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Principles of research ethics

Honesty
Objectivity
Openness
Confidentiality
Carefulness

Respect for colleagues
Respect for intellectual property
Respect for the law
Respect for subjects
Stewardship
Social responsibility
Freedom
### Research • publication Ethics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Social Code of Ethics</th>
<th>Internal Code of Ethics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Research topic (direction)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Research conduct</strong></td>
<td><strong>Reporting results</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Major issues</strong></td>
<td>Human genome editing, AI ethics, driverless (thinking) car, xenograft, stem cell chimera, lab-grown meat, artificial human breast milk</td>
<td>Dignity of life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Laboratory management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

#### Social responsibility

#### Research and Publication misconduct

**Background**
More than 10,000 research papers were retracted in 2023 – a new record

The number of articles being retracted rose sharply this year. Integrity experts say that this is only the tip of the iceberg.

A BUMPER YEAR FOR RETRACTIONS

Retraction notices in 2023 have passed 10,000, largely because of more than 8,000 retractions by Hindawi.

RISING RETRACTION RATES

The ratio of retracted papers to articles published has risen to above 0.2%.

- Including conference papers
- Excluding conference papers

More than 8,000 IEEE* conference papers were retracted in 2009–2011.
(New) List of Predatory Journals – 2023
About Journal

PubMed NLM ID: 9918523088506676

Fortune Journal of Health Sciences (ISSN: 2644-2906) is an international, open access, peer-reviewed journal promoting excellence in all areas of medical sciences from basic research to clinical and experimental work. Fortune Journal of Health Sciences addresses the use of science, technology, engineering in the delivery of healthcare to human beings.

The journal mainly deals with topics like:

- Angiology/Vascular Medicine
- Hepatology
- Bariatrics
- Infectious Diseases and Vaccinology
- Bioinformatics and Biotechnology
- Kinesiology
- Biomedicine
- Medical Education
- Cardiology
- Nephrology
- Cell Biology
- Neuroscience
- Clinical and Hospital Pharmacy
- Oncology
- Clinical Immunology
- Ophthalmology
- Clinical Research
- Osteology
- Critical Care
- Otorhinolaryngology
- Medicine
- Paediatrics
- Dentistry
- Pharmacogenomics
Open access, and Predatory journal/paper mill
8th Asian Science Editors’ Conference & Workshop 2024
July 15th and 16th, 2024
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Open Science is .. .. ..

OPEN
EXPAND THE POSSIBLE
SCIENCE

Open Science

Open Source
Open Hardware
Open Access
Open Evaluation
Open Science
Open Data
Open Educational Resources
Open Labs
Open Notebook
Open Innovation
Open Crowdfunding
Crowd-Funding

Components of Open Science

Prepared for the Canadian Commission for UNESCO
By Ella Chan, Dick Bourgeois-Doyle, Michael Donaldson, and Eleanor Haine-Bennett
Ottawa, Canada, April 2020
[Scientist] Publication = Job/Promotion/Honor/Incentives

Open access → Predatory journal, paper mill, selling authorship

Temptation for research misconduct

APC (article processing charge)
Incentives for publication
Problems that Open Access would solve

**Economic barriers:** license fees, subscription fees, membership fees, etc.
**Legal issues:** Copyright, licensing, etc.
**Technical barriers:** Accessibility issues

**Characteristics of Open Access**

**Why Open Access?**

**Scientist (author):** Solving the problem with copyright transfer, distribution and subscription fees, and *etc.*
**Library:** Budget savings
**Government/Public Institutions:** Free public accessibility, Bridging the information gap
**Publisher/society:** Build up and maintenance of electronic text
• **Traditional** (subscription) model.

• **Gold** open access (OA): financed by submitting authors (typically through their institution or funding agency).

• **Diamond OA**: published/distributed/preserved with no fees to either reader or author. [platinum open access, non-commercial open access, cooperative open access or, more recently, open access commons]. Funded by an academic institution, learned society or a government information center.

Bronze OA, Green OA, Black OA, Delayed OA, Hybrid OA
The **Budapest Open Access Initiative** arose from a small but lively meeting convened in Budapest by the Open Society Institute (now Open Society Foundations [OSF]) on December 1-2, 2001.

### 2012

**BOAI10**
The meeting to mark the tenth anniversary of the BOAI took place in Budapest, Hungary on February 14-15, 2012.

### 2017

**BOAI15**
A global community survey was conducted to take stock of progress toward Open Access and to gauge the main obstacles to its widespread adoption.

### 2017

**BOAI20**
In collaboration with colleagues from around the world, we developed a new set of recommendations to mark the BOAI's 20th anniversary.

**TRANSLATIONS**

One goal of the BOAI is to encourage cultural diversity. With this in mind, we would like to circulate the BOAI20 Recommendations in as many languages as possible. Generous volunteers are translating the recommendations. If you would be interested in volunteering to translate the recommendations, please contact: boai20anniversary@gmail.com. The recommendations are currently available in the following language(s):

- Chinese (Simplified)
- English
- French
- Polish
- Spanish
- Turkish
SUMMARY
Open access is not an end in itself, but a means to further ends. Above all, it is a means to the equity, quality, usability, and sustainability of research. Our four high-level recommendations address systemic problems that obstruct progress toward these ends.

1. **Host OA research on open infrastructure.** Host and publish OA texts, data, metadata, code, and other digital research outputs on open, community-controlled infrastructure. Use infrastructure that minimizes the risk of future access restrictions or control by commercial organizations. Where open infrastructure is not yet adequate for current needs, develop it further.

2. **Reform research assessment and rewards to improve incentives.** Adjust research assessment practices for funding decisions and university hiring, promotion, and tenure decisions. Eliminate disincentives for OA and create positive new incentives for OA.

3. **Favor inclusive publishing and distribution channels that never exclude authors on economic grounds.** Take full advantage of OA repositories and no-APC journals (“green” and “diamond” OA). **Move away from article processing charges (APCs).**

4. **When we spend money to publish OA research, remember the goals to which OA is the means.** Favor models which benefit all regions of the world, which are controlled by academic-led and nonprofit organizations, which avoid concentrating new OA literature in commercially dominant journals, and which avoid entrenching models in conflict with these goals. Move away from read-and-publish agreements.

February 14, 2022

6957 individuals and 1612 organizations have added their names to the declaration.
Dutch lead European push to flip journals to open access

Academic consortia urge faster changes in scholarly publishing.

Declan Butler

06 January 2016
Finland joins Europe’s bold open-access push

Nation’s funder is the first to join Plan S – which aims to make all scientific works free to read on publication – since the effort was announced.
Wellcome and Gates join bold European open-access plan

The Wellcome Trust has also announced how it will implement the plan, which could provide a blueprint for others.

doi: 10.1038/d41586-018-07300-5
The policies — which take effect on 1 January 2025 — elevate the role of preprints and are aimed at reducing the money the Gates Foundation spends on APCs, while ensuring that the research is free to read.

But the policy's ramifications are unclear. “Whether this will help the open-access movement or not, it’s hard to know,” Hinchliffe says. On the one hand, more research will become freely available in preprint form, she notes. On the other, the final published versions of articles, known as the version of record, might become harder to access. Under the revised rules, after sharing their manuscript as a preprint, authors will be allowed to submit it to the journal of their choice and will no longer be required to select the OA option.

“Ending support for APC payments is not the cOAlition S policy, I can be very clear about that,” Rooryck says. “That’s a decision that Gates has taken. It’s not a decision that we, as cOAlition S, are ready to make by 1 January 2025.”
On Jul. 27, 2017
~ four major academic institutions in Berlin announced that they would not renew their subscriptions with the Dutch publishing giant Elsevier .. ..

“The general issue is that large parts of the research done is publicly funded, the type setting and quality control [peer review] is done by people who are paid by the public, [and] the purchase of the journals is also paid by the public,” says Christian Thomsen, the president of the Technical University of Berlin. “So it’s a bit too much payment.”
On Feb. 28, 2019, UC publishes nearly 10% of US research papers. About $11 million a year to Elsevier in subscription fees.

**Open access: Universities, UC [3]**

**Trends in Subscription Fees for Major Electronic Resources at SNU Library**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Fee ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>$3.89M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>$3.98M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>$4.31M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>$4.86M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>$4.9M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>$5.16M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>$5.69M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>$5.66M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>$6.19M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**Subscription Trends of Electronic Resources at Seoul National University Library**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Subscription fee ($)</th>
<th>Subscription number (#)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>$3.5M</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>$4.79M</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>$5.69M</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>$5.66M</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>$7.61M</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>$7.86M</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>$8.77M</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: SNU Library

Scientists in Germany, Peru and Taiwan to lose access to Elsevier journals.
EU council’s ‘no pay’ publishing model draws mixed response

Some academics have welcomed the proposed open-access plans. But publishing-industry representatives warn they are unrealistic and lack detail. The European Union’s council of ministers has called for the bloc to implement a ‘no pay’ academic-publishing model that bears no cost to readers or authors.

YES; Strong support
Organizations including the German Research Federation (DFG) have welcomed the principles. In a statement, the DFG said that it supported the “landmark recommendations”. “Under no circumstances should a situation arise in which the availability of funds determines participation in academic discourse,” it said.

NO; The principles lack clarity as to how the no-pay model would be achieved in practice.

Focus on integrity
The conclusions also highlight the importance of research integrity in publications, and recommend that member states make efforts to tackle predatory journals and paper mills — companies or individuals.
More than 40 leading scientists have resigned in masse from the editorial board of a top science journal in protest at what they describe as the “greed” of publishing giant Elsevier. The entire academic board of the journal *Neuroimage*, including professors from Oxford University, King’s College London and Cardiff University resigned after Elsevier refused to reduce publication charges.

Academics around the world have applauded what many hope is the start of a rebellion against the huge profit margins in academic publishing, which outstrip those made by Apple, Google and Amazon. *Neuroimage*, the leading publication globally for brain-imaging research, is one of many journals that are now “open access” rather than sitting behind a subscription paywall. But its charges to authors reflect its prestige, and academics now pay over £2,700 ($3,500) for a research paper to be published. The former editors say this is “unethical” and bears no relation to the costs involved.

Elsevier, a Dutch company that claims to publish 18% of the world’s scientific papers, reported a 10% increase in its revenue to £2.9bn last year. But it’s the profit margins, nearing 40%, according to its 2019 accounts, which anger academics most. The big scientific publishers keep costs low because academics write up their research – typically funded by charities and the public purse – for free. They “peer review” each other’s work to verify it is worth publishing for free, and academic editors collate it for free or for a small stipend. Academics are then often charged thousands of pounds to have their work published in open-access journals, or universities will pay very high subscription charges.

Stephen Smith, professor of biomedical engineering at Oxford University and formerly editor-in-chief at *Neuroimage*, said: “Academics really don’t like the way things are, but individuals feel powerless to get the huge publishers to start behaving more ethically.”
Open access ‘at any cost’ cannot support scholarly publishing communities

Kaitlin Thaney, July 20th, 2023

The EU Council’s recent call lead current momentum establishing Open Access for “no pays” vs. “reasonable costs” of publication vs. “at any cost” over the past two decades.

Following the signing of the Budapest, Berlin, and Bethesda Open Access declarations in the early 2000s, progress has been made towards the vision of scholarship that’s “free to read” – but not “free” or even affordable to publish, with some arguing that the latter wasn’t the point.

UNESCO Recommendation on Open Science

The UNESCO Recommendation on Open Science is the first international standard setting instrument on open science.

OSTP: the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy
**Open Access journals (Gold OA)**

- **2009**: about 4,800 active OA journals, publishing around 190,000 articles.
- **2015.10**: over 10,000 OA journals listed in the Directory of Open Access Journals (DOAJ)
- **2018.02.16**: 11,169; Peer-reviewed OA journals listed in the DOAJ.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>80</th>
<th>130</th>
<th>12,789</th>
<th>18,541</th>
<th>8,206,141</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>13,595</td>
<td>20,437</td>
<td>9,987,483</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LANGUAGES** | **COUNTRIES REPRESENTED** | **JOURNALS WITHOUT FEES** | **JOURNALS** | **ARTICLE RECORDS**

As of Apr., 2024
• Traditional (subscription) model.
• Fee-based (gold) open access (OA): financed by submitting authors (typically through their institution or funding agency).
• No-fee (platinum or diamond) OA: funded by an academic institution, learned society or a government information center.
• Delayed OA: subscription model but OA after some time.
• Hybrid OA: a subscription journal in which some of the articles are OA.
Predatory, Potential, Possible, Probable, or Suspicious
Predatory journals: no definition, no defence

Leading scholars and publishers from ten countries have agreed a definition of predatory publishing that can protect scholarship. It took 12 hours of discussion, 18 questions and 3 rounds to reach.

The definition

The consensus definition reached was: “Predatory journals and publishers are entities that prioritize self-interest at the expense of scholarship and are characterized by false or misleading information, deviation from best editorial and publication practices, a lack of transparency, and/or the use of aggressive and indiscriminate solicitation practices.”

They accept articles for publication — along with authors’ fees — without performing promised quality checks for issues such as plagiarism or ethical approval.
Is MDPI a predatory publisher?  

Paolo Crosetto

MDPI: Multidisciplinary Digital Publishing Institute, an Open-Access only scientific publisher.

2013: 388 SI in 74 journals (5/ journal)  
2020년: 6,756 SI (less than 100/ journal)  
2021년: 39,687 SI (about 500/ journal)
The raincloud plot of the overall distribution (cut at 150 days, for the sake of visualisation. This leaves out about 3% of the papers in 2016, but, a further indication of the shrinking of turnaround times, only 0.3% of papers in 2020). On the left, each point is a paper. On the right, you see the kernel density estimation. There is heterogeneity, but it is rather low, and it is being dramatically reduced. The rather flat distribution of 2016 has been replaced by a very concentrated distribution in 2020.
Fast publishing, a high acceptance rate, and a low APC are unattractive to authors if they are not accompanied by a good (or in some cases, any) Impact Factor and ranking.
Is MDPI a predatory publisher?

As a firm, MDPI should be admired for pulling this extremely effective strategy. MDPI created a handful of journals with high IF from scratch. [.....] They managed to cut all slack times to zero and deliver an efficient workflow — mean times from acceptance to publication are down to 5 days in 2020 from nearly 9 days in 2016.

Still, I think this model is not sustainable, and stand a high chance of collapsing. It’s simple, really: it will likely collapse because journal reputation is a common pool resource — and MDPI is overexploiting it.

The problem is that bad money always crowds out good money. With MDPI pushing the SI model faster and faster, the balance will shift sooner rather than later towards deeming MDPI not worth working with.
The initial list of 50 papers under investigation expanded to more than 300 submissions received since 2020 – about 100 of them already published – with concerns about improper authorship and conflicts of interest that compromised peer review.

Systematic manipulation of the publication process
DOI: https://doi.org/10.24318/cope.2019.2.23
Publisher retracts 350 papers at once

IOP Publishing has retracted a total of 350 papers from two different 2021 conference proceedings because an “investigation has uncovered evidence of systematic manipulation of the publication process and considerable citation manipulation.”

The case is just the latest involving the discovery of papers full of gibberish – aka “tortured phrases” – thanks to the work of Guillaume Cabanac, a computer scientist at the University of Toulouse, Cyril Labbé, of University Grenoble-Alpes and Alexander Magazinov, of Skoltech, in Moscow. The tool detects papers that contain phrases that appear to have been translated from English into another language, and then back into English, likely with the involvement of paper-generating software.

The papers were in the Journal of Physics: Conference Series (232 articles), and IOP Conference Series: Materials Science and Engineering (118 articles), plus four editorials.

IOP has had similar issues before, including a case that led to more than 20 retractions in 2020.
James Heathers “found at least 1,500 off-topic papers, many with abstracts containing ‘tortured phrases’ that may have been written by translation or paraphrasing software, and a few with titles that had been previously advertised with author positions for sale online.”

This article has been withdrawn as part of the withdrawal of the Proceedings of the International Conference on Emerging Trends in Materials Science, Technology and Engineering (ICMSTE2K21). Subsequent to acceptance of these Proceedings papers by the responsible Guest Editors, Drs. S. Sakthivel, S. Karthikeyan and I. A. Palani, several serious concerns arose regarding the integrity and veracity of the conference organisation and peer-review process. After a thorough investigation, the peer-review process was confirmed to fall beneath the high standards expected by Materials Today: Proceedings.

Elsevier’s Catriona Fennell wrote:
In confidence, we also have an active investigation of several conferences/proceedings published in Materials Today Proceedings, where we have evidence that the peer review process was faked. We suspect some conferences may have never taken place (even virtually) and we are currently gathering evidence to support that suspicions. We have not started manual checking the content of papers yet on an individual article level.
What is a Paper Mill?

In recent years, publishers have seen an increase in research integrity issues stemming from **systematic manipulation of the publishing process**. Paper mills are at the heart of this. The scholarly publishing industry organization Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE) describes paper mills as “**profit oriented, unofficial and potentially illegal organizations that produce and sell fraudulent manuscripts that seem to resemble genuine research.**”
Guest Post — Addressing Paper Mills and a Way Forward for Journal Security

Why is a Paper Mill problem?

Paper mills circumvent journal security by doing two things: *manipulating identities* of the participants in the publishing process, and *fabricating content* that gets published. Journal security is thus critical for trustworthy research communication. Without it, paper mills and other schemes will continue to fill journals with fabricated content, and damage society’s trust in peer review and journal publications. *The scale of the problem will only increase as technology, like generative AI, becomes more widely adopted.*

https://scholarlykitchen.sspnet.org/2023/04/04/guest-post-addressing-paper-mills-and-a-way-forward-for-journal-security/?informz=1&nbd=3b507d70-bcb-42c2-9c1f-7c6bba1350ab&nbd_source=informz
In a preprint\(^1\) posted on the arXiv server in December 2021, Abalkina describes an analysis of more than 1,000 authorship offers, together worth more than US$6.5 million, published in 2019–21 on a Russian-language website called International Publisher. She has now linked 460 published papers to the adverts. (International Publisher did not respond to Nature’s request for comment.)

In July 2022, the International Journal of Emerging Technologies in Learning retracted 30 papers linked to adverts on International Publisher. The retraction notices say that the work was connected to a “criminal paper mill selling authorships and articles for publication in several online journals to paying customers”. The blog Retraction Watch highlighted this case in an investigation into International Publisher published in December 2021. “Generally, these things are really difficult to prove,” says Tim Kersjes, a research-integrity manager at Springer Nature in Dordrecht, the Netherlands.

---

Predatory journals accept papers (and collect publication fees) regardless of quality. A 2017 analysis of predatory journals in the database Scopus found that the share of publications in such journals by South African researchers was roughly five times those for the United States and Brazil, and two-and-a-half times that for China, which is frequently criticized for boosting publication numbers in inferior journals (see go.nature.com/2tecsqx).

Why are South Africans relying so much on journals that do little or nothing to ensure quality? In an effort to boost academic productivity, the country’s education department launched a subsidy scheme in 2005. It now awards roughly US$7,000 for each research paper published in an accredited journal. Depending on the institution, up to half of this amount is paid directly to faculty members. At least one South African got roughly $40,000 for research papers published in 2016 — about 60% of a full professor’s annual salary.

South African publications listed in the Scopus database each year more than doubled in the decade after the payout programme began. But the number of publications by South African researchers in predatory journals jumped more than 140-fold in the same period. Clearly, many researchers in South Africa are being forced to choose: cash or quality?
**Problem 1:** The publisher’s old policy simply stated that “Requests to modify the author list after submission should be made to the editorial office using the authorship change form.”

**Solution:** Now, such requests “will only be granted under exceptional circumstances and after in-depth assessment by the Frontiers’ research integrity unit,” according to the release. The publisher will also keep track of the requests “to identify suspicious patterns and trends.”

**Problem 2:** Websites that advertise authorship positions on scientific papers have been around for years, and brokers also post ads on social media sites including Facebook.

**Further restriction:** In case of any concerns regarding potential authorship manipulation, *Frontiers reserves the right to contact the authors’ institution(s) for further investigation and/or decline the requested changes.*
China has updated its list of journals that are deemed to be untrustworthy, predatory or not serving the Chinese research community’s interests. For the first time, it flags journals that exhibit misconduct called citation manipulation, in which authors try to inflate their citation counts.

Called the Early Warning Journal List, the latest edition, published last month, includes 24 journals from about a dozen publishers.

How do you go about creating the list every year?

What changes did you make this year?

You also introduced journals with abnormal patterns of citation. Why?

You also flag journals that publish a high proportion of papers from Chinese researchers. Why is this a concern?

How do you determine whether a journal has a paper-mill problem?

What impact has the list had on research in China?
TEXT SIMILARITY CHECK SOFTWARE
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How to deal with it?

Paper mills

Predatory journals
The InterAcademy Partnership (IAP) is a global network consisting of over 140 national and regional member academies of science, engineering, and medicine. It was founded in 1993 as the InterAcademy Panel (IAP). In 2000, the IAP founded the InterAcademy Council (IAC) and the InterAcademy Medical Panel (IAMP). The partnership was established in 2016 when it merged the three inter-related networks into IAP for Health (formerly IAMP), IAP for Science (formerly IAP), and IAP for Policy (formerly IAC). [Wikipedia]
## A spectrum of predatory behaviours for journals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fraudulent</th>
<th>Deceptive</th>
<th>Unacceptable low-quality</th>
<th>Low-quality</th>
<th>Promising low-quality</th>
<th>Questionable quality</th>
<th>Quality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Risk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Low Risk</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Typical markers:
- Non-existent or improper peer review and misrepresenting the process by which its articles are selected
- Mimicry of other journals or websites
- No or fake editorial board
- Alternative or fake Impact Factor
- Lies about being indexed or members of publishing organisations
- Hides the costs for publishing
- Potentially illegal operations

### When does a journal become deceptive?
When it is lying about its true purpose or misleading authors or readers about the journal status, costs involved, or services provided.

### Typical markers:
- Low quality peer review
- Breaches of good editorial practice
- Services to authors and academia are lacking or poor
- Use of aggressive and indiscriminate solicitation practices
- Unclear about publishing charges
- Lack of satisfactory archiving
- Inactive editorial board

### When should a journal be considered low quality?
The more markers checked, the lower the quality.
The further to the right on the spectrum, the more deserving of support to achieve quality publishing.

### Typical markers:
- Thorough peer review
- Strong editorial boards
- Robust system to ensure research integrity and retractions
- Clear about publishing costs
- Occasionally engages in predatory practices but takes proper action when criticised

---

Taken from Combatting Predatory Academic Journals and Conferences. InterAcademy Partnership (IAP)
## A spectrum of predatory behaviours for conferences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fraudulent</th>
<th>Deceptive</th>
<th>Unacceptable low-quality</th>
<th>Low-quality</th>
<th>Promising low-quality</th>
<th>Questionable quality</th>
<th>Quality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Risk</td>
<td>Low Risk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Typical markers:
- Does not take place, or cancels on unclear grounds
- Webpage used for criminal/fraudulent purposes
- Registration fees are not returned if cancelled
- Established researchers’ names are used on programmes, in marketing materials, or on advisory boards without their permission
- Not funded by any research council or sponsor so all profit comes from the conference attendees
- Target unsuspecting early-career researchers with flattering invitations
- Falsely claim that submissions are peer reviewed or promise an extremely short peer review process
- In most serious cases, emptying out bank accounts of unsuspecting registrants

### When does a conference become deceptive?
When it is lying about its true purpose or misleading speakers or registrants about the conference status, costs involved, or services provided.

### Typical markers:
- The organiser holds many conferences in different fields at the same time and/or in different cities/online platforms
- Titles are too broad so conference lacks focus
- Invites are asked to speak/present on subjects unrelated to their research
- Invites are encouraged to participate, e.g. chair a session on a topic unrelated to their research
- Invitations have spelling and grammatical mistakes
- Exaggerate the event's prestige and/or location
- Low attendance
- Poor organisation
- Low-quality research is presented.

### When should a conference be considered low quality?
The more markers checked, the lower the quality

### Typical markers:
- Well-planned and with an appropriate venue/online platform
- The conference has a clearly defined scientific purpose
- Funded and/or arranged by reputable organisations
- Thorough peer review of submissions
- Abstracts are collected or the best papers are published in a reputable journal
- Robust system to ensure academic relevance of research promotion, speakers, and subjects addressed
- Clear about conference costs
- Any sponsor follows compliance
- Helpful with arranging accommodation, travel, transportation, payments, accompanying persons program, etc.
- Accounts for sustainability and safety provision
- Occasionally engages in some predatory practices, but takes proper action when challenged

---

Taken from Combatting Predatory Academic Journals and Conferences. InterAcademy Partnership (IAP)
Strategies and actions pertaining to research and publication ethics

8th Asian Science Editors' Conference & Workshop 2024
July 15th and 16th, 2024
The Westin Jakarta, Jakarta, Indonesia [Host: HAMKA University]

Conclusion
Take-home message

Submiting research work

THINK

Are you submitting your research to a trusted journal or publisher?
Is it the right journal or book for your work?

CHECK

Use our check list to assess the journal or publisher

SUBMIT

Only if you can answer 'yes' to the questions on our check list

Attending meeting

https://thinkcheckattend.org/

KCSE

https://thinkchecksubmit.org/
[Scientist] Publication = Job/Promotion/Honor/Incentives

[Institute] Boost institutions’ rankings

Open Access → Predatory journal, Paper mill

Key Factors

- Publication cost
- Authorship sale
- APC
- Impact Factor

Research Misconduct

STRESS

STRESS
Most scientists regarded the new streamlined peer-review process as "quite an improvement."

**THE EVOLUTION OF ACADEMIA**

- **Publish**
- **Publish or Perish**
- **Publish in high impact journals or Perish**
- **Publish frequently in high impact journals and maybe you won't Perish**

Facebook.com/pedronics
“Real integrity is doing the right thing, knowing that nobody’s going to know whether you did it or not.” – Oprah Winfrey

Strategies and actions pertaining to research and publication ethics

Thank you very much for your attention; cyun@snu.ac.kr