

Predatory Publications in Evidence Syntheses: A Learning Forum

Aims and objectives of the course

Upon completion of this course, participants will be able to:

- Understand how predatory publishing impacts the scholarly landscape.
- Describe predatory publications and their impact on evidence syntheses.
- Identify predatory publications from an established criteria.
- Communicate to both a research and lay audience about how to evaluate information found in both traditional and predatory publications.

How does the course relate to the vision and purpose of G-I-N/JBI and/or the conference theme?

Systematic reviews, practice guidelines and other evidence syntheses are only as strong as the evidence that form the basis of recommendations. With the rise in predatory or deceptive publications, these are being cited in evidence syntheses, leading to questions about whether the evidence truly is trustworthy! What role should predatory publications play in evidence syntheses, if any? How can review authors spot predatory publications?

Detailed programme and timetable, including overall length of course

The course will be 6.5 hours in length, with two short breaks and one longer break for lunch.

9:00 – 10:00	Lecture on the history and definitions of predatory publications The earliest mention of a predatory publication was in a 2008 blog post, but the term was adopted and popularized by librarian Jeffery Beall in 2010. Since that time, the number of journals both he and others have labelled as predatory have increased exponentially. This session will chronicle the rise of these journals from the earliest beginnings in 2008, to the Federal Trade Commission case against one large predatory publisher, to the state of predatory publishing today since the shutdown of Beall's popular list in 2017.
10:00 – 10:15	Break
10:15 – 11:30	Discussion on criteria for predatory journals The criteria for predatory journals is not clearly established. While Beall's criteria are commonly used, they are not without controversy. In this session, we will evaluate existing criteria for predatory journals in small groups, working to develop a concept analysis on what constitutes a predatory journal.
11:30 – 12:30	Ranking / Voting on Criteria

	Coming back to the larger group, a broader discussion on ranking criteria and voting on the importance of each, with a goal to reaching a group consensus. What did we make of Beall's criteria? Are there others that we would add?
12:30 – 1:30	Break for lunch
1:30 – 2:30	Exercises: Spot the predatory publication Using real world examples, participants will use the criteria developed by consensus in the morning to determine whether articles do or do not meet the criteria for being a predatory publication, and whether they should be included or not included in a synthesis document. Participants will discuss how to ensure both researchers and clinicians can spot predatory journals easily and how to communicate with the general public about questionable publishing practices.
2:30 – 2:45	Break
2:45 – 4:00	Where to publish: Search techniques A demonstration of how to find reputable journals in just about any discipline, using both free and subscription based tools. Also, how to track your publications to measure your own h-index or other bibliometric measures, how to determine a journal's true impact factor and what to do if a journal doesn't have an impact factor.
4:00 – 4:30	Discussion: Where do we go from here? Large group discussion of what to bring back to our organizations based on today's learning session.

Names, pictures and bios of the workshop facilitators

Amanda Ross-White, MLIS, AHIP

Health Sciences Librarian, Nursing

Queen's University, Kingston, Canada

Amanda Ross-White has been the nursing liaison librarian at Queen's University since 2004. She is the author of *Guideline Adaptation: Conducting systematic, exhaustive and reproducible searches* (2014) and has been involved in developing practice guidelines and systematic reviews on a wide range of topics. Her current research is on the impact of predatory publications on evidence syntheses.

Michelle Lieggi, MLS, AHIP

Clinical Research Librarian, Fishbon Library

UCSF Medical Center, San Francisco, CA USA

Michelle Lieggi has been a clinical research librarian at the University of California San Francisco (UCSF) since 2015, where she consults and develops search strategies for systematic reviews. She has presented at national and international conferences, and participates in methods groups for the Joanna Briggs Institute. Her current emphasis is on improving quality of systematic reviews through librarian-led search development and informed selection of sources.

Target audience, including maximum number of participants

This session will be suitable for researchers, review authors and information science specialists in a variety of disciplines. It is recommended that the course be capped at 30 participants.

Proposed teaching methods

The course will be taught through a combination of lecture, discussion in both large and small groups and exercises.