**Edited and anonymised chat transcript from OASPA Webinar *Scholarly Communication in Crisis: Research Integrity and Open Scholarship,* April 19, 2023**

*Q. I missed the definition of a "hijacked journal". Can someone explain?*

A legitimate journal that is taken over by Editors who corruptly publish for pay without peer review.

Basically a fraudulent operation posing as a legitimate journal (in name, website, etc.)

Journal hijacking - Wikipedia

*Q. Thanks, so it was once legitimate?*

I usually experience it as an unrelated parallel. There might even be two journals, the reliable one and the hijacker.

This is how illegitimate papers get indexed.  If the original journal was indexed in WoS or Scopus, they can sometimes sneak in as part of the old journal.

I maintained a bit of a taxonomy of fraudulent journals because there are differences in how to detect them.
*Imposter:*  Legit journal exists, but title/issn/design/near-match URL or title is used by a fully false organization with no relationship.
*Hijacked:* legit journal with changed management or changed editorial policy so that the content has drifted from legit to fraudulent.
Zombie:  Legit journal ceased (often losing its domain name) and title is resumed by a illegit actor.

Publishers are doing an increasing amount of work to track and stop papermill submissions before they are published - for interested group there are resources prepared by the STM association like the new integrity hub STM Integrity Hub

IMO: ORCiD only useful for author disambiguation for authors who use it properly.  We often run into one-time-use ORCiDs - and how are those distinguishable from ECRs?

In case of interest, last year, at Elsevier, we published a three-part article series for Editors on papermills including one focused on signals: Paper mills: see the wood for the trees (Part 2)

How do you keep automated systems (that are necessary) from being completely biased?

I'm glad Brian finished with that medium (not so) crazy idea. Diamond OA removes 'the market' aspect he refers to and the financial incentive to corrupt the publishing process (not all

incentives but as many bad actors operate for financial gain).

Reviewing research assessment is indeed key. The Coalition for Advancing Research Assessment is all about that. All institutions welcome to join: [www.coara.eu](www.coara.eu)

Authors not sticking to one ORCID and institutions globally not validating ORCIDs makes it much less useful for assessing author identity. Institutional domains are more useful (though can be hacked or bought), but in the Global South many researchers don't have institutional email addresses. Verifying author identity is not a trivial issue.

There are methods / metadata for capturing provenance / authentication and it's really important that the infrastructure supports this.
Well, but it is discouraged to have more than one ORCIDs and you can merge several IDs. Cf. [Do you have more than one account?](#)

[TOP Factor](#)

I recently collated reflections on this from the UK [ORCIDs in the Wild: A Field Guide to the Popular Persistent Identifier](#)

Very interesting conversation between Bryan Alexander et al. on Higher Ed and AI: [How might higher education respond to AI?](#)

For interest, the STM Association published its position on Research Assessment last summer: [Our Position on Research Assessment](#)

Further on impact factors: how to exercise pressure on institutions to stop rewarding fraudulent or semi fraudulent behaviours aimed at boosting citation count? See the last bit of news with regard to this: [One of the world's most cited scientists, Rafael Luque, suspended without pay for 13 years | Science & Tech](#)

Let's not forget that the 'publish or perish' culture is quite recent. I am confident we can get back to a more reasonable approach to what publications are actually for.

Selective CVs and narrative CVs might also support more ethical publishing and better assessment

In my (less formal) research, there were very few tangible ramifications to authors for publishing in predatory journals. They may be underreported, but I expected a lot more accounts of job/promotion loss, etc.

See NISO - CREC: [Collaborative Effort to Prevent Spread of Retracted Research](#)

But, frankly - the papers that ARE retracted due to investigation and detection of problems are less of a problem than the ones that are just left there.