

Transportation Librarians Roundtable January 10, 2019

Please stand by for real time captions. Please stand by for real time captions.

Hello, everyone. We will give it another minute before we get started, just to let you know. Thank you. Okay, we can go ahead and get started now. I want to welcome all of you to this month's Transportation Librarians Roundtable . Of course, this is the first TLR for 2019. Samantha and I are very glad that you could join us today for what should be a very worthwhile presentation. I did want to clarify something. It is correct least dated on the slide that you see on the screen here right now. But last month when we indicated the topic for the TLR today we inadvertently misspelled the speaker's last name as Hudson. I wanted to clarify that we will not be featuring one of the more famous finalists from American idol, just to will make you aware of that. However, you will not be disappointed because we have someone who is just as much if not more so worth the time to have is a featured speaker today, Jennifer Herron. I know you will not be disappointed. Before we get underway with our presentation I will make the formal introduction I would like to turn the microphone over to Samantha, who will go over the basic rules as far as the technical logistics for the next hour. The floor is yours, Samantha.

Thank you, Bob. Thank you everybody for joining us. Just a few technical and logistical announcements. Today's TLR is being recorded including the Q&A session . It will be deposited into the bid will depository. Audio presentation is through your phone rather than Adobe connect. If you are using your phone be sure to mute the computer speakers by muting the icon. Change it from green to suede -- to white to help oblivate echoing. If you need to step away, do not put us on hold estate may mess up our recording and audio. We also recommend that you type in any feedback. This TLR now has life captioning and you should see that in the captioning pod. Also captioning will be available afterwards. You can also use the chat pod in the bottom left corner to present any questions during the presentation. Bob Cullen and I will be monitoring this chat pad during the presentation. Thank you everybody. I will now send back over to Bob to introduce Jennifer.

Thank you, Samantha. Our speaker wants to go through her presentation and afterwards we will have an opportunity for Q&A sessions. If there is anything you need to let us know in the meantime, particularly if there is any difficulties hearing the speaker or anything else, any kind of glitch or anything you need to clarify that cannot wait until after the presentation is done, please feel free to enter those comments and feedback into the chat box and Samantha and I will keep on the lookout for that. Otherwise if you can hold your questions and comments until the end of the presentation that would be great.

Now let me formally introduce our speaker. Our speaker today is Jennifer Herron. She is of the Michigan Department of Transportation Library. Her presentation is entitled Predatory Publishers , a very important topic as I know all of you will agree. Let me first of all give you background information on our speaker. Jennifer graduated from Wayne State University. She is as I mentioned the library and at the Michigan Department of Transportation. Prior to her current employment Jennifer worked as the emerging technologies library and for the Ruth Lilly medical library. She has achieved one year of transportation librarianship. She is looking forward to continuing to learning and develop in this field. Now I think we are certainly fortunate not only to have her today as the distinguished speech or but to also have her as one of our distinguished community members. I would like to go ahead and introduce our speaker for today, Jennifer Herron . It is all yours, Jennifer.

Thank you Bob. And thank you Samantha for helping me get set up. I will get started in the topic.

Predatory Publishers . I am focusing on this. I know the input side of Predatory Publishers is what people may be aware of but it is the output that I am focusing on today. And also helping you figure out what these are. This again is a nice overview. What makes a predatory publisher, how do you know the different types, how to recognize the problems, I have authors and researchers. I will show how to evaluate. How to check websites. We want to raise awareness of Predatory Publishers. If you didn't know anything about them I hope you will have more knowledge about it after this. I came to transportation librarianship in 2018. This after I was a medical librarianship. This is a concern in transportation and the government libraries. That's where I've been researching more on this topic. I wasn't sure if it was the paranoid ramblings of a library and so I wanted to check with experts. When I'm not 100% certain on a topic I will ask people. I will be here for one year in less than a month and a half now. Initially I focused on predatory apps which were applications you can download on your mobile phone that pretended to be medical sites. After that it kind of moved on to Predatory Publishers. That is a little bit of the background. Open access seems to be a difficult topic because it has so many levels and so many sides to it. It was sort of born out of open access journals. The problem came to what was their intention. Journals became malicious. It has kind of fallen apart and turned into this kind of big issue where we don't know exactly how to go about addressing it. That is one of the first things. Other people don't like calling these journals [Indiscernible] but it could be that they don't understand the process. There is a peer review process, all of those elements that go into making a good research journal. Are they predatory? Are they safe? Are they misleading?

This is a picture of my dog who will one day be a therapy dog visiting libraries and hospitals. It was a look at the intentions of Predatory Publishers . I found there were three main types, oblivious offender, the phisher and the hijacker. And oblivious offender may be unaware of problems. They may think they are doing the right thing. That's one of the things where they don't realize it and they think they are doing good. Again, new journals and good intentions. This is something I published an editorial about and I had a workshop about. Afterwards a man took down his site. Everyone was relying on a list of who to avoid and this is how this grew out of that. There was an option to have journalists taken off the list. If it would be appealed, that means they have good intentions to me. Moving on to the phisher . This is sort of a double sided . It could be a good intention or a bad intention. It's not always like the fishing e-mail scams where they try to get your credit card information. They may be trying to pull in new authors or contributors. They may mean well. It may be a legitimate journal but it could be someone that just referred you to them. Sort of like the word of mouth contact. Not so much out of the blue.

Now the last one is definitely one with bad intentions, hijackers. This one will give you the biggest headache. Sometimes domain names expire and someone will take it over. They pretend to be someone else and that is how it is hijacked. They may copy the name or take on a very similar name that is deceptive or it is such a small change you don't even know it. Sometimes they are knockoff journals. They are more predatory because they are tricking people into thinking Thursday think they are other people. This is an example. What I do is go poop the way back machine. This was on a journal under hijacked. This is the process I do when I check it out. I will Google it for an instant quick answer you see two right at the top. From the URL the second site seemed a little skeptical. I already knew the first link was the correct one and so I will show you that right off. The Journal of engineering technology. This is a message from the editor that you see right off the bat. They also have this information where they are aware that they have been hijacked. They are already warning people here. Then I wanted to show you the flipside. This is the second link in the Google results. What you notice is to me it looks professional. They have Thomas routers logo on the top which is interesting because I don't think they

even had anything to do with the original article. And you notice this ISSN which is the exact one from the print journal. This is how it gets confusing. How can they do this? That's the frustrating thing, you don't understand how it can exist. If you do some more poking around, sometimes you wonder if it is a hijacked site because there are two of them. If you look under "instructions for authors" they have a refund policy. I don't typically see that. I found that interesting. I don't see that too often, a refund policy. There are also publication FX. I highlighted this at the very end. They said that plagiarism should be considered as well as copyright infringements. That kind of opens the door for them. They recommend you probably shouldn't plagiarize. Again this is a publication process. Also on the home page they had this section showing impact factors. This was a huge long list. This is where I confused myself as well because I looked at DOAJ and they were not there. There was another journal that was not there. But they are lying about being on DOAJ. And some of these other journals may be shown but it may not be the hijacked version and that's where it gets really muddy. it can get really confusing here. This is another article that I opened up just to see how it looked. You will notice they have the logo copied right into the article from ASEE which makes it even more confusing. They just copied that picture however. You also have to wonder about the author as submitted. I will talk about the publication process in the next slide. But is the author aware this has been a hijacked journal? Are they trying to boost esteem and get more articles published? They are not worried about plagiarism so this could even be a copy of another article. And are they at trying to avoid a publication fee? There can be heavy publication fees. I think the gold access can be in the thousands of dollars. Is it unfair to be biased because authors just don't have that money available?

This screen doesn't look correct but it says submitting an article for publication. I apologize. This is just a story about a neuroscience PhD student. This is the flip side of where can get dangerous in the journals. What happened was Dr. Vaucher got some fishing emails. He was finishing up research and had something he could submit. He submit something and a few days later he gets something saying your article is approved, send us \$900, we will see what needs changed and we will submit it. To me that would be a device moment when someone asks for money. His moment was this was a quick peer review turnaround time. So we wondered whether went through the peer review process. He was concerned but this was his first time publishing. So we thought they may just be really quick and he paid the \$900. He listed some changes he needed made. He gave it to them within 24 hours. Everything went live. None of the changes he asked for were made. That's when he got even more paranoid. He didn't think anybody even looked at it. He kept emailing asking about the peer review process. What he found out was some person that was not even given a title, like John Doe said this article was good so we were going to publish it. So that is when he wanted his article taken down. It had errors and it now. His article was up . It was not formatted . It was not looking right and he did not believe it had been through a peer review. He went through months and over a year where he had to get a lawyer to take his article down. And this was after he paid \$900 to put the article up. That is just one example of how they can hold an article hostage. The Journal just wanted to get his money and put up whatever they could. There was no fact-checking. They didn't ask for copyrights. They didn't do a plagiarism check. They went ahead and published it.

This is on the input side so you can have this information. If you know people that want to publish do these three things. Think. Check. Submit. You can go to the directory of open access journals. You can go to the Beall's List . You can also go to Think Check Submit . Those websites are listed on the screen.

This is the flip side I was talking about. The impact on the output side. This is something, again I was a medical librarian. Try to pull in something that patients can relate to. This is a pain assessment tool. It's a good way to assess how you may feel about your research. I will use this quickly here. This is an example

of a search that was done in 2001. Dr. Toghiani's "good faith effort" to research a drug's adverse effects. These are the steps that they went through. Again I put 2001 to remind myself about it. I had no idea what GoTo.com was. Maybe it was a better site that has since been replaced. What I want people to do is write in the chat box how you feel about this search from the pain assessment tool. He looked at one contemporary textbook. What do you think of the search? He did use multiple resources as well instead of just going to Google and calling it a day. How do you feel about his search? I will give you a second to type your answer into the chat box.

John Hopkins tragedy could librarians have prevented a death? This will highlight what can happen with the bad search. This is what I have in my head when I think about Predatory Publishers. What happened was Dr. Toghiani didn't realize what was going on. He needed information published in the early 70s. Unfortunately, a patient did die. Looking back with hindsight is always 20/20. Librarians can easily say you should have looked at this database. That's where you wonder if he missed something and this is the consequence. What I wondered was what if the information was just bad? What if the research he found was from a predatory publisher and maybe it was something that did not get a peer review. Maybe it was biased. Maybe it was made up or skewed or misleading. What if it is bad information? Credible journals make a higher confidence level. If he looked at all the right things and still got bad information at least he knows he relied on resources that were good. It's always -- you cannot look at everything 100%. But you want to have accurate information.

Now we are back to this hijacked journal. This is an example. This is an article that we look at that I took this article. If I put in these keywords this would show up in the Google result at the top. This is something I did in the different presentation. I redid the search and now it is in the top instead of second.

And I thought this was interesting. I put the same search into being and the article didn't show up at all. I thought that was interesting, the being search did not show it up at all.

Why did we care about the peer review? Dr. Toghiani cared about not getting a peer review. That's because researchers want their work questioned. It is a way to scrutinize science. I was trying to think if I was being paranoid. Basically this goes back to a retraction. If an article is retracted, what is it retracted? Last night I did some research and found a website about retracted database.org. I was curious as to what would get an article that was published in a credible journal taken down. Basically the results were not producible, there was an error in the method or application, and plagiarism or copyright claims. There was a journal that did a study on this. The most common reason to retract was compromised peer review. I thought that was interesting. That's the main issue with these predatory publishers, the lack of peer review. Is this actually happening? What does this mean with the peer review process? Are these all articles they could be retracted? That's what it boils down to. And there was another article where they talked about the cost of promoting incorrect science and they said the problem is having retracted articles out there. That is where this has fallen into for me. If you see a retracted article means there is been an extra level of scrutiny involved with it.

This can be overwhelming if you think on it too long. Many say to work with librarians before publishing. Systematic reviews is a higher level of evidence. Publishers are requiring librarians as authors. That is one thing. And also higher level of evidence means there is more at stake. And this is another problem. Articles I was looking at were worried about citing retracted articles. You also need to be concerned about citing Predatory Publishers. It could fan the flames, give them credibility, or damage reputations.

So again, Predatory Publishers with a salt shaker behind it because everything I say about them I would like everyone to take with a "grain of salt." Not everything is black and white and Predatory Publishers can fall into a gray zone. This is somewhat of a delicate topic. You don't want to say everybody is a predatory publisher when they just have a minor problem. Sometimes again you have to think of what their intent is, do they want to make money or do they want to share research?

This is spot the difference. I have two journal titles here. I always go into the Beall's List and find the Journal and review it myself and that is how I make my decision. Here this journal of geotechnical and geo-environmental engineering. It has a ranking of 2.42 and is peer-reviewed. On the flipside the Journal of geotechnical and transportation engineering includes a pricing table for publishing, it isn't listed for a rating and it is peer-reviewed. Results for both will appear in Google. There were discussions about transportation librarians, maybe librarians being shut down. People usually say we can find everything in Google. And it was a you can find everything in Google but it may not always be good.

We will take a look first at the Journal of geotechnical logic oh and geo-environmental engineering. This is the first thing you see for the website, it is the library logo. Let's say you don't know about ASCE and you want to do more investigating, check out the process for authors. This is the editorial manager. The more difficult it is to submit work the more I would say the more legitimate the journal is. You should ask why you didn't get asked for a copyright for example. There are a lot of hoops to jump through to get something published. If it is too easy then there is probably something wrong.

This is a questionable journal. I'm not sure how we feel about it. Look at the main page. There is nothing really wrong with it. You can see the journal and the heading but down here, and this could confuse people even more, one of the problem with predatory journals is they will also hijack people. These people listed as editors in chief may not even know that their names are on this page. So that is why you take this information with a grain of salt. These people may not even know that they are listed as an editor on this page. I see the information. It's nice they haven't. Others don't tell you where the editor is and that is also suspicious. Now let's move on and look at the top header. Any time money is priority to a journal it sometimes makes you wonder why they are more interested in promoting getting the money then the research they are doing. I always say go to the "about" page of the journal. This tells you what type of publication it is. Basically look at the about. You can read more and see if there is something wrong. Sometimes they just copy and paste and don't realize that they have goofed up something. I also recommend looking at this contact page. One of the things I found to be useful is when you see a journal within address put it into Google Earth. I found one journal that was an apartment complex. That makes you wonder about the journal, white it is coming out of an apartment instead of an office building. You have to wonder if it is one person running it or if it is more of a professional operation. This has New York, Washington, and Melbourne. There's another star in California. Why is that? There is no physical address but it gives a phone number. You can always make up a phone number. Through Google number you can generate your own telephone number so they could've just generated their own telephone number. I also clicked on the social media link 10 view. This brought me to this page. They said it was a scientific pre-review journal. Being a professional publication that will showcase your work, what other type of errors could be in the works? That something you don't think they would want to mess up. They want to do peer review and not pre-review. You can see some issues. This says it is based in the United States but they seem to have language issues. And so you have to wonder if they are lying about where they are at. Just one thing to scrutinize a little bit.

And then I went to the publication fee table. This can be the most telling. They do offer free publication as you can see. But I always looks suspiciously at rapid publication. That could make you wonder if this is

a predatory journal or not . It makes you think they are skipping the peer review process. I would imagine that would take one week or two weeks, if not a long time. If they offer rapid publication, that means there will be less peer review. That is one of the things to watch out for. They also offer this ultra option at the end. They skip right over rapid publication. They don't even tell you the price. They said they will just publish it. These are just some warning signs to look out for.

This is from the about page. This is almost like a product liability statement. This is something you don't see all the time in a credible journal.

Going back to the pain assessment tools, how do you feel about this journal? Do you get a little worried? This is where I say you make your own judgment. You may say it's not too bad and just a 4 or maybe you say it is a 10 and terrible. That is where I say to use your own personal judgment. Let others make their own decisions. You don't want to say it is a bad journal when there could just be some problems. That's what is always emphasized . It may not just be a predatory journal but the research could just be bad. That is where it gets difficult. That can be a problem as well.

Again, what did you find? You find good research but the journal is questionable. This is a dive deeper issue. Look into the authors and see what you can find about them. Also look for the article and if it was indexed anywhere else. I went to this questionable journal again and opened another article. This is about single vehicle crashes. I copied the title. This is a result I got and I was surprised. Then I saw it wasn't actually linked to the article but to the transportation research Board annual meeting. The journal article was 90 pages but the citation here says 16. That again gives credibility to the article and the authors but the journal itself is not credible. This is another side. Let's look at this journal, it is questionable research. This shows who was cited. Someone did cite the article in a credible journal. That is sort of the spread of Predatory Publishers . Once they appear here people may look in the reference list and that is where they start the research. They could start with this article and use it again. So this goes back to finding retracted articles. We don't know with the peer review process happened with this article. One of the main reasons articles do get pulled is because of lack of peer review. That's why you don't know about these journals and the research that is being put out.

This is a checklist. This is this is the CRAAB method. Don't trust a journal 100%. Look at the editorial process. Look at the aims and scope. Do they make sense? Is it lacking information? Is something not quite right? Look at the location, does it exist? Check it against Google Earth. I think I found one that was actually in an alley. and be sure to check TRID for the journal. Also review the authors. Finally use personal judgment. How does the journal make you feel? Does it seem fishy to you? Is it suspicious? Does the content make sense? Dig a little deeper.

Levels of credibility. This is something I used in my previous job, levels of evidence and I flipped it into levels of credibility. With research you need to look at levels of credibility. Look for journals that are reputable. If they are not in the DOJ, or a trusted resource but in the directory, you could give them credibility but look in the trusted resources first.

To tie things up. This is a TV quote that makes me think of this problem. This is from "DANTE'S SOUP" and a recipe for frog soup. If you put a frog in boiling water they will jump off. But in lukewarm water with they sit and get cooked? This is the situation. Would we instantly know this is a problem? You have to wonder, are we just slowly sitting in this?

To make matters worse, this is my attempt to make this a little more humorous, predatory conferences, organizations and associations . It is not funny that they exist. If you can make up a journal you can make up a conference. I knew a librarian that actually went to one. She said there were presenters but it was on every topic a manageable. It was not organized at all.

This is an example of a phishing e-mail. It looks like a citation that they took. Greetings from the international Association of advanced materials. I did not even see that it was advanced materials until yesterday. When I first got this e-mail I was flattered because I thought someone was reaching out to me because I had been doing various presentations and I was very excited. Now I looked through it. I put this conference into Google. Look at this typo here. It's pretty obvious. If you see something like that, it should give you a feeling. I put the conference into Google. I didn't see anything pop up. And then I got a predatory conference invite. I didn't want to still give up so I click on the link in the e-mail. Again, don't always do that unless you have a good firewall protection because it could be a malicious link. I click on it anyway. This is the screen that popped up . It didn't seem to bother me. I thought it was a good looking publication site. I thought maybe it was in conference. I read more on the website. It is a series of crews events were over 10 international symposiums are hosted in a single vessel. Something about me, I don't like water. I don't want to be in a boat and especially our motion. I don't even like to fly over the ocean. I still wanted to do this but going to Sweden was out of the question. I was just blinded by being asked to do something about this. I clicked on another link and it was a dead link. Sometimes you just need to investigate a little bit. Sometimes the site will go nowhere . It can be a shell of a website and they want you to just give money.

And so how would you feel about this event? It didn't matter for me because I wasn't going over the ocean. But if someone came to you and said your research was great, I just got this invite, what did you think? I would go through these things. If the links don't work, if the topic is strange. And it asked about advanced material and medical technology. Here it is, it is still going today. They are still running.

Basically what I think of is what we can do about Predatory Publishers . You can help on the input side and choose a good journal to publish to in academia. Everybody knows about the index. Predatory journals will not have that. They could say that they have high impact but they don't. For the output side I would say enhance and increase searching skills, promote awareness and offer this as a service offering. You could give reference lists. A lot of times I found in reference list they are doing good, credible searches. At least the references appear to be that way.

To wrap things up, any questions, concerns, or feelings? I always feel like chicken Little because I don't know if this is a big deal. Maybe nothing will happen but it's one of those things we just don't know.

Thank you very much, Jennifer. Let's jump into the comments and questions. The first one, in terms of clarification, Google startup did not start till 2004. Thank you Kendra. Enid asked do predators try to steal your copyright rights? How would you address that?

What I've been seeing on other sites is that it varies. Sometimes they don't try to steal the copyright. Sometimes they will take it from you. Other times, it's not important and they just want your money. Also sometimes they would ask for 900 dollars and call it a publication processing fee, but if you don't pay it they will still put your article online. Sometimes it can be a way of holding it hostage. Then you have to pay the \$900 to have them take it down if you don't want it up there so that is what I mean about bad intentions. That is why it is a mixed game because you cannot predict which ones will do that. They are doing that more and more to the I keep -- I think to keep from publishing elsewhere.

Another issue raised by Gretchen. Do you have any thoughts or resources for identifying journals that seem independent but are funded and published by regulated type sources with compromised peer review processes?

That is a good question. I know that there are many sides to the entire publication process. There are issues with publication bias. Even in reputable journals. That's the one thing where it is tricky to identify. I would say just right -- just try to review the site. If something pop out at you as an area of concern try to dig a little deeper. Is this data compromised? Are the results biased? If you site from a credible resource you have protection and a safety net. If it gets retracted later you can fall back on that, that it was at least a reputable journal. But if it is not reputable you lose the safety net. I would definitely say treat the journals online like they are websites. Unfortunately they have all lost the credibility where you could trust a journal is credible information. But people can create journals now willy-nilly and we have kind of lost that safety net with the credibility of them.

And we have another question in this one is from Hong . Have the articles been cited? and doesn't have to be cited to be critical -- credible?

That is a good question. New publications are coming up as well. Students are trying to create their own journals. Those are legitimate and they are trying to follow the right steps so they may not have been cited or, like you said, it may have been a new publication. So you need to do the best job and try to review the journal your self. A new journal may just be starting out. They may have some faults but it can be really tricky. You want to give them the benefit of the doubt. I would just say do your research on the authors of the articles. They may have also authored previously incredible journals. The journal is something you will have to wonder and hope that the article, itself, is credible even if the journal is not credible.

Okay. If anybody else has comments or questions for Jennifer, we do still have time. I guess I want to make a comment and ask you as well, Jennifer, first of all a very wonderful and very instructive presentation. I did like the dog as a de-stressor. Very nice to include that. More pertinent to the presentation, not that the dog was impertinent, he was great, but also checking and submitting on the websites that you listed as good sources to gauge whether something is the real deal or not and whether we are dealing with Predatory Publishers. So thank you for posting that . Very helpful resources. The question I wanted to ask is, just to get more of a clarification as to what the first steps should be in the process if you come across a questionable solicitation that maybe a predatory publisher. You went through the steps. I wrote down that you recommended checking the website for the journal and potential predatory publisher first. Even instinctively if that's the first step that you take, I know earlier on you made reference to doing a Google search to see what would pop up. I guess for me that would be the first step but do you have any thoughts for the first resort?

What you can do, definitely, is go to the field list, that is the master list. It is the Beall's List which is sort of like a blacklist. And there's also the open access, sort of the white list. If you find a journal and you are not sure you can check it into one of those. If it comes up on Beall's List that is when I say you have to look at it a little more closely. And you can also look at DOAJ which is the directory of open access journals. If it offers it to you for free at no cost, sometimes it will fall into the category. You can start off either way and check. If it is in the directory of DOAJ you can proceed. I would be sensitive of that because even that sometimes has taken in Predatory Publishers and that is why it is really tricky. Definitely start with one of those two resources and determine which way you want to go, DOAJ and

Beall's List . Also you can probably pop it into Google. You could open it up and scrutinize it your self. You can see what you feel about it before seeing if it pops up on Beall's List. There are kind of two ways you can go about it.

Thank you.

And Carol from New Jersey D.O.T.. No need to apologize for being late. This will be available later online. Carol also asks a question. Do you know if anyone has ever sued any of these fraudulent journals?

That is a great question. I didn't bring that up. There have actually been lawsuits. There was a journal based out of India. They were sued for being misleading. Sort of the trickery they had with them. I did not actually see what came of that. Just a you need to stop with your deceptive practices. The basis is they said they had a height impact factor. Someone paid big money for an article and then found out it was a brand-new journal, it had poor peer review. They just pretended to be something better than they were. I have heard of lawyers getting involved. And hijacking journals has been going on for years. I think it is just a very time-consuming and difficult thing to kind of get these all tackled with lawsuits.

Thank you. I see we are bumping up against our time, only one minute left. That is a shame because this was definitely very robust a question and answer period as robust as the presentation was. But all good things must come to an end. Jennifer I assume if we have any more questions or comments after this TLR is finished it would be okay This message is intended only for the use of the Addressee and may contain information that is PRIVILEGED and CONFIDENTIAL. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please erase all copies of the message and its attachments and notify us immediately.