



Research Article

# Spotting Predatory Journals: A Review

Givheart C. Dano<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Faculty of the Institute of Arts and Sciences, Tangub City Global College  
Tangub City, Philippines

Email: givheart.dano6151998@yahoo.com

---

## ABSTRACT

This research paper seeks to investigate the rise of predatory journals, which undermine scholarly and research efforts. Predatory journals falsely present themselves as legitimate scientific publications, deviating from established peer-review processes and ethical standards. They often exploit scholars and researchers through excessive publication fees, lacking adequate quality control or a rigorous review process. Overlooking such malpractice in the academic sphere can compromise the quality of knowledge disseminated to the audience. Urgent action is required to identify and halt potential predatory journals. This paper emphasizes the crucial consideration for scholars and researchers to carefully assess journals before submitting their work, aiming to avoid falling victim to academic predators. Additionally, the paper addresses key themes for spotting predatory journals, including (1) Peer-reviewed Policy, (2) Article Processing Charges, (3) Indexing, (4) Spamming and Solicitation, (5) Editorial Policy, and (6) Lack of Rigor and Scrutiny. The research employs an archival research method, involving the retrieval and analysis of information from original archives, to accomplish these objectives.

**Keywords:** Predatory Journals, Scholarly Integrity, Peer Review, Academic Publishing, Journal Evaluation.

**Citation:** Dano, G. (2024).  
"Spotting Predatory Journals:  
A Review." CMU Journal of  
Science. 28(2), 108

Academic Editor: Mark Lloyd  
G. Dapar

Received: September 20, 2024  
Revised: November 08, 2024  
Accepted: November 19, 2024  
Published: December 27, 2024



**Copyright:** © 2024 by the  
authors. Submitted for  
possible open access  
publication under the terms  
and conditions of the Creative  
Commons Attribution (CC BY)  
license  
(<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Predatory journals pose a significant threat to the integrity of scholarly work, as they compromise the quality of information reaching the audience (Garcia, 2019; Angadi & Kaur, 2020). The detrimental impact on knowledge dissemination is profound, as these journals often lack stringent peer-review processes and ethical standards (Shrestha et al., 2018; Cukier et al., 2020). Consequently, substandard research is published without the rigorous scrutiny necessary for maintaining academic excellence. This erosion of quality has far-reaching consequences, as inaccurate or unreliable information may influence subsequent research, creating a ripple effect in the academic community (Kumar, 2022). Identifying and exposing predatory journals is crucial for safeguarding the interests of both the audience and researchers (Mudry & Ruben, 2019; Frandsen, 2022). A discerning approach to journal selection, based on a thorough consideration of policies and guidelines, becomes paramount. Researchers must be vigilant in assessing factors such as peer-reviewed policies, article processing charges, indexing practices, spamming and solicitation behavior, editorial policies, and the overall rigor and scrutiny exercised by the journal (Adnan, et al., 2019; Suiter & Sarli, 2019; Kratochvil et al., 2020). In doing so, not only do researchers protect the integrity of their own work (Koerber et al., 2020, p. 7), but they also contribute to upholding the standards of academic discourse. This vigilant stance ensures that knowledge disseminated to the audience maintains a high level of credibility (Koerber et al., 2020, p. 3), fostering an environment where scholarly pursuits can thrive and contribute meaningfully to the advancement of human understanding (Dony et al., 2020).

### 1.1 LITERATURE REVIEW

Predatory journals falsely present themselves as legitimate scientific publications (Nnodim & Nwaokoro, 2023), deviating from established peer-review processes (Siler, 2020) and ethical standards (Ferris & Winker, 2017; Pollock et al., 2023). According to Elemore and Weston (2020), predatory journals, also known as fraudulent, deceptive, or pseudo-journals. Predatory journals claim to be legitimate scholarly publications but engage in misleading publishing practices (Balehegn, 2017; Strong, 2019). Elemore and Weston (2020) highlights common characteristics of predatory journals, such as falsely claiming to provide peer review, hiding information about Article Processing Charges (APCs), and misrepresenting members of the editorial board. The main goal of predatory journals is profit, as they exploit authors by charging fees without providing robust peer review or editorial services

(Bowman, 2014; Beall, 2017). Da Silva et al. (2019) emphasize the importance of avoiding submission to predatory publishers due to various negative consequences. Fake peer review can undermine scientific progress by allowing flawed or inaccurate information to enter the research community (Bell et al., 2022). Rivera and da Silva (2021) argued that publishing in low-quality journals may result in reduced visibility and usage of research findings. Additionally, authors may risk being scammed and losing their work (Bagues et al., 2019; Pond et al., 2019; McQuarrie et al., 2020). To help authors identify and avoid predatory journals, Elemore and Weston (2020) provides tools and strategies, including tips to assess a journal's credibility and lists of online resources for checking journal quality. These resources include ThinkCheckSubmit.org, the Directory of Open Access Journals (DOAJ), the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE), SCImago Journal Rank, and more. Elemore and Weston (2020) conclude by encouraging authors to consult their institutional or local librarian for assistance in navigating these issues.

Richtig et al. (2019) and Wang et al. (2021) argued that individuals with limited experience often fall prey to predatory journals, experiencing the negative consequences of these deceptive and unethical publications. Munn et al (2021) argued on how to address the challenges posed by predatory journals in the context of systematic reviews and provide interim guidance for systematic reviewers on how to handle studies from such journals. Xia et al. (2015) and Bagues et al. (2019) highlight the increasing prevalence of predatory journals in the scientific landscape, characterized by practices that prioritize self-interest over scholarly integrity. Forero et al. (2018) emphasize the potential threats posed by studies published in predatory journals, including lower quality, increased likelihood of fraud and error, and a lack of adherence to accepted scholarly publishing practices and ethical standards. In response to this gap, Munn et al. (2021) propose several alternative strategies for consideration, depending on the reviewers' goals. These strategies include excluding all studies from suspected predatory journals, applying additional forensic examination measures for results, setting stringent search limits, and employing analytical techniques like subgroup or sensitivity analyses to investigate the impact of such studies in a synthesis (Rice et al., 2021). Munn et al. (2021) argued the discussion to the challenges faced by researchers, especially those with less experience, who may inadvertently submit quality research to predatory journals. He also explore the broader implications of including studies from predatory journals in systematic reviews, touching upon issues such as wasted resources, potential contributions to pseudoscience, and the ethical considerations surrounding the use of such research. Munn et al. (2021) concludes by highlighting the

need for further research, including meta-epidemiological studies to evaluate the impact of studies from predatory journals, methods to detect predatory journals, and exploration of researcher attitudes toward predatory journals. Beall (2016) and Happe (2020) emphasize the collective responsibility of the scientific community, including researchers, funders, regulatory bodies, and institutions, in addressing the challenges posed by predatory publishing.

In order to avoid this predatory journal, Yamada (2021) suggests measures to prevent researchers from publishing a paper in a predatory journal, addressing issues before submission, during peer review, and after acceptance. The suggested measures include pre-registration, pre-submission peer review, open peer review, topping up reviewers, post-publication peer review, open recommendation, and treatment as un-refereed (Beall, 2016; Rice et al., 2021; Yamada, 2021). The goal is to enhance the credibility of articles, even in predatory journals, and promote open and multi-layered assessment of research content. The authors emphasize the importance of these practices for all research articles to improve reproducibility and advance science. This also highlights the challenges faced by inexperienced researchers and the need for institutional and systemic changes in the scientific publishing culture (Richtig et al., 2019; Wang et al., 2021). The term “predatory publishers” was coined by Beall, a librarian at the University of Colorado, who identified organizations publishing counterfeit journals to exploit the open-access model (Kendall & Linacre, 2022). Beall maintained a list of publishers he deemed predatory on his blog, known as “Beall’s List” (Krawczyk & Kulzycki, 2021). The list was taken down in 2017, but other tools have emerged to help authors identify reliable journals. Elemore and Weston (2020) outlines common characteristics of predatory journals, such as claiming to be peer-reviewed open-access publications without providing adequate peer review (Siler et al., 2021), advertising incorrect or unverifiable citation metrics (Samuel & Aranha, 2019), and aggressively targeting potential authors through emails (Mathew & Patel, 2022). It emphasizes the importance of avoiding submission to predatory publishers, as it can lead to fake peer review, reduced visibility of research, potential scams, and loss of work. To avoid falling victim to predatory journals, authors are advised to employ various techniques, including checking the journal’s website for spelling or grammatical mistakes, ensuring transparency about the peer-review process and publishing fees, confirming indexing in relevant databases, and verifying contact information (Burggren et al, 2018; Elemore & Weston, 2020; Yildizhan, 2022). Elemore and Weston (2020) also provide a list of online resources and tools, both free and subscription-based, to help authors identify and avoid predatory journals.

The issue of predatory journals in academia demands an urgent and comprehensive response to safeguard the integrity of scholarly research (Desmir, 2018; Ojala et al., 2020). Immediate awareness among the academic community is crucial to equip scholars and researchers with the tools to identify and avoid falling victim to deceptive publishing practices. The outlined key themes for spotting predatory journals serve as a foundational guide, ensuring a well-informed scholarly community. Firstly, understanding the peer-reviewed policy is fundamental, as predatory journals often claim to offer rigorous peer review when, in reality, they fall short of this standard (Strong, 2019). Awareness of deceptive practices related to article processing charges (APCs) is equally critical. Predatory journals may hide or misrepresent these charges, exploiting authors financially without delivering genuine editorial services (Metilda et al., 2023). Indexing is another crucial theme, as legitimate journals are typically indexed in reputable databases. By being attentive to indexing information, scholars can discern the credibility of a journal (Suiter & Sarli, 2019). Additionally, recognizing the signs of spamming and solicitation, such as unsolicited emails with promises of rapid publication, is essential to avoiding potential pitfalls (White & Wilson 2023). Examining editorial policies and ensuring a journal adheres to recognized standards for rigor and scrutiny further fortifies the academic community against predatory practices (Grudniewicz et al, 2019). As Callaghan et al. (2020) argued, disseminating knowledge about these key themes empowers scholars to make informed decisions, reinforcing academic integrity and fostering a scholarly environment that prioritizes genuine research dissemination over exploitative publishing practices.

## 2. METHODOLOGY

The research under consideration employed the archival method as a foundational approach for data collection and analysis. Archival research methods encompass a diverse set of practices designed to facilitate the examination of documents and textual materials related to organizations (Mohr & Ventresca, 2002; Brenna, 2023). Traditionally, these methods involve the exploration of historical documents—those created in the distant past, offering unique insights into organizations, individuals, and events of bygone eras (Heller, 2023). This classic interpretation of archival methods provides access to information that might otherwise remain obscured. However, Sinner (2013) and Mohr and Ventresca (2002) argued that the utility of archival methods extends beyond historical investigations, as contemporary scholars employ them in non-historical inquiries into documents and texts associated with present-day organizations. These methods serve as valuable tools to complement other research

approaches such as field methods and survey methods (Gaillet, 2012). In this contemporary context, archival methods can also be effectively applied to scrutinize digital texts, encompassing electronic databases, emails, and web pages (Owens & Padilla, 2020). Owens and Padilla (2020) added that this adaptation underscores the versatility of archival research, demonstrating its applicability across historical and non-historical inquiries, as well as its capacity to encompass a wide array of textual materials, including those generated in the digital realm.

### 3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

#### *Latest List of Predatory Journals*

*Table 1: Beall's List of Predatory Journals, 2010-recent*

Year	Number of Publishers	Number of Standalone Journals
2010-2011	18	-
2011-2012	23	-
2012-2013	225	126
2013-2014	477	303
2014-2015	693	507
2015-2016	923	882
2016-2017	1153	1294
2017-recent	8000	15059

Table 1 presents the growth of predatory journals and publishers listed by Beall from 2010 to the recent period. In 2010-2011, there were 18 publishers identified, with no standalone journals specified (Beall, 2016). The numbers increased significantly in subsequent years. By 2012-2013, the count rose to 225 publishers and 126 standalone journals. The trend continued, reaching 8000 publishers and 15059 standalone journals in the recent period 2017 to

The proliferation of predatory journals has reached alarming levels, with a substantial increase in their numbers over time. This surge poses a significant threat to the integrity of scholarly publishing, as these journals often engage in deceptive practices, compromise peer review standards, and prioritize profit over genuine scientific contribution (Elmore & Weston, 2020). Lopez and Gaspard (2019) argued that the rising prevalence of such predatory entities underscores the urgent need for heightened awareness, robust evaluation processes, and effective countermeasures within the academic community to safeguard the credibility of research and publications.

recent (Linacre, 2021). This exponential growth indicates a proliferation of predatory journals over the years, suggesting an escalating challenge in identifying and addressing such entities within the academic publishing landscape. The substantial surge from 2012 onwards underscores the need for ongoing efforts to combat predatory practices in scholarly publishing.

#### *Top Countries with Highest Contribution in Predatory Journals*

*Table 2: Top 10 Counties with Highest Contribution in Predatory Journals*

Rank	Countries	Number of Publications	Percentage
1	India	16720	42.09%
2	Iran	1449	3.64%
3	Nigeria	1219	3.06%
4	United States	509	1.27%
5	Malaysia	469	1.17%
6	Egypt	445	1.11%

7	Saudi Arabia	440	1.10%
8	China	376	0.94%
9	South Korea	345	0.86%
10	Pakistan	353	0.88%

Table 2 provides a comprehensive overview of the top 10 countries and their respective contributions to the realm of predatory journals, presented both in absolute numbers and as a percentage of the total publications. The percentages are derived from each country's share of the overall publication count. India emerges as the foremost contributor with a substantial 16,720 publications, commanding a significant 42.09% of the total. Following closely, Iran secures the second position with 1,449 publications, contributing 3.64%, while Nigeria claims the third spot with 1,219 publications, constituting 3.06%. The

United States occupies the fourth position with 509 publications, representing 1.27%. Further down the list, Malaysia, Egypt, Saudi Arabia, China, South Korea, and Pakistan each play a role in the global prevalence of predatory journals. These percentages provide valuable insights into the relative weight of each country in shaping the landscape of predatory publishing, with India notably standing out as a major player. Future studies should investigate the underlying factors that contribute to both the excessive and insufficient numbers of journals in these areas.

### **Top 15 Subject Areas of Predatory Publications**

*Table 3: Top 15 Subject Areas of Predatory Publications*

<b>Rank</b>	<b>Subject Areas</b>	<b>Number of Journal</b>
1	Health & Medical Sciences	40
2	Pharmaceutical Sciences	38
3	Multidisciplinary	28
4	Biological Sciences	18
5	Engineering & Technology	13
6	Chemistry & Chemical Technology	9
7	Plant Sciences & Medicinal Plants	8
8	Science & Technology	8
9	Environmental Sciences	6
10	Natural Sciences	5
11	Life Sciences	5
12	Humanities & Social Sciences	4
13	Biotechnology	3
14	Management	3

The provided table outlines the top 15 subject areas affected by predatory publications, offering insights into the prevalence of unethical practices across various academic disciplines. Topping the list is Health & Medical Sciences with 40 predatory journals, followed closely by Pharmaceutical Sciences with 38. Multidisciplinary journals, numbering 28, also demonstrate vulnerability to predatory practices. Biological Sciences, Engineering & Technology, and Chemistry & Chemical Technology follow suit, with 18, 13, and 9 journals, respectively, indicating a concerning trend across the scientific spectrum. Plant Sciences & Medicinal Plants, Science & Technology, and Environmental Sciences are also affected, emphasizing the need for vigilance in diverse fields. Predatory practices extend to Humanities & Social Sciences, Biotechnology, and Management, suggesting that no discipline is immune. Even in Mathematics and other unspecified areas, 2 predatory journals highlight the pervasive nature of this issue. Thus, researchers across a wide array of subjects must exercise caution, thoroughly evaluating potential publication venues to safeguard the integrity of academic discourse.

### Common Themes of Predatory Journals

Identifying predatory journals is crucial for maintaining the integrity of academic research (Dobusch & Heimstadt, 2019; Elmore & Weston, 2020). Several key themes serve as red flags in spotting these unscrupulous publications. Firstly, a lack of a genuine peer-review policy is a significant indicator (Van Noorden, 2020). Van Noorden argued that reputable journals have a transparent and rigorous peer-

review process, ensuring the quality and reliability of published research. Secondly, the presence of exorbitant Article Processing Charges (APCs) is a common characteristic of predatory journals (Rice et al., 2021). Legitimate journals have reasonable fees or no charges at all for publishing. High APCs can be a sign of profit-driven motives rather than a commitment to scholarly dissemination (Duc et al., 2020). Thirdly, the indexing of a journal in reputable databases is crucial. Predatory journals often claim false or misleading indexing information. Researchers should verify a journal's indexing status through reliable databases to ensure their work gains proper recognition (Elmore & Weston, 2020). Fourthly, spamming and unsolicited solicitations for submissions are indicative of predatory practices. Esteemed journals do not engage in aggressive recruitment tactics, and researchers should exercise caution when receiving unsolicited invitations (Grudniewicz et al, 2019). Fifthly, scrutinizing the editorial policy is essential. Predatory journals may lack clear editorial guidelines, ethical standards, or an editorial board with credible experts, leading to a compromised review process. Lastly, a lack of rigor and scrutiny in the review process is a key theme. Reputable journals uphold high standards for research quality and methodology. Predatory journals often bypass thorough scrutiny, accepting subpar or even pseudoscientific work (Burggren et al, 2018). Ojala et al., (2020) remind scholars and researchers should remain vigilant, considering these themes collectively, to distinguish reputable journals from predatory ones and safeguard the credibility of scholarly discourse.

#### i. Peer Reviewed Policy

Table 4: Peer-Reviewed Policy

Indicators	Reliable Journals	Predatory Journals
Double-blind Review	Articles are reviewed by several other experts in the field before the article is published in the journal in order to ensure the article's quality.	Lack proper peer review process. This can result in inadequate evaluations, biased feedback, or a lack of critical analysis of the research.
Time Reviewed	On average, it can take several weeks to several months for a manuscript to go through the entire review process.	In some cases, predatory journals may claim to provide a quick review and publication process, often within a few days or even hours.
Competent Referees	Editor assigns more referees who are knowledgeable in the	Assign reviewers who may not have the appropriate expertise

---

specific area of research covered by the manuscript.	and qualification of the subject matter.
--	--

---

## ii. Article Processing Charges

Table 5: Article Processing Charges (APCs)

Indicators	Reliable Journals	Predatory Journals
Charging Outrageous Fees	Legitimate journals may charge APCs or publication fees to cover costs of the peer review process, editing typesetting, and online hosting of the published articles. However, these fees are typically reasonable and transparent, and they are justified by the services and quality assurance provided by the journal. But most likely, this journal does not ask for any payment.	Often engage in deceptive practices, including charging authors unreasonable fees for publication. These fees are typically much higher and often not justified by the quality or services provided by the journal.
Pay Before Review	Reputable journals typically follow a process where authors submit their manuscripts for review, and the review process takes place before any payment. But most likely, this journal does not ask for any payment.	Often engage in ethical practices, such as asking for payment before the review process takes place. This is a clear red flag and is not the standard practice.
Pay Without Publishing	Legitimate journals follow a transparent and accountable publishing process. They have a clear publication policy and ensure that accepted papers go through the necessary editing, typesetting, and online hosting processes before being published. Reputable journals also provide authors with a clear timeline for publication and communicate any delays or issues that may arise.	Engage in unethical practices, including accepting payment but not publishing the submitted paper. This is a clear violation of ethical publishing standards and can be highly frustrating for authors who have put time and effort into their research.

## iii. Indexing

Table 6: List of Indexing

Category	Reliable Indexing for Academic Journals	Predatory Indexing for Academic Journals
Academic Databases	<i>Scopus, Web of Science, BASE,</i>	Infobase Index Factor, Scientific

	<i>JSTOR, EBSCO, CORE, ScienceDirect, Medline etc.</i>	Journal Impact Factor, Cite Factor, Global Impact Factor etc.
OA Indexes	DOAJ, PubMed Central	–

#### iv. Spamming and Solicitation

Table 7: *Spamming and Solicitation*

Indicators	Reliable Journals	Predatory Journals
Spam	Reputable journals do not rely on spamming to attract submissions and generally have a more professional and transparent approach to soliciting quality research.	Often rely on spamming as a method to attract submissions and deceive authors. They send unsolicited emails to researchers, often promises of quick publication, low or no publication fees, and exaggerated claims about the journal's impact or reputation.
Deadlines	Legitimate journals typically have a well-defined submission process with clear deadlines that allow authors sufficient time to prepare and submit their manuscripts. They prioritize the quality and thorough review of the research over quick publication.	Often use urgent deadlines as a tactic to pressure authors into submitting their work quickly and without careful consideration. These urgent deadlines are often accompanied by promises of fast-track publication or other benefits to entice authors.
Erroneous Salutations	Legitimate journals take the time to personalize their communications and address authors by their correct names. They understand the importance of establishing professional and respectful relationships with authors.	Often use erroneous or generic salutations in their communications as a sign of their lack of attention to detail and professionalism. Instead of addressing authors by their correct names or using appropriate titles, they may use generic greetings like "Dear Author" or "Dear Researcher"

#### v. Editorial Policy

Table 8: *Editorial Policy*

Indicators	Reliable Journals	Predatory Journals
Copyright and Licenses	Reputable journals typically require authors to sign a copyright agreement or license agreement that outlines the	Often lack proper copyright and licensing policies, which is a significant red flag. They may have vague or ambiguous



	terms and conditions for the use and distribution of their published work. These agreements specify how the journal and others can use the content, whether it is for non-commercial or commercial purposes, and any restrictions or permissions granted to the authors.	policies that do not adequately protect the rights of authors.
Scope and Publication Ethics	Legitimate journals have well-defined scopes that clearly outline the types of research they accept and publish. They typically focus on specific discipline or sub-discipline within a field, ensuring that the published articles align with the journal’s expertise and contribute to the advancement of knowledge in that area.	Often lack clear scope and publications ethics. These journals may have a vague or broad scope that encompasses a wide range of topics, without specific focus or expertise in any particular field.
Bugos Editor	Legitimate journals have reputable and established editors who are experts in their fields. These editors have a track record of scholarly contribution and are actively involved in the academic community. They play a crucial role in ensuring the quality and integrity of the research published in the journal.	Often have bogus or fictitious editors listed on their websites or in their communications. These journals may create the illusion of having a prestigious editorial board by using the names and affiliations of well-known researchers without their knowledge or consent.

**vi. Rigor and Scrutiny**

*Table 9: Rigor and Scrutiny*

<b>Indicators</b>	<b>Reliable Journals</b>	<b>Predatory Journals</b>
Acceptance Rate	Legitimate journals typically have a rigorous peer-review process and maintain high standards for accepting research papers. The acceptance rates of reputable journals vary widely depending on the field and the specific journal, but they are generally much lower than what predatory journals claim.	Often advertise higher acceptance rates as a way to attract authors and make their journal appear more attractive. They may claim to have acceptance rates of 80% or even 100%, which is significantly higher than the acceptance rates of reputable journals.
Procedures	Reputable journals have well-established procedures in place to ensure the rigorous	Often lack rigorous procedures in their publication process. These journals may have a less

	evaluation of submitted manuscripts. This typically involves a double-blind peer review process, where experts in the field review the manuscript for its scientific soundness, methodology, significance, and adherence to ethical standards.	stringent or non-existent peer-review process, which is a crucial step in ensuring the quality and validity of published research.
Final Report	Legitimate journals prioritize providing detailed and constructive feedback to authors to help improve the quality of their research.	Often lack exhaustive comments or feedback as a final report during the peer review process.

In the quest to uphold the integrity of academic research, recognizing common themes among predatory journals is essential. These unscrupulous publications exhibit several red flags, starting with the absence of a genuine peer-review policy, a cornerstone of reputable journals ensuring quality and reliability. Additionally, the presence of exorbitant Article Processing Charges (APCs) can signal profit-driven motives rather than a commitment to scholarly dissemination. Indexing discrepancies, particularly false claims about a journal's inclusion in reputable databases, are also prevalent. Predatory journals resort to spamming and unsolicited solicitations, promising quick publication and low fees. Scrutinizing editorial policies reveals a lack of transparency and ethical standards, with fictitious editors sometimes listed. Lastly, a dearth of rigor and scrutiny in the review process is a significant theme, as predatory journals often claim unrealistically high acceptance rates and lack meticulous procedures. By understanding these key themes collectively, scholars can discern between reputable and predatory journals, ensuring the credibility and reliability of scholarly discourse. The tables further elaborate on specific indicators in peer-reviewed policies, article processing charges, indexing, spamming and solicitation, editorial policies, and the rigor of scrutiny.

#### 4. CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the rise of predatory journals poses a serious threat to scholarly and research integrity, with potentially far-reaching consequences for the quality of knowledge disseminated. This paper has shed light on the urgency of identifying and addressing these deceptive practices, emphasizing the responsibility of scholars and researchers to carefully assess journals before submitting their work. The key themes discussed, including peer-reviewed policies, article processing charges, indexing practices, spamming and solicitation behavior, editorial

policies, and the overall rigor and scrutiny exercised by journals, provide a comprehensive guide for spotting predatory journals. The archival research method employed in this study has revealed alarming trends in the proliferation of predatory journals, as evidenced by the exponential growth in their numbers over the years. The tables presenting data on predatory journals, top contributing countries, and subject areas affected underscore the global nature of this issue. By understanding and collectively considering these common themes, scholars can navigate the academic publishing landscape more discerningly, contributing to the safeguarding of the credibility and reliability of scholarly discourse. The paper concludes with a call for heightened awareness, robust evaluation processes, and collaborative efforts within the academic community to counter the menace of predatory publishing.

**Acknowledgments:** I would like to acknowledge the people behind the completion of this research project, particularly the Research, Extension, and Development Office (REDO) at Tangub City Global College, for their insights and comments that contributed to the improvement of the paper. This research work is likewise dedicated to the College to serve as a guide for faculty and students in promoting a culture of research.

**Conflicts of Interest:** The author declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this study.

#### 5. REFERENCES

Adnan, A., Anwar, S., Zia, T., Razzaq, S., Maqboo, F., & Rehman, Z.U. (2019). Beyond Beall's blacklist: Automatic detection of open access predatory research journals. In 2018 IEEE 20<sup>th</sup> International Conference on High Performance Computing and Communication, 1692-1697.

- Angadi, P.V., & Kaur, H. (2020). Research integrity at risk: Predatory journals are growing threat. *Archives of Iranian Medicine*, 23 (2), 113-116.
- Bagues, M., Sylos-Labini, M., & Zinovyeva, N. (2019). A walk on the wild side: 'Predatory' journals and information asymmetries in scientific evaluations. *Research Policy*, 48(2), 462–477. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2018.04.013>
- Balehegn, M. (2017). Increased publication in predatory journals by developing Countries' institutions: What it entails? And what can be done? *International Information & Library Review*, 49(2), 97–100. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10572317.2016.1278188>
- Beall, J. (2016). Essential Information about Predatory Publishers and Journals. *International Higher Education*, (86), 2–3. <https://doi.org/10.6017/ihe.2016.86.9358>
- Beall, J. (2017). What I learned from predatory publishers. *Biochemia Medica*. (2), 273–278. Doi: 10.11613/bm.2077.029 [PMC free article] [PubMed]
- Bell, K., Kingori, P., & Mills, D. (2024). Scholarly Publishing, Boundary Processes, and the Problem of Fake Peer Reviews. *Science, Technology, & Human Values*, 49(1), 78-104. <https://doi.org/10.1177/01622439221112463>
- Bowman, J. (2014). Predatory publishing, questionable peer review and fraudulent conferences. *American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education*, 78 (10), 1-6.
- Brenna, C. (2023). Archival research. Varieties of Qualitative Research Method, Selected Contextual Perspective, DOI: 10.1007/978-3-031-04394-9\_6
- Burggren, W. & Madasu, D. K. & Hawkins, K. S. & Halbert, M., (2018) "Marketing via Email Solicitation by Predatory (and Legitimate) Journals: An Evaluation of Quality, Frequency and Relevance", *Journal of Librarianship and Scholarly Communication* 6(1), eP2246. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.7710/2162-3309.2246>
- Callaghan, C. W., & Nicholson, D. R. (2020). Predatory publishing and predatory journals: A critical review and proposed research agenda for higher education. *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, 44(10), 1433–1449. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0309877X.2019.1695762>
- Cukier, S., Helal, L., Rice, D.B., Pupkaite, J., Ahmadzai, N., Wislon, M., Skidmore, B., Lalu, M.M., & Moher, D. (2020). Checklists to detect potential predatory biomedical journals: A systematic review. *BMC Medicine*, 18, 1-20.
- Da Silva, J., Dobranszki, J., Tsigaris, P., & Al-Khatib, A. (2019). Predatory and exploitative behaviour in academic publishing: An assessment. *The Journal of Academic Librarianships*, 45 (6), 1-5. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acalib.2019.102071>
- Demir, S. (2018). Predatory journals: Who publishes in them and why? *Journal Informetrics*, 12 (4), 1296-1311. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joi.2018.10.008>
- Dobusch, L., & Heimstädt, M. (2019). Predatory publishing in management research: A call for open peer review. *Management Learning*, 50(5), 607-619. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1350507619878820>
- Dony, C., Raskinet, M., Renaville, F., Simon, S., & Thirion, P. (2020). How reliable and useful is Cabell's blacklist? A data-driven analysis. *LIBER Quarterly*, 30(1), 1–38. <https://doi.org/10.18352/lq.10339>
- Duc, N., Hiep, D., & Thong, P. (2020). Predatory open access journals are indexed in reputable database: A revisiting issue or an unsolved problem. *MedArch*, 74 (4), 318-322.
- Elmore, S. A., & Weston, E. H. (2020). Predatory Journals: What They Are and How to Avoid Them. *Toxicologic pathology*, 48(4), 607–610. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0192623320920209>
- Ferris, L., & Winker, M. (2017). Ethical issues in publishing in predatory journals. *Biochemia Medica*, 27(2), 279-84. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.11613/BM.2017.030>.
- Forero, D., Oermann, M., Manca, A., Deriu, F., Zeron, H., Dadkhan, M., Bhad, R., Deshpande, S., Wang, W., & Cifuentes, M. (2018). Negative effects of "predatory" journal on global health research. *Ubiquity Press*, 84 (4), 584-589. DOI: 10.29024/aogh.2389
- Frandsen, T. (2022). Authors publishing repeatedly in predatory journals: An analysis of scopus articles. *Learned Publishing*, 35 (4), 598-604. <https://doi.org/10.1002/leap.1409>
- Gaillet, L. L. (2012). (Per)Forming Archival Research Methodologies. *College Composition and Communication*, 64(1), 35–58. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/23264916>
- Garcia, M. (2019). Plagiarism and predatory journals: A threat to scientific integrity. *An Pediatr*, 90 (1), 57.e1 – 57 e8. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.anpedi.2018.11.003>

- Grudniewicz, A., Moher, D., Cobey, K.D., Bryson, G.L., Cukier, S., Allen, K., et. Al. (2019). Predatory journals; no definition, no defence. *Nature*. 576, 201-212.
- Happe L. E. (2020). Distinguishing Predatory from Reputable Publishing Practices. *Journal of managed care & specialty pharmacy*, 26(8), 956–960. <https://doi.org/10.18553/jmcp.2020.26.8.956>
- Heller, M. (2023). Rethinking Historical Methods in Organization Studies: Organizational Source Criticism. *Organization Studies*, 44(6), 987-1002. <https://doi.org/10.1177/01708406231156978>
- Kendall, G., & Linacre, S. (2022). Predatory journals: Revisiting Beall's research. *Publishing Research Quarterly*, 38, 530-543. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12109-022-09888-z>
- Koerber, A., Starkey, J. C., Ardon-Dryer, K., Cummins, R. G., Eko, L., & Kee, K. F. (2020). A qualitative content analysis of watchlists vs safelists: How do they address the issue of predatory publishing? *Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 46(6), 102236. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acalib.2020.102236>
- Kumar, M.J. (2022). Beware of predatory journals. *IETE Technical Review*, 39 (4), 735-736. DOI: 10.1080/025602.2022.2132712
- Kratochvíl, J., Plch, L., Sebera, M., & Koritáková, E. (2020). Evaluation of untrustworthy journals: Transition from formal criteria to a complex view. *Learned Publishing*, 33(3), 308–322. <https://doi.org/10.1002/leap.1299>
- Krawczyk, F., & Kulczycki, E. (2021a). 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), 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acalib.2020.102271>
- Lopez & Christine S. Gaspard (2020) Predatory Publishing and the Academic Librarian: Developing Tools to Make Decisions, *Medical Reference Services Quarterly*, 39:1, 1-14, DOI: 10.1080/02763869.2020.1693205
- Mathew, R. P., Patel, V., & Low, G., Associate Clinical Professor (2022). Predatory Journals- The Power of the Predator Versus the Integrity of the Honest. *Current problems in diagnostic radiology*, 51(5), 740–746. <https://doi.org/10.1067/j.cpradiol.2021.07.005>
- Marydee Ojala, Regina Reynolds & Kay G. Johnson (2020) Predatory Journal Challenges and Responses, *The Serials Librarian*, 78:1-4, 98-103, DOI: 10.1080/0361526X.2020.1722894
- McQuarrie, F. A. E., Kondra, A. Z., & Lamertz, K. (2020). Do tenure and promotion policies discourage publications in predatory journals? *Journal of Scholarly Publishing*, 51(3), 165–181. <https://doi.org/10.3138/jsp.51.3.01>
- Metilda, M., Pinto, A., & Pachiyappan, S. (2023). Article processing charges and their impact in open access publishing. 330-341. DOI: 10.4018/978-1-7998-9805-4.ch016
- Mohr, J., & Ventresca, M. (2002). *Archival research methods*. Blackwell Publishers, DOI: 10.1002/9781405164061.ch35
- Mudry, A., & Ruben, RJ. (2019). The fox and the crow: Predatory open access journals in otolaryngology. *Otolaryngology-Head and Neck Surgery*, 161 (2), 193-194. DOI: 10.1177/0194599838756
- Munn, Z., Barker, T., Stern, C., Pollock, D., Ross-White, A., Klugar, M., Wiechula, R., Aromataris, E., & Shamseer, L. (2021). Should I include studies from "predatory" journals in a systematic review? Interim guidance for systematic reviewers. *JBI evidence synthesis*, 19(8), 1915–1923.
- Nnodim, K., & Nwaokoro, JC. (2023). Predatory journals in scientific research: A great challenge. *Journal of Case Reports in Medical Medicine*, 9 (1), 1-4. DOI: 10.56557/JOCRIMS/2023/v9i18135
- Padilla, T., Owens, T. (2020). Digital Sources and Digital Archives: Historical Evidence in the Digital Age. *International Journal of Digital Humanities* 1-17. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s42803-020-00028-7>
- Pollock, D., Barker, T., Stone, J., Aromataris, E., Klugar, M., Scott, A., Stern, C., White, A., Whitehorn, A., Wiechula, R., Shamseer, L., & Munn, Z. (2023). Predatory journals and their practices present a conundrum for systematic reviewers and evidence synthesisers of health research: A qualitative descriptive study. *Research Synthesis Methods*, 1-18. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jrsm.1684>
- Pond, B. B., Brown, S. D., Stewart, D. W., Roane, D. S., & Hariforoosh, S. (2019). Faculty applicants' attempt to inflate CVs using predatory journals. *American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education*, 83(1), 7210. <https://doi.org/10.5688/ajpe7210>
- Rice, D.B., Skidmore, B. & Cobey, K.D. (2021). Dealing with predatory journal articles captured in systematic

- reviews. *Syst Rev*, 10 (175), 1-4.  
<https://doi.org/10.1186/s13643-021-01733-2>
- Richtig, G., Richtig, E., Böhm, A., Oing, C., Bozorgmehr, F., Kruger, S., Kiesewetter, B., Zielinski, C., & Berghoff, A. S. (2019). Awareness of predatory journals and open access among medical oncologists: Results of an online survey. *ESMO Open*, 4(6), e000580.  
<https://doi.org/10.1136/esmooopen-2019-000580>
- Rivera, H., & Da Silva, J. (2021). Retractions, fake peer reviews, and paper mills. *Journal of Korean Medical Science*, 36 (24), e165. DOI: 10.3346/jkms.2021.36.e165
- Samuel, A., & Aranha, V. (2018). Valuable research in fake journals and self-boasting with fake metrics. *Journal of Pediatric Neurosciences*, 13 (4), 517-518. DOI: 10.4103/JPN\_66\_18
- Shrestha, J., Subedi, S., Timsina, K.P., & Tripathi, M. (2018). Risk of publication in worthless journals. *Journal of Agriculture and Natural Resources*, 1(1), 1-5.
- Siler, K. (2020). Demarcating spectrums of predatory publishing: Economic and institutional sources of academic legitimacy. *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology*, 71(11), 1386–1401. <https://doi.org/10.1002/asi.24339>
- Siler, K., Vincent-Lamarre, P., Sugimoto, C. R., & Larivière, V. (2021). Predatory publishers' latest scam: Bootlegged and rebranded papers. *Nature*, 598(7882), 563–565.  
<https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-021-02906-8>
- Sinner, A. (2013). Archival research as living inquiry: An alternate approach for research in the histories of teacher education. *International Journal of Research and Method in Education*, 36(3), 241-251.
- Strong G. (2019). Understanding Quality in Research: Avoiding Predatory Journals. *Journal of human lactation: official journal of International Lactation Consultant Association*, 35(4), 661–664.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0890334419869912>
- Suiter, A. M., & Sarli, C. C. (2019). Selecting a Journal for Publication: Criteria to Consider. *Missouri medicine*, 116(6), 461–465.
- Van Noorden R. (2020). Hundreds of scientists have peer-reviewed for predatory journals. *Nature*, 10.1038/d41586-020-00709-x. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-020-00709-x>
- Wang, J., Xu, J., & Chen, D. (2021). Chinese PhD students' perceptions of predatory journals. *Journal of Scholarly Publishing*, 52(2), 88–106.  
<https://doi.org/10.3138/jsp.52.2.02>
- White, A., & Wilson, R. (2023). What can be learned about predatory journals from a failed study? Possible motivations behind predatory journals. *Journal of Scholarly Publishing*, 54 (1), 3-14.
- Xia, J., Harmon, J. L., Connolly, K. G., Donnelly, R. M., Anderson, M. R., & Howard, H. A. (2015). Who publishes in "predatory" journals? *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology*, 66(7), 1406–1417.  
<https://doi.org/10.1002/asi.23265>
- Yamada, Y. (2021). How to protect the credibility of articles published in predatory journals. *Publications*, 9 (4), 1-8. <https://doi.org/10.3390/publications9010004>
- Yildizhan E. (2022). Avoiding Predatory Journals: Four Main Points. *Noro psikiyatri arsivi*, 59(3), 167–168.  
<https://doi.org/10.29399/npa.28243>

**Disclaimer/Publisher's Note:** The statements, opinions and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of CMUJS and/or the editor(s). CMUJS and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions or products referred to in the content.