

Developing a Predatory Journal Finder: Innovations in Safeguarding Research Quality

Wan Asiah binti Wan Muhamad Tahir*¹, Nor Hafiza Abd Samad ², Nor Hafiza Haron ³,
Fatimah Bibi Hamzah ⁴, Anis Juanita Mohd Zainudin ⁵, Rukhiyah Binti Adnan ⁶, Mohd Azahari
Mohd Yusof ⁷

^{1,2,3,4,5&6} Universiti Poly-Tech Malaysia, 56100 Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia

⁷ Universiti Teknologi MARA,

Corresponding author email: wanasiah@uptm.edu.my

Received 31 October 2024, Accepted 25 November 2024, Available online 29 November 2024

ABSTRACT

With the proliferation of Open Access journals and the shift to online publishing, academic publishing has changed dramatically. The number of journals has expanded significantly as the publishing business has evolved. There are currently more journals where authors can publish their work. With the numerous advantages of open-access publication for writers and readers, credible publishers are launching hundreds of new open-access journals. However, due to their increased popularity, less respectable journals have emerged, abusing the author-pay model and jeopardizing the integrity of published research. They do not adhere to academic publishing norms and usually publish papers quickly. Publishing research findings in such publications harms the writers and undermines public trust in scientific research. As a result, an application was developed to detect predatory journals, which will guide researchers in evaluating a journal or publisher. The app will help users identify predatory publications and determine whether a journal is legitimate by checking databases such as SCOPUS and Web of Science. To accomplish the goal of this study, Beall's List and other lists of predatory publishers will be employed.

Keywords: publishing, open-access publication, predatory journals, Application, Vulnerabilities

How to Cite:

Wan Asiah binti Wan Muhamad Tahir, Abd Samad, N. H. ., Haron, N. H. ., Hamzah, F. B., Mohd Zainudin, A. J., Adnan, R., & Mohd Yusof, M. A. (2024). Developing a predatory journal finder: Innovations in safeguarding research quality. *Jurnal Evolusi* , 5(2), 99–107.
<https://doi.org/10.61688/jev.v5i3.351>

Copyright: © 2023 The Author(s)

Published by Universiti Poly-Tech Malaysia.

This article is published under the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY 4.0) license.

<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/legalcode>

INTRODUCTION

The most serious threat to the integrity of academic research and the spread of knowledge is the proliferation of predatory journals. Predatory journals misuse the open-access model; many do not apply the rigorous peer review common in more established journals, so substandard or even misleading research might be published. This undermines the reputation of legitimate scholarly communication and has far-reaching implications for several fields, including medicine, social science, and natural sciences (Gopalakrishna et al., 2021). The more pressure researchers face to publish, the more likely they are to submit work to these journals, which in turn exacerbates research misconduct and questionable practices (Fanelli et al., 2015).

The potential of a predatory journal finder in safeguarding research quality and upholding academic integrity standards is apparent. It would help researchers find suitable options and thus avoid predatory journals, promoting a culture of responsible research practices (Labib & Evans, 2021). This becomes all the more important in disciplines where the consequences of disseminated flawed research can directly affect public health and safety, including medical and health sciences (Aggarwal et al., 2017). In addition, a predatory journal finder could also play an educational role in letting researchers know what characteristics a good journal maintains and how important peer review can be (Jing et al., 2020).

This has more extensive implications for society beyond academia. The baseless research findings can lead to misinformed policies, poor resource allocation, and a general diminution of public trust in scientific findings (Hastings et al., 2022). For example, in the area of health, low-quality research published in predatory journals can ultimately affect clinical guidelines and patient care practices, hence affecting health outcomes (Mahomed et al., 2022). It therefore becomes important to safeguard the integrity of research publications, not only for the scholarly community but also for the sake of society's well-being. Promoting an environment where high-quality research is paramount would enable us to raise the quality bar for knowledge-supporting decision-making processes across various fields (Yazdani et al., 2019).

As researchers, we want to publish our research results in high-level journals. We will also find many journals related to our study to help the research. However, the journal or the article obtained may not be of high quality and may be published without evaluation by any competent reviewer. Some journals, for instance, may feel no compulsion to adhere to good scientific practice but rather use the academic publication market for commercial reasons, benefiting only the publishers. Such publications also charge authors publication fees or article processing charges, often referred to as "predatory journals," but do not conduct peer reviews or other quality control measures because the review process is slow and inconsistent. There are apprehensions about bias, lack of transparency, and the occasional failure to catch errors or fraudulent research.

Given the issues outlined above, there is a clear need for a system and method to detect predatory documents. While existing systems and methods in the prior art address this concern, significant room remains for improvement to enhance their practical application. It provides a new publishing platform to assist researchers, academics, students, publishers, and institutions in conducting research by accessing the quality and legitimacy of journals indexed in the renowned SCOPUS and WoS on one platform. It also assists and improves the work of publishing in high-impact journals in the Scopus or WoS databases. One reason for searching the Scopus and Web of Science (WoS) databases is their commitment to indexing authentic articles based on rigorous criteria, such as peer-review quality, editorial board composition, and adherence to publication ethics. Journals that meet these standards are generally considered more reputable. Additionally, Scopus and WoS conduct periodic reviews of the journals they index, and a journal can be removed from the index if it fails to maintain these standards, indicating that a journal's status can change over time.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Predatory journals have been a problem of late, garnering increasing attention over the past few years and reflecting a growing awareness of the threats such publications pose to the integrity of academic publishing. Predatory journals exploitatively feature practices that often include minimal or no peer review, false claims about indexing, and aggressive solicitation of manuscripts, which may lead to the dissemination of poor-quality or fraudulent research (Cukier et al., 2019; Cobey et al., 2019). It is very unnerving to see the rise of such journals. For instance, it has been reported that the number of predatory journals increased from about 800 in 2010 to about 8,000 by 2014, showing enormous proliferation within a very short period of time (Gurnani & Kaur, 2021; Alrawadieh, 2018). The rapid growth raises critical questions concerning the quality of the research being published and its propensity for consequences for scientific discourse.

Previous literature has pointed out that scholars in general are not aware of predatory journals. For example, in the survey of veterinary and medical authors, it was found that about 25.8% of respondents were familiar with the term "predatory journal" (Christopher & Young, 2015). This is of concern, especially for early-career researchers who, inexperienced and possibly under pressure to publish, might be more susceptible to the lure of predatory journals (Richtig et al., 2018; Swanberg et al., 2020). It has also been stated that the motives for publishing in such journals are often multifactorial, including a lack of understanding of legitimate publishing practices and pressure from the urgency to fulfill publication requirements and the perceived ease of acceptance at predatory venues (Cobey et al., 2019; Kurt, 2018).

Fighting the boom in predatory journals has also been attempted by providing educational resources and checklists, enabling authors to identify and avoid predatory journals (Cukier et al., 2019; Cukier et al., 2020). As such, Cukier et al. proposed a consensus-driven checklist that could prove to be a useful tool for researchers (Cukier et al., 2019). In that spirit, increased awareness and understanding of predatory publishing practices, especially for institutions in regions where resources are scarcer, have been advised (Bairi et al., 2023; Shrestha, 2021). Clear definitions and criteria defining predatory journals' characteristics would also provide guidance in making informed decisions on where to submit work for publication (Cukier et al., 2020; Shrestha et al., 2018).

Several applications have been studied to help researchers before developing their own applications. These tools facilitate the identification of potentially predatory publications and promote greater awareness of ethical publishing practices. Below are three notable applications that serve as valuable resources for researchers aiming to avoid predatory journals and uphold the integrity of their scholarly contributions.

Here are three applications that can help detect predatory journals:

a. Cabell's Predatory Journal List

Cabell's, overall, comes with a full database presenting a predatory journal list, advanced metrics, and evaluation criteria. One can search for any journal and get information on editorial practices, peer review, and its reputation. It contains advanced search options, journal analytics, and insights into publisher behavior.

b. Think. Check. Submit.

A collaborative effort that provides a simple checklist to help researchers determine the trustworthiness of journals before submitting their work. It guides the user through a set of questions relating to the journal's practices and provides resources for further evaluation. It is also very easy to use, with its checklist, educational resources, and links to trusted publishing guidelines.

c. Predatory Publishing Database (PPD)

The PPD is an online database of catalogues of suspected predatory journals submitted by its users and through research. It enables users to search for journals by name, with explanations provided for why they are held predatory. It also hosts user-generated reports on the journals, their rating, and community feedback about questionable publishing practices.

These tools can go a long way in assisting scholars in finding and avoiding predatory journals, thus saving the integrity of their published work.

METHODOLOGY

The methodology used in this research is a mixed-method approach where qualitative and quantitative approaches will be applied. The qualitative approach will take place regarding data requirements and gathering, which will be provided to proceed with the mobile application implementation. It will also include a review of website /mobile application design; user interface, usability, etc. Meanwhile, the quantitative approach will be conducted during the implementation and deployment phases. To ensure that the mobile application meets all user requirements, the survey will include the acceptance model. This will guide the researcher in terms of feedback and evaluation towards the open-access predatory journal application. The research flow is as follows:

Figure 1:
Research Flow Chart



Each phase involved in the methodology for addressing predatory journals and developing a journal finder are explained below:

a. Identify Problems

In this initial phase, the focus is on recognizing and articulating the specific challenges associated with predatory journals. Their characteristic features include non-peer review, high publication fees, and exploitation within the open-access model. The publication landscape engages various stakeholders, including researchers, academic institutions, and publishers, to get their experiences and challenges in dealing with predatory journals. Laying this groundwork is important, as it paves the way for solution development.

b. Define Objectives of Solutions

Once the problems are identified, it becomes possible to set measurable objectives that any proposed solution must meet. This includes the determination of what the journal finder should do: whether it is meant to improve the identification of predatory journals, better facilitate users' access to reliable publications, or eventually educate by offering resources on how to evaluate journals. That kind of set objectives ensures development is focused and result-oriented, covering specific user needs.

c. Design and Development

In this stage, technical specifications and functionalities of the journal finder will be designed and developed. This will include creating a user-friendly interface, integrating SCOPUS and Web of Science into the application, and setting up algorithms to evaluate the legitimacy of journals based on predefined criteria. The design must balance ease of use while ensuring back-end process strength in retrieving and analysing data. Development refers to the system's coding, infrastructure building, and ensuring the platform is scalable and secure.

d. Exhibition

This phase involves showcasing the developed journal finder to potential users and stakeholders. Demonstrations may include live presentations, user testing sessions, and webinars highlighting the tool's features and benefits. The exhibition serves to gather initial feedback from users, allowing developers to refine the tool based on real-world interactions and usability assessments. This phase is crucial for generating interest and building a community around the tool.

e. Evaluation

After launching the journal finder, there will be a mature evaluation stage where its impact and effectiveness are assessed. It may involve gathering user feedback, analyzing usage data, and comparing outcomes with the defined objectives. Evaluation helps identify the system's strengths and weaknesses for future iterations and improvements. The metrics can include user satisfaction, accuracy in identifying predatory journals, and overall adoption rates among researchers.

f. Communication


The final stage is disseminating results, achievements, and continuing development to the wider academic community. This may be through published reports, outreach activities, or conference and workshop participation. Proper communication ensures stakeholders understand how the tool should be used, its benefits, and the best practices involved. This also creates a forum for further collaboration and continued discussion of the challenges posed by predatory publishing and the need for research integrity.

These phases, therefore, come together for a holistic methodology aimed at problems posed by predatory journals, hence providing a reliable means for journal selection among researchers.

EXPERIMENTATION AND RESULTS

The system for detecting predatory documents includes an authentication module designed to validate request information sent to a publication database. It features an Application Programming Interface (API) engine that facilitates communication with the publication database by accessing and processing the request information. Additionally, a query processor works with the API engine to process requests from the authentication module and retrieve information from the publication database. The query processor is further enhanced by components such as a user interaction module, a verification module, an asynchronous module, a backend communicator, and an evaluation model.

Once the request is authenticated, the API engine processes the information and communicates with the publication database by handling the authentication request. The publication databases utilized are SCOPUS and Web of Science (WoS). The API key serves as a unique identifier that grants permission to interact with the SCOPUS database.



The user interaction module acts as the interface between the system and the user, facilitating communication with the frontend framework. This allows users to input journal information and initiate the detection process. The verification

module validates the information received from the user interaction module. This step is crucial to ensure that only legitimate and accurate requests are processed further within the system.

Following successful verification, the verified information is transmitted from the frontend programming framework to a backend server, facilitated by the asynchronous module.

The backend communicator is designed to enable communication with the backend server, ensuring smooth interaction with publication databases like SCOPUS. Responses from SCOPUS are processed on the backend server before being sent back to the frontend for user access.

Additionally, the evaluation module includes a predatory assessor, which analyzes the retrieved information based on predefined criteria, such as journal and publisher details, to evaluate the publisher's reputation and history.

The table below shows an example of the input information and the output.

Table 1:
Example input and output

INPUT EXAMPLE	OUTPUT EXAMPLE
i. Journal Name: International Journal of Innovative Research ii. Journal ISSN: 1234-5678 iii. Journal Title: Science Advances	i. Journal Status: Legal ii. Reputation and Evaluation: The journal's indexing and peer review process are questionable. iii. Reasoning: The journal is not indexed in reputational databases. Its peer review process lacks transparency. iv. Additional Information: The journal has a history of publishing low-quality research.

A "Legal" status indicates that the system didn't identify significant factors associated with predatory journals.

CONCLUSION

The pursuit of publishing research in reputable journals is critical for researches, yet the rise of predatory journals poses significant challenges to the integrity of academic publishing. Many journals compromise on quality and ethics; thus, non-validated and misguided research gets published. In view of such concerns, the need for an effective system of predatory publication detection becomes very apparent. Though current solutions provide some help, there remains much room for further improvement in the interest of researchers and academics. The proposed platform will provide a complete resource through which journal quality may be evaluated, based on the stringent indexing standards used by SCOPUS and Web of Science. The platform will also provide access to credible journals that will support researchers in their publishing efforts and will also ensure the scientific literature reliability. In these ways, we hope to help ensure that quality research continues to thrive within the academic community

REFERENCES

- Aggarwal, A., Fojo, T., Chamberlain, C., Davis, C., & Sullivan, R. (2017). Do patient access schemes for high-cost cancer drugs deliver value to society?—lessons from the NHS Cancer Drugs Fund. *Annals of Oncology*, 28(8), 1738-1750. <https://doi.org/10.1093/annonc/mdx110>
- Alrawadieh, Z. (2018). Publishing in predatory tourism and hospitality journals: mapping the academic market and identifying response strategies. *Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 20(1), 72–81. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1467358418800121>
- Bairi, K., Fourtassi, M., Fatimy, R., & Kadmiri, N. (2023). Distance education as a tool to improve researchers' knowledge on predatory journals in countries with limited resources: the Moroccan experience. *International Journal for Educational Integrity*, 19(1). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40979-023-00122-7>
- Christopher, M. & Young, K. (2015). Awareness of “predatory” open-access journals among prospective veterinary and medical authors attending scientific writing workshops. *Frontiers in Veterinary Science*, 2. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fvets.2015.00022>
- Cobey, K., Grudniewicz, A., Lalu, M., Rice, D., Raffoul, H., & Moher, D. (2019). Knowledge and motivations of researchers publishing in presumed predatory journals: a survey. *BMJ Open*, 9(3), e026516. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2018-026516>
- Cukier, S., Lalu, M., Bryson, G., Cobey, K., Grudniewicz, A., & Moher, D. (2019). Defining predatory journals and responding to the threat they pose: a modified Delphi consensus process. <https://doi.org/10.1101/19010850>
- Cukier, S., Lalu, M., Bryson, G., Cobey, K., Grudniewicz, A., & Moher, D. (2020). Defining predatory journals and responding to the threat they pose: a modified Delphi consensus process. *BMJ Open*, 10(2), e035561. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2019-035561>
- Fanelli, D., Costas, R., & Larivière, V. (2015). Misconduct policies, academic culture and career stage, not gender or pressures to publish, affect scientific integrity. *Plos One*, 10(6), e0127556. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0127556>
- Gopalakrishna, G., Riet, G., Vink, G., Stoop, I., Wicherts, J., & Bouter, L. (2021). Prevalence of questionable research practices, research misconduct and their potential explanatory factors: a survey among academic researchers in the Netherlands. <https://doi.org/10.31222/osf.io/vk9yt>
- Gurnani, B. & Kaur, K. (2021). Avoiding predatory publishing for early-career ophthalmologists. *Indian Journal of Ophthalmology*, 69(12), 3719–3725. https://doi.org/10.4103/ijo.ijo_1639_21
- Hastings, R., Labib, K., Lechner, I., Bouter, L., Widdershoven, G., & Evans, N. (2022). Guidance on research integrity provided by European discipline-specific learned societies: a scoping review. <https://doi.org/10.31222/osf.io/kn5y9>
- Jing, W., Halffman, W., & Zwart, H. (2020). The Chinese scientific publication system: specific features, specific challenges. *Learned Publishing*, 34(2), 105–115. <https://doi.org/10.1002/leap.1326>
- Kurt, S. (2018). Why do authors publish in predatory journals?. *Learned Publishing*, 31(2), 141–147. <https://doi.org/10.1002/leap.1150>
- Labib, K. & Evans, N. (2021). Gender, diversity, and the responsible assessment of researchers. *Plos Biology*, 19(4), e3001036. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pbio.3001036>
- Mahomed, S., Loots, G., & Staunton, C. (2022). The role of data transfer agreements in ethically managing data sharing for research in South Africa. *South African Journal of Bioethics and Law*, 26–30. <https://doi.org/10.7196/sajbl.2022.v15i1.807>
- Richtig, G., Richtig, M., Hoetzenecker, W., Saxinger, W., Lange-Asschenfeldt, B., Steiner, A., ... & Richtig, E. (2018). Knowledge and influence of predatory journals in dermatology: a pan-Austrian survey. *Acta Dermato Venereologica*, 0. <https://doi.org/10.2340/00015555-3037>
- Shrestha, J. (2021). Predatory journals as threats to academic publishing: a review. *Journal of Agriculture and Natural Resources*, 4(2), 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.3126/janr.v4i2.33640>
- Shrestha, J., Subedi, S., Shokati, B., & Chaudhary, A. (2018). Predatory journals: a threat to scholarly publishing. *Journal of Education and Research*, 8(1), 89–101. <https://doi.org/10.3126/jer.v8i1.25482>
- Swanberg, S., Thielen, J., & Bulgarelli, N. (2020). Faculty knowledge and attitudes regarding predatory open access journals: a needs assessment study. *Journal of the Medical Library Association JMLA*, 108(2). <https://doi.org/10.5195/jmla.2020.849>
- Yazdani, S., Akbarilakeh, M., Abdalla, M., Boelen, C., Arbabisarjou, A., & Moonaghi, H. (2019). Measuring social

accountability of medical universities' education function- design, development, and validation of instrument. Journal of Evolution of Medical and Dental Sciences, 8(26), 2110–2114. <https://doi.org/10.14260/jemds/2019/464>