Barw Medical Journal | 2024;2(3):26-30
Journal home page: https://barw.krd/index.php/BMJ

Review

Predatory Publishing Lists: A Review on the Ongoing Battle Against Fraudulent Actions

Hiwa O. Abdullah[1], Berun A. Abdalla[2], Fahmi H. Kakamad[3*], Jafaar O. Ahmed[4], Hiwa O. Baba[1], Marwan N. Hassan[5], Rawa Bapir[1,6], Hawbash M. Rahim[7], Diyar A. Omar[8], Suhaib H. Kakamad[9], Shvan H. Mohammed[10], Karokh K. Mohammed[11], Tomas M. Mikael[5], Fakher Abdullah[5], Dahat A. Hussein[1], Sasan M. Ahmed[5], Sarhang S. Abdalla[1], Hemn A. Hassan[1,5], Sherko R. Azeez[1,5], Shevan M. Mustafa[5], Snur Othman[5]

1. *Smart Health Tower, Madam Mitterrand Street, Sulaymaniyah, Kurdistan, Iraq*
2. *Department of Biology, College of Education, University of Sulaimani, Madam Mitterrand Street, Sulaymaniyah, Kurdistan, Iraq*
3. *College of Medicine, University of Sulaimani, Madam Mitterrand Street, Sulaymaniyah, Kurdistan, Iraq*
4. *Psychology Department, Faculty of Art, Soran University, Soran, Erbil, Kurdistan, Iraq*
5. *Kscien Organization for Scientific Research (Middle East Office), Hamid Street, Azadi Mall, Sulaymaniyah, Kurdistan, Iraq*
6. *Department of Urology, Sulaymaniyah Teaching Hospital, Sulaymaniyah, Kurdistan, Iraq*
7. *Department of Medical Laboratory Science, College of Health Sciences, University of Human Development, Kurdistan Region, Sulaymaniyah, Iraq*
8. *Medical Laboratory Technology, Shaqlawa Technical College, Erbil Polytechnic University, Erbil, Kurdistan, Iraq*
9. *Collage of Medicine, Department of Immunology and Hematology, Kurdistan University of Medical Science, Sanandaj, Iran*
10. *Xzmat Polyclinic, Rizgari, Kalar, Sulaymaniyah, Kurdistan, Iraq*
11. *Smart Health Tower (Raparin Branch), Karukh Street, Ranya, Sulaymaniyah, Kurdistan, Iraq*

[*] ***Corresponding author***: *fahmi.hussein@univsul.edu.iq (F.H. Kakamad). Doctor City, Building 11, Apartment 50, Zip code: 46001, Sulaymaniyah, Kurdistan, Iraq*

Keywords:
Predatory publishers
Predatory journals
Beall's list
Cabells' list
Kscien's list
Early Warning List of International Journals

Received: April 8, 2024
Revised: May 20, 2024
Accepted: June 11, 2024
First Published: June 21, 2024

Abstract

Predatory journals challenge the scholarly community by muddling the boundary between legitimate and dubious publishing practices. Despite the awareness of predatory publishers, there are no globally accepted criteria for identifying them. Various warning lists have emerged as predatory practices evolve, but they are not impervious to criticism despite their utility. This study reviewed the most common of the predatory lists. Beall's list, the pioneer in exposing predatory publishers, received criticism for its inclusion criteria. It is now anonymously managed and poorly updated. Cabells' list has a broad range of inclusion criteria; however, some have been criticized for redundancy and lack of alignment with predatory practices. Kscien's list shows promise as an alternative for spotting predatory journals and publishers. However, it requires refinement since the included journals, based on their core criteria, are not distinguished from those included using traditional criteria. The Early Warning List of International Journals is a recent compilation with diverse criteria. Despite attracting the scientific community's attention, there are questions about the reliability of its inclusion criteria. However, these lists are crucial in flagging predatory publishers; researchers can depend on them while preparing their manuscripts.

Citation: Abdullah HO, Abdalla BA, Kakamad FH, Ahmed JO, Baba HO, Hassan MN, et al. Predatory Publishing Lists: A Review on the Ongoing Battle Against Fraudulent Actions. Barw Medical Journal. 2024;2(3):26-30. https://doi.org/10.58742/bmj.v2i2.91

1. Introduction

Predatory journals pose a widespread concern in scholarly publishing, casting doubt on the integrity and quality of academic research. They exploit the "publish or perish" culture by providing publication services lacking proper peer review, editorial oversight, and quality control, often for substantial fees [1,2]. These journals present a formidable challenge to the scholarly community as they obscure the distinction between legitimate and dubious publishing practices. Despite the increasing awareness of predatory publishers, there remains a paucity of globally accepted criteria to specify what characterizes a predatory journal. Jeffrey Beall, a trailblazer in the field, coined the term "predatory publishers" in 2010 while listing several publishers suspected of questionable practices [1,3]. Predatory journals commonly exploit the open-access (OA) publishing model, and their rapid evolution can undermine the integrity of scientific research, contributing to the dissemination of pseudoscience [4]. The absence of universally established criteria compounds the challenge of discerning predatory journals, fostering confusion and diverse interpretations within the academic community [5]. Great efforts have been made to stand against predatory publishers, as several warning lists have been released. In this mini-review, the most common lists have been discussed [3,5-7].

2. Predatory Publishing Lists

2.1 Beall's list

Jeffrey Beall, an American librarian, founded Beall's List in 2008 after receiving numerous emails inviting him to join editorial boards. The list gained widespread attention among academics around mid-2010. Beall's announcement aimed to help authors identify predatory publishers and select reliable journals for their work. Beall's list comprised four main categories. The first focused on suspicious publishers, followed by "predatory standalone journals." The third listed journals that hijacked others, misleading authors by adopting the identities or names of legitimate journals. The last category, misleading metrics, included journals with falsified metrics [8]. Jeffrey Beall's criteria for listing journals on his site included repeated editors, unknown or absent editorial staff, lack of academic information about the editorial team, absence of an editorial board, suspicious publishing processes, a high number of journals, inadequate digital preservation, undisclosed article processing charges (APC), mismatch between journal names and scopes, false impact factors (IF), discrepancies between the journal name and its country of origin, appointment of unqualified reviewers, absence of plagiarism checks, false claims of indexing, self-plagiarism, indiscriminate acceptance of suggested reviewers, publication of essays without scrutiny, and undisclosed or fake office locations. Additional indicators included the use of free email services, plagiarism evident in author guidelines, poorly developed webpages, generic or overly broad journal names, unauthorized use of copyrighted academic content, lack of proper contact information, absence of a retraction policy, no Digital Object Identifier (DOI) and International Standard Serial Number (ISSN), excessive advertising on websites, attempts to legitimize through links to genuine conferences and events, promotion of an unusually rapid peer-review process, and imitation of legitimate journal names [9]. Beall's list is available at Beall's List – of Potential Predatory Journals and Publishers (beallslist.net).

2.2 Kscien's list

After Beall's list was discontinued, Kscien, a non-profit organization, began crafting its list of predatory publishers. The oversight of the list falls under the purview of the "Predatory List Committee," comprised of several young researchers. They commit to updating the list and unveiling predatory entities' evolving tactics and strategies. The criteria for pinpointing predatory practices involve journal misconduct, fabrications, and inadequate peer review processes. Much like Beall's list, Kscien's list initially comprised four separate categories arranged sequentially as "predatory publishers," "predatory standalone journals," "hijacked journals," and "misleading metrics." [1]. As predatory practices evolve, Kscien is expanding its scope by introducing two additional standalone lists alongside the existing four. These new lists are named the "Conference List" and the "Cumulative List." The "Conference List" includes predatory conferences, whether independent or sponsored by specific organizations. The "Cumulative List" is designed to extract and separately document journals associated with predatory publishers [5]. Kscien's list is available at www.Kscien.org

2.3 Cabells' list

After vanishing Beall's list, various imitative platforms emerged, including Cabells' list [10]. Cabell Publishing Company (Cabells), based in Texas, USA, introduced the Cabells' list to categorize predatory publishing within the OA domain [6,10]. Cabells established their watchlist, primarily sourced from Beall's list, and it was further developed in collaboration with Jeffrey Beall's consultancy. This compilation encompasses a comprehensive set of 74 criteria, as detailed in version 1.1 on March 13, 2019 [6,10]. Cabells' two lists, known as the safelist and the blacklist, were meticulously crafted by a dedicated team entrusted with the list's development and curation. However, the team members' identities have never

been revealed to the public or clients [6]. Furthermore, around mid-2020, Cabells took a curated approach, rebranding their blacklist into the now-renowned "Predatory Reports" [11]. Cabell's list is available at https://cabells.com/.

2.4 Early Warning List of International Journals

As scientific research rapidly advances, China has emerged as the world's leading producer of scientific papers. Despite this impressive academic output, it has also exposed numerous cases of academic misconduct. In March 2021, an analysis by Nature Journal showed that more than 1,300 articles were flagged as potentially originating from paper mills. Many of these articles contained problematic images, and the authors were affiliated with Chinese institutions [7,12]. The Chinese government has introduced several regulations to eradicate intrinsic and extrinsic sources of scholarly misconduct. Additionally, there are proposals for implementing an early warning mechanism for academic journals. At the end of 2020, the National Science Library of the Chinese Academy of Sciences (CAS) unveiled the Early Warning List of International Journals, offering guidance to scholars in making informed choices when selecting journals. The list comprises 128 journals categorized into three risk levels: low, medium, and high [13,14]. The high-level warning aims to combat the problem of research misconduct. Journals receiving a high warning publish fabricated manuscripts from paper mills. The medium-level warning seeks to enhance the efficiency of research funding utilization in China and promote international communication of academic achievements. Journals with a medium warning have low internationalization among authors and readers and unreasonable APC. The low-level warning reminds scientists that these journals are at risk of declining IF, mainly including large-scale journals with a surge in publication volume [12]. The Early Warning Journal List is available at https://earlywarning.fenqubiao.com/#/en/.

3. Comments

Former Science correspondent John Bohannon is credited with initiating the exposure of predatory publishers by submitting fake papers, as demonstrated in his article "Who's Afraid of Peer Review?". He generated fabricated research papers intentionally containing significant errors, designed so that a competent peer reviewer should readily identify their shortcomings and deem them unsuitable for publication. The fabricated papers included fictitious authors affiliated with nonexistent institutions. During the study, 304 versions of fabricated papers were submitted to different OA journals. In total, 157 journals (51.6%) accepted the paper without recognizing its critical flaws, while 98 (32.2%) rejected it. Among the remaining 49 journals (16.1%), 29 were no longer under active management by their creators. The editors of the other 20 journals mentioned that they were still reviewing the paper. Of the 255 papers that underwent comprehensive editing leading to acceptance or rejection, 60% of the final decisions were made without apparent evidence of peer review. In Bohannon's investigative operation, 25% of the selected journals were situated in India. Of these, 64 journals accepted the fraudulent papers, while only 15 declined. The United States followed as the second-largest hub, with 29 acceptances and 26 rejections [15].

OA models provide benefits to publishers, authors, and readers. Readers can easily access research, while authors benefit from widespread sharing, resulting in increased citations. Nevertheless, certain unscrupulous publishers exploit the OA system by establishing deceptive websites that mimic legitimate publishers, deceiving inexperienced researchers into paying for rapid publication. These dishonest publishers utilize spam emails to solicit manuscript submissions and frequently engage in minimal or fraudulent peer-review processes [16]. Researchers naturally aspire to publish in high-impact journals, and achieving a high IF is challenging and time-consuming. Predatory publishers and journals exploit researchers' ambitions and circumvent the IF obstacle by employing deceptive metrics [9,17]. Their main objective is to maximize profits by accepting many manuscripts [18]. Leveraging the considerable growth in OA publications in recent decades, predatory OA publishers have witnessed a significant surge in their numbers [19].

Fortunately, the scientific community has not ignored these journals [19]. Numerous researchers have actively addressed the issue by investigating the problem, conducting sting operations, and compiling lists to identify predatory publishers [1,3,10,12,15]. Researchers commonly turn to Jeffrey Beall's list and his blog in the literature for guidance, which have played a crucial role in protecting the scientific community from inadequately vetted research. However, Beall has encountered significant criticism and backlash, particularly about certain publishers like Frontiers. Critics contend that his selection of journals lacks clear parameters and is subjective. This approach has been accused of penalizing publications from developing countries due to language imperfections and relying heavily on Beall's intuition [18,19].

Richtig et al. extensively examined bibliometric data from various sources such as the ISSN database, PubMed, PMC, Scopus, Crossref, and Web of Science. Additionally, they conducted a citation analysis by extracting data from Crossref. In the course of their investigation, Beall's list comprised a total of 21,735 distinct journals. Among these, 3,206 (38.8%) were located in the USA, 2,484 in India (30.0%), and 585 in the United Kingdom (7.1%). The majority of these journals were indexed in the ISSN database (8,266), Crossref (5,155), PubMed (1,139), Scopus (570), DOAJ (224), PMC (135), or Web of Science (50). The findings revealed a continual increase in journal articles published on Beall's list and the DOAJ from 2011 to 2017. Significantly, the journals on Beall's list garnered higher citation rates when indexed in Web of Science and PMC. The authors contended that the impact of Beall's list on the scientific community has been exaggerated [20]. In 2017, Jeffrey Beall shut down his list without explaining this decision. Subsequently, anonymous individuals took over the management of the list, and the modifications made were deemed inappropriate [5,21].

After discontinuing Beall's list, Cabells' list emerged as an alternative, sharing similarities with Beall's list but incorporating a few changes. Cabells' list comprises 74 criteria and is recognized as the most comprehensive watchlist [22]. Nevertheless, it has encountered significant criticism from various perspectives [6,23,24]. In an analysis of 17 Turkish journals featured in Cabells' predatory reports, researchers

discovered that some journals exhibited valid bibliometric indicators, including genuine DOIs [25]. Another investigation highlighted that specific criteria utilized by Cabells to flag predatory journals might be more indicative of journal quality rather than signaling predatory intent [24]. Da Silva et al. conducted an extensive study to assess the 74 criteria of Cabells' predatory report. They proposed significant recommendations and modifications to improve the list's effectiveness. Their findings proposed the removal of 53% of the criteria and the revision of 38%, and if the recommended adjustments were not implemented, only 9% of the criteria were considered retained [6]. Dony et al. carried out an in-depth examination of Cabells' safelist (Journalytics) and watchlist (Predatory Reports), exposing disparities in content and the criteria used [23]. The notable prevalence of empty journals in Cabells' blacklist has raised significant concerns regarding their selection criteria and their dedication to keeping an updated and valuable blacklist for the academic community. These empty, fraudulent journals have not yet inflicted harm on researchers or the scholarly community, given their ineffective predatory activities thus far [24].

Dony et al. observed that out of the 822 journals assessed by Cabell in 2019, a noteworthy 687 (83.6%) were identified as empty journals. To gain a more in-depth understanding of Cabells' approach, it is beneficial to consider the total number of journals listed in the blacklist in connection to the violations they receive. In the Dony et al. study, a significant number of journals (51.3%) were included in the blacklist due to 7 violations. However, these seven violations accounted for only 10.9% and 9.46% of Cabells' violations in their v1.0 and v1.1 criteria versions, respectively [23]. Additionally, Observations have been made of instances where the same violations were recorded more than once for a single journal. Another issue highlighted is the inclusion of the same journals twice, each with different violation numbers. Dony and colleagues argued that these variations in violation numbers for identical journals suggest a subjective nature in Cabells' review process [23]. Moreover, Cabells' list is managed anonymously, posing inherent risks of misclassification and reliance on undisclosed criteria [6].

Unlike Beall's openly accessible list and blog, Cabells' Predatory Reports, covering a substantial 16,834 journals, is not offered for free, with pricing details conspicuously absent from Cabells' website. Da Silva et al. highlighted a significant limitation: independent researchers cannot directly subscribe to Cabells' Predatory Reports through the website. This restricts accessibility for researchers and others lacking the financial means or institutional authorization. The undisclosed pricing suggests a certain opacity in the company's business practices. Additionally, the lack of disclosure about new or updated criteria on the company website implies no revisions or enhancements have been made since 2019 [6].

Kscien's list, similar to Cabells' counterpart, initially mirrored Beall's list. Managed by a team of young researchers at Kscien, the list emerged in response to predatory entities' exploitation of authors from developing nations. The organization aimed to guide authors in navigating the challenges of predatory publishing. While the list initially closely resembled Beall's, the organization later refined it, striving to establish a credible alternative through significant modifications [1,5]. Identifying predatory journals and publishers, which was once simple using Beall's criteria, has become more intricate. Modern predators know that using traditional methods makes it harder to escape detection by predatory lists, posing a potential threat to their operations. They have recently advanced their practices, making differentiating from genuine journals and publishers difficult. Predators have established professional websites, obtained indexing in reputable databases, secured sponsorship from legitimate organizations, provided free publication with concealed motives, falsified archives, and implemented rigorous plagiarism checks [5]. Kscien's modifications include introducing conference and cumulative lists on their blog to address evolving predatory practices. What sets it apart from Beall's and Cabells' lists is its emphasis on accepting "sting" papers or intentionally flawed submissions by journals as a crucial criterion, alongside several traditional indicators from earlier lists [5]. It is updated daily and publicly accessible to scholars, providing a credible alternative to previous lists with some noted limitations. Journals or publishers reproduced from Beall's list lack a screening mechanism based on accepting "sting papers"; instead, inclusion primarily hinges on conventional indicators. The list also lacks evident categorization or differentiation for the number of entries based on "sting" criteria [26].

CAS's Early Warning List of International Journals, introduced in 2020, represents the latest initiative to combat fraudulent practices [7]. The list's criteria encompass a blend of qualitative and quantitative methodologies. However, a comprehensive set of indicators has not been revealed; only a partial selection has been made public [27]. The inclusion criteria consider article count, international reach, rejection rate, APC, journal citation success index, retraction, and self-citation rate. Concerning the inclusion criteria, a rapid increase in published articles may suggest a decline in the journal's selection standards. The lack of global author diversity may indicate the journal's locality. Journals with low rejection rates might pose potential risks. A significantly higher self-citation rate than other journals could cause caution. A high retraction rate in a journal may signal issues with the quality of its editorial procedures [27]. Opinions on the list are divided, with some deeming it reasonable and others questioning the inclusion of journals with higher IFs. The list's release is expected to substantially decrease the number of papers published by Chinese researchers in these journals [26]. Moreover, concerns about the list criteria are expressed, as specific indicators may be found in reputable and reliable journals, making them less definitive for identifying predatory practices.

4. Conclusion

This review has offered insights into various perspectives on commonly utilized lists for detecting predatory publishing practices. Despite commendable global endeavors to combat and preempt the machinations of predatory publishers and the dissemination of pseudoscientific content, the extant lists, when scrutinized individually, reveal inherent limitations and lack

universal acceptance. Nevertheless, concerted action by professionals in the field holds the potential to fortify resistance against predatory practices, fostering a collective effort to formulate guidelines that garner widespread endorsement within the scientific community. Consequently, a collaborative approach and sustained efforts are imperative in the ongoing struggle against those entangled in compromising scientific integrity.

Declarations

Conflicts of interest: The author(s) have no conflicts of interest to disclose.

Ethical approval: Not applicable.

Patient consent (participation and publication): Not applicable.

Source of Funding: None.

Acknowledgements: None to be declared.

Authors' contributions: HOA, BAA, and FHK were major contributors to the conception of the study and the literature search for related studies. JOA, HOB, MNH, HOA, and RB were involved in the literature review, manuscript writing, and data analysis and interpretation. HMR, DAO, SHK, SHM, KKM, TMM, FA, DAH, SMA, SSA, HAH, SRA, SMM, and SO were involved in the literature review, the study's design, and the manuscript's critical revision. HOA and FHK Confirmation of the authenticity of all the raw data All authors approved the final version of the manuscript.

Use of AI: AI was not used in the drafting of the manuscript, the production of graphical elements, or the collection and analysis of data.

References

1. Kakamad FH, Mohammed SH, Najar KA, Qadr GA, Ahmed JO, Karukh K M, et al. Kscien's list; a new strategy to hoist predatory journals and publishers. International Journal of Surgery Open. 2019; 17: 5-7. *doi:10.1016/j.ijso.2019.01.002*
2. Thyo EM. Predatory Journals & Developing Countries. Barw Medical Journal. 2023;1(2):1. *doi:10.58742/bmj.v1i2.20*
3. Beall J. "Predatory" open-access scholarly publishers. The Charleston Advisor. 2010;11(4):10-7. *doi:N/A*
4. Kakamad FH, Salih AM, Mohammed SH. Predatory journals: evolution keeps them under the radar. Nature 2020;580:29–30. *doi:10.1038/d41586-020-00910-y*
5. Muhialdeen AS, Ahmed JO, Baba HO, Abdullah IY, Hassan HA, Najar KA, et al: Kscien's List; A New Strategy to Discourage Predatory Journals and Publishers (Second Version). Barw Med J.2023; 1 (1): 1 3. *doi:10.58742/bmj.v1i1.14*
6. Da Silva JA, Moradzadeh M, Yamada Y, Dunleavy DJ, Tsigaris P. Cabells' Predatory Reports criteria: Assessment and proposed revisions. The Journal of Academic Librarianship. 2023;49(1):102659. *doi:10.1016/j.acalib.2022.102659*
7. Mo Y, Liang G, Zhen N, Lin H, Xiang H, Liu E, et al. Establishment of an early warning list of SCI-indexed international journals with dual benefits for both scientists and publishers. Publishing Research. 2023;2(1). *doi:10.48130/PR-2023-0003*
8. Kakamad FH, Mohammed SH, Najar KA, et al. Kscien's list; a new strategy to discourage predatory journals and publishers. Int J Surg Open 2020;23:54–6.doi: *doi:10.1016/j.ijso.2019.11.001*
9. Beall J. Best practices for scholarly authors in the age of predatory journals. The Annals of The Royal College of Surgeons of England. 2016;98(2):77-9. *doi:10.1308/rcsann.2016.0056*
10. Mohammed, K. K., Hama, J. I., Kakamad, F. H. Beyond Beall's list: The need for contemporary evaluation tools in predatory publishing research. Learned Publishing. 2024;37(2), 157-158. *doi:10.1002/leap.1602*
11. Cabells. (2020). Announcement regarding brand-wide language changes, effective immediately. June 8, 2020; last accessed: December 18, 2022. blog. *https://blog.cabells.com/2020/06/08/announcement/*
12. Early Warning Journal List. 2020. accessed on January 24, 2024. *https://earlywarning.fenqubiao.com/#/en/*
13. The Retraction Watch Database. New York: The Center for Scientific Integrity. 2018. [2021-12-31]. Available at *http://retractiondatabase.org/*
14. Else H, Van Noorden R. The fight against fake-paper factories that churn out sham science. Nature. 2021;591(7851):516-20. *doi:10.1038/d41586-021-00733-5*
15. John Bohannon. Who is Afraid of Peer Review?. Science. 2013: 342, 60-65. *doi:10.1126/science.2013.342.6154.342_60*
16. Kakamad, Fahmi H. PhDa,b,c; Salih, Abdulwahid M. MDa,c; Abdulla, Berwn A. BScb,c; Abdullah, Fakher LLBb; Ahmed, Jaafar O. MDb; Salih, Rawezh Q. BScb,c; Mohammed, Shvan H. BScb; Mikael, Tomas M. BScb,c; Kakamad, Suhaib H. BScb; Fatah, Gona M. BScb,c. Analysis of 5000 predatory emails. IJS: Short Reports 6(1):p e16, January/March 2021. *doi:10.1097/SR9.0000000000000016*
17. Mohammed Shvan H., Kakamad Fahmi H., Salih Abdulwahid M., Omar Diyar A., Mikael Tomas M., Hassan Marwan N., et al. Predatory journals in oncology: prevalence and impacts. IJS: Short Reports. 2022;7(3): 55. *doi:10.1097/SR9.0000000000000055*
18. Cascella M, De Cassai A, Navalesi P. Proscription lists and predatory publishers: Pointing to careful certifications. Quantitative Science Studies. 2023;4(2): 489-90. *doi:10.1162/qss_a_00251*
19. Carroll CW. Spotting the wolf in sheep's clothing: predatory open access publications. Journal of graduate medical education. 2016;8(5):662-4. *doi:10.4300/JGME-D-16-00128.1*
20. Richtig G, Berger M, Koeller M, Richtig M, Richtig E, Scheffel J, et al. Predatory journals: Perception, impact and use of Beall's list by the scientific community–A bibliometric big data study. Plos one. 2023;18(7): e0287547. *doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0287547*
21. Beall's list. Beall's list of potential predatory journals and publishers. December 8, 2021. *https://beallslist.net/#*
22. Bisaccio M. Cabells' Journal Whitelist and Blacklist: Intelligent data for informed journal evaluations. Learned Publishing. 2018;31(3): 243-8. *doi:10.1002/leap.1164*
23. Dony C, Raskinet M, Renaville F, Simon S, Thirion P. How reliable and useful is Cabell's Blacklist? A data-driven analysis. arXiv preprint arXiv:2009.05392. 2020 Sep 11. *doi:10.18352/lq.10339*
24. Murphy JA. Predatory publishing and the response from the scholarly community. Serials Review. 2019;45(1-2):73-8. *doi:10.1080/00987913.2019.1624910*
25. Akça S, Akbulut M. Are predatory journals contaminating science? An analysis on the Cabells' Predatory Report. The Journal of Academic Librarianship. 2021;47(4):102366. *doi:10.1016/j.acalib.2021.102366*
26. Kscien Organization (2018). Kscien Organization website, Predatory publishing, accessed on October 18, 2023. *https://kscien.org/predatory.php*
27. Zhang L, Wei Y, Huang Y, Sivertsen G. What makes a journal questionable? An analysis using China's early-warning list. SocArXiv 94v5m, Center for Open Science. 2021 Sep 6. *doi:10.31219/osf.io/94v5m*