

Berger, Monica. (2024). *Predatory Publishing and Global Scholarly Communications*.

Chicago: Association of College and Research Libraries, 2024. 350pp. ISBN

9780838989562. \$115.00

Penny Hecker, Southeastern Louisiana University



Predatory Publishing and Global Scholarly Communications by Monica Berger is a clear-eyed exploration of predatory publishing and the prevailing system of knowledge production in the Global North. Primarily intended for academic librarians, it's divided into four parts. Part 1 "Background" (chapters 1 through 3) provides information on predatory publishing, open access, scholarly assessment, and how business values are imposed on the academy. Part 2 (chapters 4 through 6), titled "Characteristics and Research," examines the characteristics of predatory publishing and other aspects to help readers appreciate the motivations and framework of authors and editors. Part 3 "The Geopolitics of Scholarly Publishing" (chapters 7 through 9) provides context of low- and middle-income countries (LMIC) who manage to publish beyond the high-income Global North, generally considered the arbiter of scholarly communication and publishing. Finally, Part 4 "Responses and Solutions" is composed of chapters 10 through 12 offering a variety of solutions by the scholarly community and academic librarians.

The phrase "predatory publishing" was first coined by librarian Jeffrey Beall in 2010. According to Berger, Beall conflated predatory publishing and open access. Predatory

publishing, seen initially as a product of the Global South, was a target of Beall's for many years. Beall is critical of Global South scholarship because it emerges from nations with lower economic status, where the quality of scholarship is deemed suspect and untrustworthy. However, Berger recognizes that being an academic from the wealthier, more privileged Global North, can lead to beliefs that the LMIC of the Global South produce inferior scholarship because their work is perceived to lack the quality control of top-tier Global North publishing.

The author, who has worked on her own process of understanding predatory publishing, notes that it can stem from xenophobic attitudes. She describes how Global South local journals lack financial resources and thus publish on geographically limited topics, meaning limited visibility to an international audience. This can create a perception of local and small publishers in the Global South as lower-tier, and even predatory. However, similarly small, niche publishers of the Global North are not seen the same way. Berger also writes how the expression "predatory publishing" is flawed and binary, even offensive and reductive, as in the binary of good and bad as well as black and white, due to vestiges of colonialism. She points out how predatory publishing arose from shortcomings in scholarly communication, such as publish-or-perish requirements, the valuing of quantity over quality, and ineffective peer review, among other aspects.

However, Berger also discusses the harms of predatory publishers, ranging from devaluation of the scholarly record and communications due to the publication of misleading and untruthful information, to false claims of indexing in DOAJ, and even listing editorial board members who have no affiliation with the publication. On pages 9–10 she

lists eight predatory publishing harms:

1. Authors, editors, and publishers from the Global South who are falsely viewed as illegitimate.
2. Authors who experience unethical behaviors, lose credit, or suffer reputational damage; pay fees but experience inadequate editorial services; and whose publication languishes in obscurity.
3. Editors whose names are listed without consent or whose requests to be removed from editorial boards are ignored.
4. Funders whose monies are spent on author fees.
5. Institutions that suffer reputational damage and have wasted author fee funds.
6. Patients whose care decisions are based on specious research.
7. Broader acceptance and support for open access, which is conflated with predatory publishing. Very few open access journals are predatory.
8. The discourse on reform of scholarly publishing by distracting from ills in scholarly communications including negative practices by corporate publishers.

Solutions? Berger definitely has cogent thoughts on that. Chapter 9, "Other Countries, the Geopolitics of Predatory Publishing, and Solutions from the South," covers how predatory publishing happens worldwide, not just in LMIC scholarship. In Chapter 9, Section C, "Solutions to Predatory Publishing in the South," the concept of bibliodiversity suggests that Global South stakeholders determine scholarly quality on their own terms. Berger believes that local, small-scale publishing should receive better funding and visibility. She also points her readers to quality open access publishing in the academic

and scholarly community of Latin America. Approximately 80 percent of all Latin America journals are open access and Berger describes them as "vibrant open access publishing cultures that value local research and local languages."

In Chapter 10, she notes the scholarly community offers solutions in the following ways: publishing guidelines from editorial and publishing organizations, especially adherence to "Principles of Transparency and Best Practice in Scholarly Publishing," created by The Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE), DOAJ: Directory of Open Access Journals, the Open Access Scholarly Publishing Association (OASPA), and the World Association of Medical Editors (WAME). Another approach is promoting scholarly publishing literacy, the broader educational aspect of COPE's mission. COPE provides flowcharts to aid in responding to publishing misconduct and ethical concerns, as well as outreach to teach best practices. Its website, Berger notes, is "a rich resource" for all stakeholders such as authors, librarians, or anyone concerned about publication ethics.

Chapters 11 and 12 discuss librarian and pedagogical solutions. Open Peer Review (OPR), which dates back to 1999, is considered an approach that can mitigate or put an end to predatory publishing. The transparency of OPR can help evaluators when external reviewers are not used. Conversely, nontransparent peer review can create a situation where researchers are sometimes unable to differentiate between predatory and mainstream peer review, which can cause a lack of journal rigor. The traditional system of peer review is not always reliable as not every peer reviewer has the expertise to evaluate a specific article. Berger suggests that editors or journal teams should regularly audit peer-review processes, as not all journals have ethics guidelines or their rubrics are

oversimplified with not enough attention paid to methodology, article scope, and other key content-related assessment. One solution is motivating reviewers. The journal *Nature* experimented with a referee-recognition program. The OPR way of review acknowledges reviewers and thus increases transparency, which can avert predatory publishing.

Other solutions are free-to-author nonprofit open access publishing which provides another option to predatory and corporate/commercial open access, and the nonprofit, noncommercial, immediate access of diamond open access, which avoids the excessive monetization of gold open access. Librarian Emily Ford considers the results of research on open vs traditional peer review to be mixed. OPR may be better for science, whereas double-blind peer review works better for social and political science reviewing due to the potential of author identity bias. Also, early career researchers may avoid journals that use OPR due to a perceived lack of journal prestige. Berger counters by noting that OPR helps investigators understand specific incidents better and thus reduce or avoid "sloppy science," reduce predatory publishing, and enhance the quality of scholarly publishing and science.

The author's position is a strong support of open access; open access to scholarship and knowledge should be a shared public good. Her ideal publisher is nonprofit. She would like to see a more diverse playing field that challenges the monopolization and monetization of for-profit publishing as well as supports quality Global South journal publishing, so that low-quality predatory publishing is relegated to the past. Berger envisions a research world where librarians advocate for library publishing or other scholar-led publishing and where librarians enable important conversations to create

change, improve dissemination and quality of research, and assessment practices. She hopes that predatory publishing will one day be seen as a "chronicle of resistance to scholarship held hostage by commercial concerns and assessment by proxy and quantity." Overall, this reviewer finds *Predatory Publishing and Global Scholarly Communications* thought-provoking and a valuable addition to academic library collections where research and scholarship are vital outputs in various fields.