

Scholarly Open Access

Critical analysis of scholarly open-access publishing

Beall's List of Predatory Publishers 2016



(<https://scholarlyoa.files.wordpress.com/2015/01/bealls-list-logo.jpg>)
2016

Beall's List of Predatory Publishers 2016

by **Jeffrey Beall**, **January 5, 2016**. Each year at this time I formally release my updated list of predatory publishers. Because the list is now very large, and because I now publish four, continuously-updated lists, this year's release does not include the actual lists but instead includes statistical and explanatory data about the lists and links to them.

Potential, possible, or probable predatory scholarly open-access publishers: This year, 2016, marks the sixth annual release of this list, which is also continuously updated. The list this year includes 923 publishers, an increase of 230 over 2015.

Publishers	
Year	Number of publishers
2011	18
2012	23
2013	225
2014	477
2015	693
2016	923

(<https://scholarlyoa.files.wordpress.com/2016/01/2016-publishers.jpg>)

Number of predatory publishers, 2011-2016.

Potential, possible, or probable predatory scholarly open-access journals: This year, 2016, marks the fourth annual release of this list, which is also continuously updated. The list this year includes 882 journals, an increase of 375 over 2015.

Standalone journals	
Year	Number of journals
2013	126
2014	303
2015	507
2016	882

(<https://scholarlyoa.files.wordpress.com/2016/01/2016-journals.jpg>)

Number of predatory, standalone journals, 2013-2016.

Two New Lists: Misleading metrics and Hijacked journals This year, I started two new lists that track two new areas of questionable practices related to open-access journals. The **Misleading metrics** list includes companies that “calculate” and publish counterfeit impact factors (or some similar measure) to publishers, metrics the publishers then use in their websites and spam email to trick scholars into thinking their journals have legitimate impact factors. The **Hijacked journals** list includes journals for which someone has created a counterfeit website, stealing the journal’s identity and soliciting articles submissions using the author-pays model (gold open-access).

Misleading metrics (<https://scholarlyoa.com/other-pages/misleading-metrics/>): 38. Last year’s list had 26. (The list debuted in March, 2014.)

Hijacked journals (<https://scholarlyoa.com/other-pages/hijacked-journals/>): 101 (The list started in

May, 2014.)

Hijacked journals	
Year	Number of hijacked journals
2015	30
2016	101

(<https://scholarlyoa.files.wordpress.com/2016/01/2016-hijacked-journals.jpg>)

Hijacked journals, 2015-2016.

Here are links to current edition of each list:

- ∞ [Predatory Publishers \(https://scholarlyoa.com/publishers/\)](https://scholarlyoa.com/publishers/)
- ∞ [Predatory standalone journals \(https://scholarlyoa.com/individual-journals/\)](https://scholarlyoa.com/individual-journals/)
- ∞ [Misleading metrics companies \(https://scholarlyoa.com/other-pages/misleading-metrics/\)](https://scholarlyoa.com/other-pages/misleading-metrics/)
- ∞ [Hijacked journals \(https://scholarlyoa.com/other-pages/hijacked-journals/\)](https://scholarlyoa.com/other-pages/hijacked-journals/)

Acknowledgement: I am extremely grateful for all the help, support, suggestions, criticism, and advice I have received over the past year. I especially thank those who have forwarded information — such as spam emails — to me, emails providing information about new and questionable journals and publishers.

This entry was posted on Tuesday, January 5th, 2016 at 9:00 AM and is filed under [Scholarly Open-Access Publishers](#). You can follow any responses to this entry through the [RSS 2.0 feed](#). You can [leave a response](#), or [trackback](#) from your own site.

293 Responses to *Beall's List of Predatory Publishers 2016*

Marcos Pedlowski says:

January 5, 2016 at 9:07 AM

Reblogged this on [Blog do Pedlowski](#) and commented:

O professor Jeffrey Beall da University of Colorado-Denver lança estatísticas da evolução do seu monitoramento sobre a invasão do “Trash science” na ciência mundial. Este material é uma leitura obrigatória para todos os interessados no futuro da ciência.

Reply

Jeffrey Beall says:

January 5, 2016 at 9:08 AM

Sure, can you share some of your grant money with me so I can pay someone to do this?

Reply

Susan Ariew says:

January 5, 2016 at 9:30 AM

Thanks for offering the stats on the explosion of publishers, standalone titles, false metrics, and now hijacked journals. Hopefully you will not continue to be a lone voice in the wilderness