## **Journal Evaluation Rubric**

Criterion	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)			
Step 1. Journal eva	Step 1. Journal evaluation					
Journal name and identifiers	The journal name is unique and cannot be confused with another journal. It has standard identifiers such as ISSNs or DOIs.	The journal being evaluated has a name similar to another journal but is able to be distinguished between the two.	The journal being evaluated is unable to be distinguished from another with a similar name. The publisher does not use standard identifiers such as ISSNs or DOIs or uses them improperly.			
Journal website	The journal website is competently designed and functional (examples: no broken links, easy navigation, no missing information).		The journal is poorly designed and is not functional (e.g. broken links, poor navigation, missing information). Mimics another journal/publisher website.			
Editorial board	The editorial board is listed with their full names and institutional affiliation. Board members demonstrate geographic diversity and the academic expertise to reasonably qualify them to be publication gatekeepers in the journal's field.	The editorial board is listed with their full names only (no affiliation). Limited academic expertise. No or little geographical diversity among board members.	No editorial board is listed. The publisher's owner is the editor. Evidence exists showing that the editor and/or review board members do not possess academic expertise to reasonably qualify them to be publication gatekeepers in the journal's field.			
Ownership and management	the journal website.	Ownership is not indicated on the website.	The organizational or journal name misleads potential authors about the nature of the journal's owner.			
Review process	has a review policy listed.	The journal states whether it is peer reviewed/edited and has no review policy listed.	reviewed/edited and has no review policy listed.			
Research misconduct	The journal has a clear policy on dealing with research misconduct such as plagiarism, citation, manipulation and data falsification/fabrication.	The journal states a research misconduct policy, but the description of how conflicts will be handled is unclear.	The journal does not state a conflicts of interest policy.			
Data sharing	The journal has clear policy on data sharing and reproducibility.	The journal states a data sharing and reproducibility policy, but the description of how it would be handled is unclear.	The journal has no clear policy on data sharing and reproducibility.			
Corrections and retractions	The journal has clear policy on post-publication corrections and retractions.	The journal states a post-publication corrections and retractions policy, but the description of how it would be handled is unclear.	The journal has no clear policy on post-publication corrections and retractions or retracts articles without a formal statement (stealth retractions); also the publisher does not publish corrections or clarifications and does not have a policy for these issues.			
Publishing schedule	The journal clearly states how often its issues will be published each year and this agrees with the archive.	The journal does not state how often its issues will be published but it can be determined from the archive.	The journal does not state how often its issues will be published each year and it cannot be determined from the archive.			
Revenue sources		The journal's business model lacks clarity when stating its revenue sources, like author fees, subscriptions, advertising, reprints, institutional support, and organizational support.	The publisher appears to focus exclusively on article processing fee procurement, while not providing services for readers, or on billing for fees, while abdicating any effort at vetting submissions.			
Journal archive	with links to full text articles. It has a clear policy or practices for digital preservation.	The journal website contains an archive but it may be incomplete or does not contain links to full text articles. Digital preservation practices are unclear.	The journal does not have an archive of its past issues and no digital preservation practices or policies. If the journal ceases operations, content disappears.			
Author fees	The journal website clearly states the author fees to have each article published, i.e. article processing charges (APC) and editorial fees.	The journal states that an author fee is required but does not note how much it is.	The journal does not state whether or not there are any author fees.			

Copyright information	The journal clearly describes its copyright and licensing information on the journal's website, and licensing terms are indicated on the published articles.	on the website.	Copyright and licensing information is not found on the journal's website and on any published articles. The publisher charges authors for publishing but requires transfer of copyright and retains copyright on journal content. Or the publisher requires the copyright transfer upon submission of manuscript.			
Journal index	The journal is indexed in more than one subject database or indexing service. (E.g. Web of Science, Scopus)	service.	The journal is not indexed in a subject database, standard periodical directories, indexing service or are not widely catalogued in library databases.			
Access to journal and articles	Ways of access to the journal and individual articles are clearly stated. The journal provides full text access to open access articles.	Ways of accessing the journal or individual articles are not clearly stated. The journal provides full text access to some open access articles.	The journal does not provide full text access to any published articles.			
Step 2. Publisher ev	Step 2. Publisher evaluation					
Publisher information	Contact information and physical location is available.	publisher are not clearly identified.	No contact information or physical location is identified. Free e-mail addresses, such as @gmail.com, is used.			
Industry standards	The publisher has membership to industry associations and/or follows industry standards, e.g. *OASPA, COPE, WAME, DOAJ, and publisher associations.		The publisher has no membership to industry associations and/or fails to follow industry standards.			
Direct marketing	Direct marketing activities, including solicitation of manuscripts and editorial board memberships are done appropriately, well targeted and unobtrusive. Communication is truthful and not misleading.		The publisher engages in excessive use of spam email to solicit manuscripts or editorial board memberships.			

Content derived from the Directory of Open Access Journals' Best Practices, Jeffrey Beall's Criteria for determining predatory open-access publishers, and Loyola Marymount University's Journal Evaluation Tool.

	41-51 Good: Within this range the journal meets many of the evaluation criteria defined for credibility. At the higher end of the range the journal would have the fewest credibility concerns.	
	30-40 Fair: Within this range the journal meets some of the evaluation criteria defined for credibility. The author would need to decide whether or not to	
Guide to interpretation	publish in the journal.	
	19-29 Poor: Within this range the journal meets the fewest of the evaluation criteria defined for credibility.	

\*Open Access Scholarly Publishers Association (OASPA)

\*Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE)

\*World Association of Medical Editor (WAME)

\*Directory of Open Access Journals (DOAJ)