope.

19. The journal sends you an unsolicited invitation to submit an article for publication while making it blatantly clear that the editor has absolutely no idea about your field of expertise.

20. Emails from the journal editor are written in the poor language, include exaggerated flattering (everyone is a leading profile in the field), and make contradictory claims (such as «You have to respond within 48 h» while later on saying «You may submit your manuscript whenever you find convenient»).

21. The journal charges a submission or handling fee, instead of a publication fee (which means that you have to pay even if the paper is not accepted for publication).

22. The types of submission/publication fees and what they amount to are not clearly stated on the journal's website.

23. The journal gives unrealistic promises regarding the speed of the peer review process (hinting that the journal's peer review process is minimal or non-existent) —or boasts an equally unrealistic track-record.

24. The journal does not describe copyright agreements clearly or demands the copyright of the paper while claiming to be an open access journal.

25. The journal displays no strategies for how to handle misconduct, conflicts of interest, or secure the archiving of articles when no longer in operation.

26. A user friendly web base interface is available [60].

Predatory journals have rapidly increased their publication volumes from 53.000 in 2010 to an estimated 420.000 articles in 2014, published by around 8.000 active journals [29, 61]. Early on, publishers with more than 100 journals dominated the market, but since 2012 publishers in the 10–99 journal size category have captured the largest market share. As of 2022, almost one-third of the 100 largest publishers (by journal count) could be deemed predatory [62]. The regional distribution of both the publisher's country and authorship is highly skewed, with three-quarters of the authors from Asia or Africa [29]. Authors paid an average fee of US \$178 each for articles to be published rapidly without review, typically within 2 to 3 months of submission [29]. As reported in 2019, some 5% of Italian researchers have published in predatory journals, with a third of those journals engaging in fraudulent editorial practices [63].

The root cause of exploitative practices is the author-facing an article-processing charge (APC) business model, in which authors are charged to publish rather than to read [64]. Such a model provides incentives for publishers to focus on the quantity of articles published, rather than their quality. APCs have gained increasing popularity in the last two decades as a business model for OA, due to the guaranteed revenue streams they offer, as well as a lack of competitive pricing within the OA market, which allows vendors full control over how much they choose to charge [65].

Ultimately, quality control relies on good editorial policies and their enforcement, and the conflict between rigorous scholarship and profit can be successfully managed by selecting which articles are published purely based on (peer-reviewed) methodological quality [66]. Most OA publishers ensure their quality by regis-

tering their titles in the Directory of Open Access Journals and complying with a standardised set of conditions [67]. A recent study has shown that Beall's criteria of «predatory» publishing were in no way limited to OA publishers and that, applying them to both OA and non-OA journals in the field of library and information science, even top-tier non-OA journals could be qualified as predatory.

The majority of predatory OA publishers and authors publishing in these appear to be based in Asia and Africa, as well as Europe and the Americas [70-72]. It has been argued that authors who publish in predatory journals may do so unwittingly without actual unethical perspective, due to concerns that North American and European journals might be prejudiced against scholars from non-Western countries, high publication pressure or lack of research proficiency [10, 73]. Hence predatory publishing also questions the geopolitical and commercial context of scholarly knowledge production. More generally, the criteria adopted by high JIF journals, including the quality of the English language, the composition of the editorial board or the rigour of the peer review process itself tend to favour familiar content from the "centre" rather than the «periphery» [75]. It is thus important to distinguish between exploitative publishers and journals – whether OA or not – and legitimate OA initiatives with varying standards in digital publishing, but which may improve and disseminate epistemic contents [76].

University of Colorado Denver librarian and researcher Jeffrey Beall, who coined the term «predatory publishing», first published his list of predatory publishers in 2010 [48]. Beall's list of potential, possible, or probable predatory scholarly open-access publishers attempted to identify scholarly open-access publishers with questionable practices [78]. In 2013, Nature reported that Beall's list and website were «widely read by librarians, researchers, and open-access advocates, many of whom applaud his efforts to reveal shady publishing practices» [48]. Others have raised the objection that «(w)hether it's fair to classify all these journals and publishers as 'predatory' is an open question—several shades of gray may be distinguishable» [79].

Beall's analyses have been called sweeping generalizations with no supporting evidence [80], and he has also been criticized for being biased against open-access journals from less economically developed countries [81]. One librarian wrote that Beall's list «attempts a binary division of this complex gold rush: the good and the bad. Yet many of the criteria used are either impossible to quantify..., or can be found to apply as often to estab-

lished OA journals as to the new entrants in this area... Some of the criteria seem to make First World assumptions that aren't valid worldwide» [82]. Beall differed with these opinions and wrote a letter of rebuttal in mid-2015 [83].

Following the Who's Afraid of Peer Review? investigation, the DOAJ has tightened up its inclusion criteria, with the purpose of serving as a whitelist, very much like Beall's has been a blacklist [84]. The investigation found that «the results show that Beall is good at spotting publishers with poor quality control» [31]. However, the managing director of DOAJ, Lars Bjørnshauge, estimates that questionable publishing probably accounts for fewer than 1% of all author-pays, open-access papers, a proportion far lower than Beall's estimate of 5–10%. Instead of relying on «blacklists», Bjørnshauge argues that open-access associations such as the DOAJ and the Open Access Scholarly Publishers Association should adopt more responsibility for policing publishers: they should lay out a set of criteria that publishers and journals must comply with to win a place on a «whitelist» indicating that they are trustworthy [48].

Beall has been threatened with a lawsuit by a Canadian publisher which appears on the list. He reports that he has been the subject of online harassment for his work on the subject. His list has been criticized [85] for relying heavily on analysis of publishers' websites, not engaging directly with publishers, and including newly founded but legitimate journals. Beall has responded to these complaints by posting the criteria he uses to generate the list, as well as instituting an anonymous three-person review body to which publishers can appeal to be removed from the list [48]. For example, a 2010 re-evaluation resulted in some journals being removed from Beall's list [48].

At the May 2017 meeting of the Society for Scholarly Publishing, Cabell's International, a company that offers scholarly publishing analytics and other scholarly services, announced that it intended to launch a blacklist of predatory journals (not publishers) in June, and said that access would be by subscription only [16]. The company started work on its blacklist criteria in early 2016 [97]. In July 2017, both a blacklist and a whitelist were offered for subscription on their website [97].

More transparent peer review, such as open peer review and post-publication peer review, has been advocated to combat predatory journals [108, 109]. Others have argued instead that the discussion on predatory journals should not be turned «into a debate over the

shortcomings of peer review—it is nothing of the sort. It is about fraud, deception, and irresponsibility...» [110].

In an effort to «set apart legitimate journals and publishers from non-legitimate ones», principles of transparency and best practice have been identified and issued collectively by the Committee on Publication Ethics, the DOAJ, the Open Access Scholarly Publishers Association, and the World Association of Medical Editors [111]. Various journal review websites (crowd-sourced or expert-run) have been started, some focusing on the quality of the peer review process and extending to non-OA publications [112, 113]. A group of libraries and publishers launched an awareness campaign [114, 115].

A number of measures have been suggested to further combat predatory journals. Others have called on research institutions to improve publication literacy notably among junior researchers in developing countries [116]. Some organisations have also developed criteria in which predatory publishers could be spotted through providing tips [117].

As Beall has ascribed predatory publishing to a consequence of gold open access (particularly its author-pay variant) [118], one researcher has argued for platinum open access, where the absence of article processing charges removes the publisher's conflict of interest in accepting article submissions [119]. More objective discriminating metrics [120] have been proposed, such as a "predatory score" [121] and positive and negative journal quality indicators [122].

Bioethicist Arthur Caplan has warned that predatory publishing, fabricated data, and academic plagiarism erodes public confidence in the medical profession, devalues legitimate science, and undermines public support for evidence-based policy [125].

In 2015, Rick Anderson, associate dean in the J. Willard Marriott Library, University of Utah, challenged the term itself: «What do we mean when we say 'predatory,' and is that term even still useful?... This question has become relevant because of that common refrain heard among Beall's critics: that he only examines one kind of predation—the kind that naturally crops up in the context of author-pays OA.» Anderson suggests that the term «predatory» be retired in the context of scholarly publishing. «It's a nice, attention-grabbing word, but I'm not sure it's helpfully descriptive... it generates more heat than light» [126]. A 2017 article in The New York Times suggests that a significant number of academics are «eager» to publish their work in these journals, making the relationship more a «new and ugly symbiosis»

than a case of scholars being exploited by «predators» [7].

Similarly, a study published in January 2018 found that «Scholars in the developing world felt that reputable Western journals might be prejudiced against them and sometimes felt more comfortable publishing in journals from the developing world. Other scholars were unaware of the reputation of the journals in which they published and would not have selected them had they known. However, some scholars said they would still have published in the same journals if their institutions recognised them. The pressure to 'publish or perish' was another factor influencing many scholars' decisions to publish in these fast-turnaround journals. In some cases, researchers did not have adequate guidance and felt they lacked the knowledge of research to submit to a more reputable journal» [10].

In May 2018, the University Grants Commission in India removed 4,305 dubious journals from a list of publications used for evaluating academic performance [127-129].

To further define and distinguish predatory journals, Leonhard Dobusch and Maximilian Heimstädt in 2019 proposed a tripartite classification of Open Access journals with below-average peer review quality [130]. Based on their procedures, there would be «aspirant», «junk» and «fake» journals.

While aspirant journals are science-oriented despite their below-average peer review (e.g. student-run journals), junk and fake journals are predominantly or exclusively profit-oriented. Junk and fake Open Access journals have superficial or no peer review procedures, despite their claims of being peer-reviewed.

In April, 2019, 43 participants from 10 countries met in Ottawa, Canada to formulate a consensus definition: «Predatory journals and publishers are entities that prioritize self-interest at the expense of scholarship and are characterized by false or misleading information, deviation from best editorial and publication practices, a lack of transparency, and/or the use of aggressive and indiscriminate solicitation practices» [131]. The adequacy of the peer review was not included in the definition because this factor was deemed too subjective to evaluate [131]. Critics of this definition argued that excluding the quality of peer review from the definition «could strengthen rather than weaken» predatory journals [132].

In March 2022, the InterAcademy Partnership published a report, Combatting Predatory Academic Journals

and Conferences, with a series of recommendations [133].

Conflict of Interest – The authors state that they have no conflict of interest.

Financing – No.

REFERENCES:

1. Bogost, Ian (24 November 2008). "Write-Only Publication".
2. Riehle, Dirk (13 September 2011). "Definition of Write-Only Journal".
3. Anderson, Rick (19 March 2019). "OSI Brief: Deceptive publishing".
4. Beall, Jeffrey (2012). "Predatory publishers are corrupting open access". *Nature*. 489 (7415):179.
5. Björk, Bo-Christer; Solomon, David (2012). "Open access versus subscription journals: A comparison of scientific impact". *BMC Medicine*. 10: 73.
6. Krawczyk, Franciszek; Kulczycki, Emanuel (2021). «How is open access accused of being predatory? The impact of Beall's lists of predatory journals on academic publishing». *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*. 47 (2): 102271.
7. Kolata, Gina (30 October 2017). «Many Academics Are Eager to Publish in Worthless Journals» Archived 5 November 2017 at the Wayback Machine, *The New York Times*.
8. Kearney, Margaret H. (2015). «Predatory Publishing: What Authors Need to Know». *Research in Nursing & Health*. 38 (1): 1–3.
9. Xia, Jingfeng; Harmon, Jennifer L.; Connolly, Kevin G.; Donnelly, Ryan M.; Anderson, Mary R.; Howard, Heather A. (2014). «Who publishes in «predatory» journals?». *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology*. 66 (7): 1406–1417.
10. Kurt, Serhat (2018). «Why do authors publish in predatory journals?». *Learned Publishing*. 31 (2): 141–7.
11. Brainard J (2020). «Articles in «predatory» journals receive few or no citations». *Science*. 367 (6474): 129. Bibcode:2020Sci.367.129B.
12. Björk, Bo-Christer; Kanto-Karvonen, Sari; Harvainen, J. Tuomas (2020). «How Frequently are Articles in Predatory Open Access Journals Cited». *Publications*. 8 (2): 17. arXiv:1912.10228.
13. Silver, Andrew (18 January 2017). «Controversial website that lists 'predatory' publishers shuts down». *Nature*.

14. Elliott, Carl (5 June 2012). «On Predatory Publishers: a Q&A With Jeffrey Beall». Brainstorm. The Chronicle of Higher Education. Archived from the original on 8 February 2014.
15. Basken, Paul (12 September 2017). «Why Beall's List Died — and What It Left Unresolved About Open Access». The Chronicle of Higher Education. Retrieved 29 August 2020.
16. Silver, Andrew (31 May 2017). «Pay-to-view blacklist of predatory journals set to launch». Nature: nature.2017.22090.
17. Eysenbach, Gunther. «Black sheep among Open Access Journals and Publishers». Random Research Rants.
18. Poynder, Richard (5 November 2008). «The Open Access Interviews: Dove Medical Press». Open and Shut? Retrieved 13 April 2016. For the series of interviews, see The Open Access Interviews Archived 1 September 2016 at the Wayback Machine index page.
19. Suber, Peter (2 October 2009). «Ten challenges for open-access journals». SPARC Open Access Newsletter. No. 138.
20. Beall, Jeffrey (2009), «Bentham Open», The Charleston Advisor, Volume 11, Number 1, July 2009, pp. 29–32(4).
21. Abrahams, Marc (22 December 2009). «Strange academic journals: Scam?». Improbable Research. Retrieved 13 January 2015.
22. Sanderson, Katharine (13 January 2010). «Two new journals copy the old». Nature News. 463 (7278): 148.
23. Basken, Paul (10 June 2009). «Open-Access Publisher Appears to Have Accepted Fake Paper From Bogus Center». The Chronicle of Higher Education.
24. McCook, Alison (26 August 2016). «U.S. government agency sues publisher, charging it with deceiving researchers». Retraction Watch. Retrieved 2 November 2016.
25. Molteni, Megan (19 September 2016). «The FTC is Cracking Down on Predatory Science Journals». Wired. Retrieved 2 November 2016.
26. Djuric, Dragan (2015). «Penetrating the Omerta of Predatory Publishing: The Romanian Connection». Science and Engineering Ethics. 21 (1): 183–202.
27. Strinzal, Michaela; Severin, Anna; Milzow, Katrin; Egger, Matthias (2019). «Blacklists» and «Whitelists» to Tackle Predatory Publishing : A Cross-Sectional Comparison and Thematic Analysis». mBio. 10 (3).
28. Shen, Cenyu; Björk, Bo-Christer (October 2015). «Predatory open access: a longitudinal study of article volumes and market characteristics». BMC Medicine. 13 (1): 230.
29. Perlin, Marcelo S.; Imasato, Takeyoshi; Borenstein, Denis (2018). "Is Predatory Publishing a Real Threat? Evidence from a Large Database Study". Scientometrics. 116: 255–273.
30. Bohannon, John (4 October 2013). "Who's afraid of peer review?". Science. 342 (6154): 60–65.
31. Van Noorden, Richard (11 March 2020). "Hundreds of scientists have peer-reviewed for predatory journals". Nature.
32. Sorokowski, Piotr (22 March 2017). "Predatory journals recruit fake editor". Nature. 543 (7646): 481–483. Bibcode:2017Natur.543..481S.
33. Kluger, Jeffrey. "Dozens of Scientific Journals Offered Her a Job. But She Didn't Exist". Time. Retrieved 22 March 2017.
34. Kolata, Gina (22 March 2017). "A Scholarly Sting Operation Shines a Light on 'Predatory' Journals". The New York Times. Retrieved 22 March 2017.
35. Burdick, Alan. "A Scholarly Sting Operation Shines a Light on 'Predatory' Journals". The New Yorker. Retrieved 22 March 2017.
36. "FTC sues OMICS group: Are predatory publishers' days numbered?". STAT. 2 September 2016. Retrieved 3 September 2016.
37. Shanka, David. "COMPLAINT FOR PERMANENT INJUNCTION AND OTHER EQUITABLE RELIEF" (PDF). Case 2:16-cv-02022. United States District Court Nevada. Retrieved 3 September 2016.
38. "Federal Trade Commission begins to crack down on 'predatory' publishers". 29 August 2016. Retrieved 3 September 2016.
39. "Enforcement » Cases and Proceedings » OMICS Group Inc". No. FTC MATTER/FILE NUMBER: 152 3113. FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION. 15 October 2019.
40. Timmer, John (3 April 2019). "FTC hits predatory scientific publisher with a \$50 million fine". Ars Technica. Condé Nast Digital. Retrieved 3 April 2019.
41. Oransky, Ivan (2 April 2019). "Court orders publisher OMICS to pay U.S. gov't \$50 million in suit alleging "unfair and deceptive practices"". Retraction Watch. Retrieved 3 April 2019.

42. Manley, Stewart (23 July 2019). "On the limitations of recent lawsuits against Sci-Hub, OMICS, ResearchGate, and Georgia State University". *Learned Publishing*. 32 (4): 375–381.
43. Leonard, Michelle; Stapleton, Suzanne; Collins, Perry; Selfe, Terry Kit; Cataldo, Tara (23 September 2021). "Ten simple rules for avoiding predatory publishing scams". *PLOS Computational Biology*. 17(9): e1009377.
44. Stratford, Michael (4 March 2012). "'Predatory' Online Journals Lure Scholars Who Are Eager to Publish". *The Chronicle of Higher Education*.
45. Gilbert, Natasha (15 June 2009). "Editor will quit over hoax paper". *Nature*.
46. Safi, Michael (25 November 2014), "Journal accepts bogus paper requesting removal from mailing list", *The Guardian*
47. Butler, Declan (March 2013). "Investigating journals: The dark side of publishing". *Nature*. 495 (7442): 433–435.
48. Beall, Jeffrey (1 August 2012). "Predatory Publishing". *The Scientist*.
49. Kolata, Gina (7 April 2013). "For Scientists, an Exploding World of Pseudo-Academia". *The New York Times*.
50. Neumann, Ralf (2 February 2012). "Junk Journals und die 'Peter-Panne'". *Laborjournal*.
51. Brezgov, Stef (3 June 2019). "Bogus New Impact Factor Appears". *Scholarly Open Access*.
52. Jalalian, Mehrdad (August 2013). "New corruption detected: Bogus impact factors compiled by fake organizations". *Electronic Physician*. 5 (3): 685–686.
53. "Don't get fooled of Journal's 'Indexed in' information". *SAR Publisher*. 2 March 2019. Retrieved 12 March 2019.
54. "Predatory publishing: Favoritism and self-promotion pollute peer review". *Big Think*. Retrieved 16 February 2022.
55. "Predatory Publishing: The Dark Side of the Open-Access Movement". *ASH Clinical News*. January 2017.
56. Brown, Michael J. I. (2 August 2015). "Vanity and predatory academic publishers are corrupting the pursuit of knowledge". *The Conversation*.
57. Beall, Jeffrey (1 January 2015). "Criteria for Determining Predatory Open-Access Publishers» (PDF). *Beall's list (3rd ed.)*. Retrieved 13 February 2019.
58. Eriksson, Stefan; Helgesson, Gert (7 October 2016). "The false academy: predatory publishing in science and bioethics". *Medicine, Health Care and Philosophy*. 20 (2): 163–170.
59. "Compass To Publish". *app.lib.uliege.be*. Retrieved 30 December 2022.
60. Carl Straumsheim (October 2015). "Study finds huge increase in articles published by 'predatory' journals". Archived from the original on 4 February 2016. Retrieved 15 February 2016.
61. Nishikawa-Pacher, Andreas (21 September 2022). "Who are the 100 largest scientific publishers by journal count? A webscraping approach". *Journal of Documentation*. 78 (7): 450–463.
62. Bagues, Manuel; Sylos-Labini, Mauro; Zinovyeva, Natalia (March 2019). "A walk on the wild side: 'Predatory' journals and information asymmetries in scientific evaluations" (PDF). *Research Policy*. 48 (2): 462–477.
63. Eve, Martin Paul (2015). "Co-Operating for Gold Open Access without APCs". *Insights: The UKSG Journal*. 28: 73–77.
64. "Developing an Effective Market for Open Access Article Processing Charges" (PDF).
65. Vanholsbeeck, Marc; Thacker, Paul; Sattler, Susanne; Ross-Hellauer, Tony; Rivera-López, Bárbara S.; Rice, Curt; Nobes, Andy; Masuzzo, Paola; Martin, Ryan; Kramer, Bianca; Havemann, Johanna; Enkhbayar, Asura; Davila, Jacinto; Crick, Tom; Crane, Harry; Tennant, Jonathan P. (11 March 2019). "Ten Hot Topics around Scholarly Publishing". *Publications*. 7 (2): 34.
66. "Directory of Open Access Journals". *doaj.org*.
67. Olivarez, Joseph; Bales, Stephen; Sare, Laura; Vanduinkerken, Wyoma (2018). "Format Aside: Applying Beall's Criteria to Assess the Predatory Nature of Both OA and Non-OA Library and Information Science Journals". *College & Research Libraries*. 79.
68. Shamseer, Larissa; Moher, David; Maduekwe, Onyi; Turner, Lucy; Barbour, Virginia; Burch, Rebecca; Clark, Jocalyn; Galipeau, James; Roberts, Jason; Shea, Beverley J. (2017). "Potential Predatory and Legitimate Biomedical Journals: Can You Tell the Difference? A Cross-Sectional Comparison". *BMC Medicine*. 15 (1): 28.
69. Oermann, Marilyn H.; Conklin, Jamie L.; Nicoll, Leslie H.; Chinn, Peggy L.; Ashton, Kathleen S.; Edie, Alison H.; Amarasekara, Sathya; Budinger, Susan C. (2016). "Study of Predatory Open Access

- Nursing Journals". *Journal of Nursing Scholarship*. 48 (6): 624–632.
70. Oermann, Marilyn H.; Nicoll, Leslie H.; Chinn, Peggy L.; Ashton, Kathleen S.; Conklin, Jamie L.; Edie, Alison H.; Amarasekara, Sathya; Williams, Brittany L. (2018). "Quality of Articles Published in Predatory Nursing Journals". *Nursing Outlook*. 66 (1): 4–10.
71. Moher, David; Shamseer, Larissa; Cobey, Kelly D.; Lalu, Manoj M.; Galipeau, James; Avey, Marc T.; Ahmadzai, Nadera; Alabousi, Mostafa; Barbeau, Pauline; Beck, Andrew; Daniel, Raymond; Frank, Robert; Ghannad, Mona; Hamel, Candyce; Hersi, Mona; Hutton, Brian; Isupov, Inga; McGrath, Trevor A.; McInnes, Matthew D. F.; Page, Matthew J.; Pratt, Misty; Pussegoda, Kusala; Shea, Beverley; Srivastava, Anubhav; Stevens, Adrienne; Thavorn, Kednapa; van Katwyk, Sasha; Ward, Roxanne; Wolfe, Dianna; Yazdi, Fatemeh; Yu, Ashley M.; Ziai, Hedyeh (September 2017). "Stop this waste of people, animals and money". *Nature*. 549 (7670): 23–25.
72. Frandsen, Tove Faber (January 2019). "Why do researchers decide to publish in questionable journals? A review of the literature: Why authors publish in questionable journals". *Learned Publishing*. 32 (1): 57–62.
73. Omobowale, Ayokunle Olumuyiwa; Akanle, Olayinka; Adeniran, Adebunsi Isaac; Adegboyega, Kamorudeen (2014). "Peripheral Scholarship and the Context of Foreign Paid Publishing in Nigeria". *Current Sociology*. 62 (5): 666–684.
74. Bell, Kirsten (8 July 2017). "'Predatory' Open Access Journals as Parody: Exposing the Limitations of 'Legitimate' Academic Publishing". *TripleC*. 15 (2): 651–662.
75. Nwagwu, W.E. (2016). "Open Access in the Developing Regions: Situating the Altercations About Predatory Publishing". *Canadian Journal of Information and Library Science*. 40 (1): 58–80.
76. Babini, Dominique (2014). "Open Access in Latin America".
77. Beall, Jeffrey. "List of Publishers". *Scholarly Open Access*. Archived from the original on 6 March 2015. Retrieved 30 April 2016.
78. Haug, C. (2013). "The Downside of Open-Access Publishing". *New England Journal of Medicine*. 368 (9): 791–793.
79. Bivens-Tatum, Wayne (2014). "Reactionary Rhetoric Against Open Access Publishing". *triple C*. 12 (2): 441–446.
80. Berger, Monica; Cirasella, Jill (March 2015). "Beyond Beall's List: Better understanding predatory publishers". *College & Research Libraries News*. 76 (3): 132–135.
81. Coyle, Karen (4 April 2013). "Predatory Publishers I Peer to Peer Review". *Library Journal*.
82. Beall, Jeffrey (1 June 2015). "Response to 'Beyond Beall's List'". *College & Research Libraries News*. 76 (6): 340–341.
83. Van Noorden, R. (2014). "Open-access website gets tough". *Nature*. 512 (7512): 17. Bibcode: 2014 Natur. 512.17V.
84. Walt Crawford, (July 2014), "Journals, 'Journals' and Wannabes: Investigating The List Archived- 2014-10-31 at the Wayback Machine", *Cites & Insights*, 14:7,
85. New, Jake (15 May 2013). "Publisher Threatens to Sue Blogger for \$1-Billion". *Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved 22 October 2016.
86. Anderson, Rick (20 May 2013). "High Noon – A Publisher Threatens to "Lunch" a Criminal Case Against Librarian Critic". *Scholarly Kitchen*. Retrieved 24 October 2016.
87. Chappell, Bill (15 May 2013). "Publisher Threatens Librarian With \$1 Billion Lawsuit". *NPR*. Retrieved 2 October 2016.
88. Venkataramakrishnan, Rohan (19 May 2013). "Send Section 66A bullies home". *India Today*. Retrieved 24 October 2016.
89. Sriram, Jayant (25 March 2015). "SC strikes down 'draconian' Section 66A". *The Hindu*. Retrieved 24 October 2016.
90. Retraction Watch (22 November 2017). "US court issues injunction against OMICS to stop 'deceptive practices'". *Retraction Watch*. Archived from the original on 8 December 2017.
91. "Accredited Journals". Stellenbosch University.
92. Beall, Jeffrey (2017). "What I learned from predatory publishers". *Biochemia Medica*. 27 (2): 273–278.
93. Swauger, Shea (4 December 2017). "Open access, power, and privilege: A response to 'What I learned from predatory publishing'". *College & Research Libraries News*. 78 (11): 603–606. doi:10.5860/crln.78.11.603.
94. Hakami, Ramzi (2017). "Predatory Journals: Write, Submit, and Publish the Next Day". *Skeptical In-*

- quirer. 41 (5): 32–33. Archived from the original on 15 August 2018.
95. "Beall's List of Predatory Journals and Publishers". Archived from the original on 4 February 2019. Retrieved 15 August 2018.
96. Anderson, Rick (25 July 2017). "Cabell's New Predatory Journal Blacklist: A Review". The Scholarly Kitchen.
97. "The precarious prevalence of predatory journals". *Research Matters*. 28 January 2018. Retrieved 16 March 2018.
98. Siegfried, Elaine (16 June 2017). "Fake medical News". *Dermatology Times*. Archived from the original on 16 March 2018. Retrieved 16 March 2018.
99. Kakamad, Fahmi H.; Mohammed, Shvan H.; Najjar, Kayhan A.; (2020). "Kscien's list; a new strategy to discourage predatory journals and publishers". *International Journal of Surgery Open*. 23: 54–56.
100. Hansoti, Bhakti; Langdorf, Mark I.; Murphy, Linda S. (2016). "Discriminating Between Legitimate and Predatory Open Access Journals: Report from the International Federation for Emergency Medicine Research Committee". *The Western Journal of Emergency Medicine*. 17 (5): 497–507.
101. Dadkhah, Mehdi; Bianciardi, Giorgio (2016). "Ranking Predatory Journals: Solve the Problem Instead of Removing It!". *Advanced Pharmaceutical Bulletin*. 6 (1): 1–4.
102. Mouton, Johann; Valentine, Astrid (August 2017). "The extent of South African authored articles in predatory journals". *South African Journal of Science*. 113 (7/8): 1–9.
103. Cukier, Samantha; Helal, Lucas; Rice, Danielle B. (18 May 2020). "Checklists to detect potential predatory biomedical journals: a systematic review". *BMC Medicine*. 18 (1): 104.
104. Błocki, Zbigniew (18 September 2018). "(Letter from Prof. dr hab. Zbigniew Błocki)" (PDF) (in Polish). The National Science Centre (Poland). Archived (PDF) from the original on 4 March 2019. Retrieved 4 March 2019.
105. Sterligov, I. A.; Savina, T. F.; Chichkova, A. O. (January 2020). "A Study of Grant Support from Russian Scientific Foundations to Domestic Publications in Leading International Journals (based on Data from Scopus and Web of Science, the Russian Foundation for Basic Research, and the Russian Science Foundation)". *Scientific and Technical Information Processing*. 47 (1): 36–55.
106. Russia has introduced a moratorium on indicators based on publications of scientists in foreign journals]. *Ведомости* (in Russian). 21 March 2022. Retrieved 14 March 2023.
107. Swoger, Bonnie (26 November 2014). "Is this peer reviewed? Predatory journals and the transparency of peer review". *Scientific American*. Macmillan Publishers Ltd. Retrieved 14 June 2017.
108. Polka, Jessica K.; Kiley, Robert; Konforti, Boyana; Stern, Bodo; Vale, Ronald D. (2018). "Publish Peer Reviews". *Nature*. 560 (7720): 545–547. Bibcode: 2018Natur.560.545P.
109. Bartholomew, R. E. (2014). "Science for sale: the rise of predatory journals". *Journal of the Royal Society of Medicine*. 107 (10): 384–385.
110. COPE/DOAJ/OASPA/WAME (10 January 2014). "Principles of Transparency and Best Practice in Scholarly Publishing" (PDF). COPE. Committee on Publication Ethics. Retrieved 14 June 2017.
111. Perkel, Jeffrey (30 March 2015). "Rate that journal". *Nature*. 520 (7545): 119–120.
112. van Gerestein, Danielle (2015). "Quality Open Access Market and Other Initiatives: A Comparative Analysis". *LIBER Quarterly*. 24 (4): 162
113. Benderly, Beryl Lieff (13 October 2015). "Avoiding fake journals and judging the work in real ones". *Science*. AAAS. Retrieved 14 June 2017.
114. Straumsheim, Carl (2 October 2015). "Awareness Campaign on 'Predatory' Publishing". *Inside Higher Ed*. Retrieved 14 June 2017.
115. Clark, J.; Smith, R. (2015). "Firm action needed on predatory journals". *BMJ*. 350: h210.
116. Beall, Jeffrey (1 April 2013). "Predatory publishing is just one of the consequences of gold open access". *Learned Publishing*. 26 (2): 79–83.
117. Cobo, Cristobal (17 November 2014). "(Gold) Open Access: the two sides of the coin". *OII Blogs*. University of Oxford. Retrieved 14 June 2017.
118. Beall, Jeffrey (1 April 2013). "Unethical Practices in Scholarly, Open-Access Publishing". *Journal of Information Ethics*. 22 (1): 11–20.
119. Teixeira; da Silva, J. A. (2013). "How to better achieve integrity in science publishing". *European Science Editing*. 39 (4): 97.
120. Beaubien, Sarah; Eckard, Max (10 April 2014). "Addressing Faculty Publishing Concerns with Open Access Journal Quality Indicators". *Journal of Librarianship and Scholarly Communication*. 2 (2).

121. "Predatory Publishing". *Journal of Midwifery & Women's Health*. 59 (6): 569–571. November 2014.
122. Wehrmeijer, Margot (2014). *Exposing the predators. Methods to stop predatory journals* (Thesis). hdl:1887/28943.
123. Caplan, Arthur L. (2015). "The Problem of Publication-Pollution Denialism". *Mayo Clinic Proceedings*. 90 (5): 565–566.
124. Anderson, Rick (11 May 2015). "Should We Retire the Term 'Predatory Publishing'?". *The Scholarly Kitchen*. Society for Scholarly Publishing. Retrieved 14 June 2017.
125. "India culls 4,305 dubious journals from approved list". www.natureindex.com. Retrieved 27 March 2019.
126. S. Jayaraman, K. (23 March 2018). "India's UGC-approved list teeming with dubious journals". *Nature India*.
127. "List of ICI Journal Titles Found to be not qualified" (PDF). University Grants Commission. Archived from the original on 27 March 2019.
128. Dobusch, Leonhard; Heimstädt, Maximilian (November 2019). "Predatory publishing in management research: A call for open peer review". *Management Learning*. 50 (5): 607–619.
129. Grudniewicz, Agnes; Moher, David; Cobey, Kelly D.; (12 December 2019). "Predatory journals: no definition, no defence". *Nature*. 576 (7786): 210–212. Bibcode:2019Natur.576..210G.
130. Competency-based approach in the scientific-research process of higher medical institutions' teachers. / F.M. Abdurakhmanov, D.N. Korikhonov, I.A. Yaqubov, et al. // *Journal of Education and Scientific Medicine*, 2023, Vol.1, #1, P. 28-31. Retrieved from <https://journals.tma.uz/index.php/jesm/article/view/366>
131. How to increase a student's motivation and focus his efforts on high-quality training in a credit-modular system: by the example of teaching general surgery. / S.S. Atakov, U.K. Kasimov, A.O. Okhunov, et al. // *Journal of Education and Scientific Medicine*, 2023, Vol.1, #1, P.18-21. Retrieved from <https://journals.tma.uz/index.php/jesm/article/view/367>
132. New pedagogical technologies in teaching surgery. / A.O. Okhunov, N.Sh. Khudaibergenova, S.S. Atakov, et al. // *Journal of Education and Scientific Medicine*, 2022, Vol.1, #3, P.8-11. Retrieved from <https://journals.tma.uz/index.php/jesm/article/view/316>
133. Okhunov A.O. SMART TEXTBOOK: a New Level in the Modern Educational Process. // *Journal of Education and Scientific Medicine*, 2022, Vol.2, #3, 11-18. Retrieved from <https://journals.tma.uz/index.php/jesm/article/view/337>
134. Optimization of the educational process at the Department of general surgery. / A.O. Okhunov, N.Sh. Khudaibergenova, S.S. Atakov, et al. // *Journal of Education and Scientific Medicine*, 2023, # 1, P.98-101. Retrieved from <https://journals.tma.uz/index.php/jesm/article/view/303>
135. Role and place of technologies webinar in cooperation with the educational process of the branches of the Tashkent medical academy. / A.O. Okhunov, N.Sh. Khudaibergenova, S.S. Atakov, et al. // *Journal of Education and Scientific medicine*, 2022, #2, P.73-76. Retrieved from <https://journals.tma.uz/index.php/jesm/article/view/278>
136. Shadmanov A.K., Kawell Z., Okhunov A.O. Features of the educational program in foreign universities: on the example of the medical college of university of central Florida, USA. // *Journal of Education and Scientific Medicine*, 2023, Vol.2, #2, P.2-9. Retrieved from <https://journals.tma.uz/index.php/jesm/article/view/440>
137. Shadmanov A.K., Okhunov A.O. Recommendations for the organization of distance education on the example of the use of electronic books. // *Journal of Education and Scientific Medicine*, 2022, Vol.2, #3, P.7-10. Retrieved from <https://journals.tma.uz/index.php/jesm/article/view/336>
138. Shadmanov A.K., Okhunov A.O. Translational medicine: a new way from the experimental laboratory to clinical practice. // *Journal of Education and Scientific Medicine*, 2023, Vol.1, #1, P.2-7. Retrieved from <https://journals.tma.uz/index.php/jesm/article/view/282>