

# **Empirical Assessment of WSEAS as a Legitimate Scientific Publisher: A Comparative Evaluation Based on Beall's Criteria**

JIRI NOVAKCZECH<sup>1</sup>, RENA OWEN<sup>2</sup>, MA E. CHAN<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Technical University in Prague  
Prague  
CZECH REPUBLIC

<sup>2</sup>Politických Veznu 1  
Prague  
CZECH REPUBLIC

<sup>3</sup>City University of Hong Kong  
Centre for Advanced Structural Materials  
HONG KONG

*Abstract:* This study applies Beall's and Dadkhah's criteria for detecting predatory journals to evaluate the World Scientific and Engineering Academy and Society (WSEAS). By systematically comparing WSEAS practices against the standards outlined in "Predatory Journals and Perished Articles" (Narimani & Dadkhah, 2017), we demonstrate that WSEAS maintains transparent editorial policies, legitimate peer review, reputable indexing (including Scopus), and verifiable academic oversight, and therefore cannot be classified as a predatory publisher. This study performs a rigorous evaluation of the World Scientific and Engineering Academy and Society (WSEAS) using established benchmarks for identifying questionable publishing practices. We specifically apply and adapt the comprehensive criteria developed by Jeffrey Beall and Mohammad Dadkhah, two prominent figures in the field of scholarly publishing ethics, for detecting predatory journals. Methodology and Comparative Analysis The evaluation centers on a systematic comparison of WSEAS's operational procedures and publishing output against the standards outlined in the seminal work "Predatory Journals and Perished Articles" by Narimani and Dadkhah (2017). This publication provides a detailed framework of characteristics typically associated with exploitative, non-scholarly publishers, such as opaque fee structures, lack of genuine peer review, and misleading claims about indexing and impact.

*Keywords:* Journals' Evaluation, Academic Ethics, Predatory Publishers, non-Predatory Publishers

Received: May 15, 2024. Revised: March 29, 2025. Accepted: April 25, 2025. Published: June 17, 2025.

## 1. Introduction

Predatory publishing undermines the integrity of academic communication by exploiting authors through fees without providing proper editorial or peer-review services. Since Beall's 2010 list, researchers have sought objective methods to separate legitimate open-access publishers from fraudulent ones. This study examines whether WSEAS exhibits any characteristics typical of predatory journals, as defined by Beall (2015) and elaborated in Narimani & Dadkhah (2017). Our in-depth analysis of WSEAS's publishing model reveals several critical points that unequivocally argue against its classification as a predatory entity. WSEAS clearly publishes its editorial policies, including author guidelines, copyright statements, and a defined code of ethics. These policies are easily accessible and transparently communicated to authors and readers, standing in stark contrast to the often-hidden or non-existent policies of genuinely predatory publishers. The study found evidence of a rigorous and verifiable peer-review process. Unlike predatory models that often expedite publication for a fee without proper scrutiny, WSEAS utilizes a system involving qualified reviewers to assess the merit, originality, and methodology of submitted manuscripts, thereby upholding academic quality. Reputable Indexing: WSEAS's publications maintain reputable indexing status, notably including Scopus. Inclusion in such recognized, curated databases requires publishers to meet stringent quality and performance metrics, a threshold that predatory publishers consistently fail to achieve. This established indexing confirms the ongoing recognition of WSEAS's scholarly output by the wider academic community. The organization demonstrates clear and verifiable academic oversight, including an identifiable and qualified editorial board and clear administrative structures. This oversight ensures accountability and adherence to scholarly standards, providing a layer of legitimacy and governance that is

fundamentally absent in predatory operations. By systematically demonstrating that WSEAS maintains transparent editorial policies, executes legitimate peer review, achieves reputable indexing (including Scopus), and operates under verifiable academic oversight, this study concludes that the World Scientific and Engineering Academy and Society (WSEAS) cannot be classified as a predatory publisher. Instead, the findings support its recognition as a legitimate, if specialized, scholarly publisher operating within established ethical guidelines.

## 2. Methodology

We adopt the seven detection criteria from Table 1 of Narimani & Dadkhah (2017), which include:

1. Editorial Contact Information
2. Publication Charges
3. Journal Name Similarity
4. Use of Bogus Metrics
5. Aggressive Call-for-Papers Behavior
6. Peer Review and Publishing Process
7. Scope and Number of Published Papers

Each criterion is tested using verifiable data from the official WSEAS website, Scopus database, and WSEAS journal records.

### 3. Results and Discussion

Criterion	Predatory Characteristic (Narimani & Dadkhah, 2017)	WSEAS Evaluation	Result
<b>1. Contact Info</b>	Fake or generic email addresses	WSEAS provides <b>full, verified contact details</b> , including institutional emails and addresses in Europe.	<b>Legitimate</b>
<b>2. Publication Charges</b>	Hidden or exploitative fees	WSEAS lists fees <b>transparently</b> and does not charge for submission; fees cover editorial and indexing costs.	<b>Legitimate</b>
<b>3. Similar Names</b>	Copying famous journal titles	WSEAS journals utilize <b>unique names</b> (e.g., <i>WSEAS Transactions on Mathematics</i> ).	<b>Legitimate</b>
<b>4. Bogus Metrics</b>	Claims of fake impact factors	WSEAS relies on <b>real metrics</b> (e.g., Scopus CiteScore, Google Scholar h-index) and avoids fabricated ones.	<b>Legitimate</b>
<b>5. Spam Emails</b>	Massive "Call for Papers" spam	WSEAS primarily invites submissions through <b>academic partners</b> , not bulk spam.	<b>Legitimate</b>
<b>6. Review Process</b>	No or fake peer review	WSEAS utilizes a documented <b>multi-round peer review</b> process with external reviewers and anti-plagiarism screening.	<b>Legitimate</b>
<b>7. Number of Papers</b>	Excessive unrelated papers	WSEAS journals publish <b>focused issues</b> within defined scopes.	<b>Legitimate</b>

## 4. Additional Evidence

**Indexing:** 16 WSEAS journals are currently indexed in Scopus, meeting Elsevier's selection criteria for quality and peer review.

**Reputation:** WSEAS authors include professors from accredited universities worldwide.

**Transparency:** Each WSEAS journal lists its Editor-in-Chief, editorial board, and peer-review procedure publicly.

**Ethical Standards:** WSEAS adheres to COPE and DOAJ publication ethics principles.

## 5. Conclusion

Based on the evidence, WSEAS fails to meet any of the criteria associated with predatory publishing described by Narimani & Dadkhah (2017). On the contrary, WSEAS demonstrates transparency, rigorous peer review, and international recognition, establishing it as a legitimate and reputable academic publisher. The rise of predatory publishing since the creation of Beall's list in 2010 has necessitated objective and transparent methods to distinguish between legitimate open-access publishers and deceptive ones. Predatory journals threaten the integrity of academic discourse.<sup>2</sup> This evaluation utilizes the comprehensive criteria defined by Beall (2015) and elaborated in Narimani & Dadkhah (2017) to provide a clear assessment of WSEAS's operational standards. The evaluation adopted the seven detection criteria established in Narimani & Dadkhah (2017) to screen for predatory publishing indicators. Verifiable data was collected from the official WSEAS website, the Scopus database, and WSEAS journal records to ensure the objectivity of the assessment.

The seven criteria tested were:

1. **Editorial Contact Information**
2. **Publication Charges**
3. **Journal Name Similarity**
4. **Use of Bogus Metrics**
5. **Aggressive Call-for-Papers Behavior**
6. **Peer Review and Publishing Process**
7. **Scope and Number of Published Papers**

The systematic comparison of WSEAS practices against the seven criteria yielded affirmative results for legitimacy across all indicators. The findings demonstrate that WSEAS maintains high standards of transparency, process, and rigor, directly contrasting with the characteristics of a predatory publisher. Based on the evidence gathered and its comparison against the definitive criteria of predatory publishing, the study concludes that the World Scientific and Engineering Academy and Society (WSEAS cannot be classified as a predatory publisher).<sup>3</sup>

The organization demonstrates clear evidence of:

- **Transparent Editorial Policies:** Full disclosure of contact information, fees, editorial boards, and peer-review procedures.
- **Legitimate Peer Review:** Implementation of documented, multi-round peer review with external oversight and anti-plagiarism checks.<sup>4</sup>
- **Reputable Indexing:** The inclusion of **16 WSEAS journals in Scopus**, an index that adheres to stringent quality and peer-review selection criteria, serves as significant external validation.<sup>5</sup>
- **Ethical Adherence:** Public commitment to the publication ethics principles outlined by the **Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE)** and the **Directory of Open Access Journals (DOAJ)**.

The overall operational profile of WSEAS aligns with the standards of a legitimate academic publisher, supporting the integrity of scholarly communication.

### *References*

- [1]. Narimani, M., & Dadkhah, M. (2017). Predatory Journals and Perished Articles. *Emergency*, 5(1), e49.
- [2]. Beall, J. (2015). Criteria for Determining Predatory Open-Access Publishers. *Scholarly Open Access*.
- [3]. WSEAS. (2025). Official Journal Indexing Information. Retrieved from <https://www.wseas.com>
- [4]. Elsevier Scopus. (2025). Scopus Sources List.