

# Journal Health Checklist

Journal Title: \_\_\_\_\_

|   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| <b>Website</b>  |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| Website looks professionally maintained   |   |   |   |   |   | Website looks outdated & from the 90s   |
| Sufficient amount of contact information provided to get in touch with publisher  |   |   |   |   |   | Has insufficient contact information with only one point of contact   |
| Website content is well-structured and properly written   |   |   |   |   |   | Website is horribly written with irregular sentences and grammar  |
| Several board members are published authors by the journal  |   |   |   |   |   | Board members are not authors of any of the journal articles  |
| The aims and goals of the journal are well presented, concise, structured, and realistic  |   |   |   |   |   | The aims and goals of the journal very broad and unstructured (a catch-all)   |
| They are affiliated with an association or publishing house (reference check the websites to confirm the affiliations)            |   |   |   |   |   | The journal is a completely separate from any associations or claims to be linked to imaginary associations               |
| <b>Publishing Information</b>   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| There are thorough instructions for authors for publication (i.e. manuscript types, word length, formatting, citation style, etc) |   |   |   |   |   | Instructions for the authors are vague with little to no details provided or feels like it would be "too-good-to-be-true" |
| There a realistic and thorough peer review process with an informed process   |   |   |   |   |   | The peer review process appears rushed (i.e. 3 weeks) or unrealistic  |
| Author fees are clearly defined with upfront expectations (If none, leave blank)  |   |   |   |   |   | Author fees are vague and undefined or feels suspiciously high or oddly timed   |
| Author copyright details are clearly defined with upfront expectations  |   |   |   |   |   | Author copyright details vague or there is a request for money post-submission  |
| <b>Other</b>  |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| A quick perusal of their published articles show they are of good quality and relevant to the aims and scope of the journal       |   |   |   |   |   | A quick reading of their published articles show they are of poor quality   |
| The journal is indexed and verifiable by reputable websites such as <a href="#">DOAJ</a>  |   |   |   |   |   | Journal is not indexed anywhere or not found in index they claimed  |
| The journal has an ISSN number and/or can be found in <a href="#">Google scholar</a> and <a href="#">General Impact Factor</a>    |   |   |   |   |   | There is no ISSN number nor can it be found in <a href="#">Google scholar</a> nor <a href="#">General Impact Factor</a>   |
| <b>Totals:</b>  |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| Notes:  |   |   |   |   |   | =   |

Between 13 and 27 – Likely low caliber and maybe predatory = Inquire Further into Journal

Between 28 and 40 – Low caliber with predatory tendencies = Inquire & Consult a Librarian

Between 41 and higher – Quite likely to be predatory = Inquire, Consult and possibly Abandon