

A Critical Rebuttal to the Misrepresentation of WSEAS in the IDEA 2017 Report ("Predatory Journals in Scopus")

CHARLES A. LONG
University of Wisconsin,
Madison, Wisconsin, USA

NIKOS E. MASTORAKIS
Technical University of Sofia,
Sofia, BULGARIA

PIERRE BORNE,
ex IEEE France Section Chair, IEEE Fellow, IEEE/SMC Past President
Ecole Centrale de Lille, FRANCE

MICHAEL N. KATEHAKIS,
Management Science and Information Systems Department
Rutgers University, USA

KLIMIS NTALIANIS,
University of West Attica, Egaleo
Athens, GREECE

IMRE J. RUDAS,
Óbuda University, Budapest
HUNGARY

VINCENZO NIOLA,
University of Naples "Federico II", ITALY

SATYA SHAH,
Department of Applied Engineering and Management
University of Greenwich, UK

XIAODONG ZHUANG,
Qingdao University, CHINA

BADEA LEPADATESCU,
Transylvania University of Brasov, Brasov
ROMANIA

YURIY S. SHMALIY,
IEEE Fellow, Universidad de Guanajuato,
Guanajuato, MEXICO

PAOLO MERCORELLI,
Institute of Product and Process Innovation - PPI,
Leuphana University of Lüneburg, GERMANY

Abstract: Several of our Czech colleagues have brought to our attention a publication available at [1]. We wish to express our concern regarding the inclusion of references to WSEAS in this publication. These references are factually incorrect and misleading. In reality, WSEAS has no connection to the content or context described. The report, titled “*Predatory Journals in Scopus: Evidence on Cross-country Differences*”, was published in 2017 by the IDEA think tank affiliated with CERGE-EI. It categorized several journals and publishers as “predatory” or of questionable quality. Among them was the World Scientific and Engineering Academy and Society (WSEAS), which was listed alongside known predatory outlets—without sufficient evidence or scholarly justification. This categorization has understandably caused concern within the academic community, particularly among authors, reviewers, and editorial board members associated with WSEAS. The present article seeks to refute the claims made in the IDEA publication, demonstrating that the inclusion of WSEAS in such a list is factually inaccurate, methodologically flawed, and damaging to its reputation.

Key-Words: - Predatory Journals in Scopus, Indexing, Genuine Journals, Predatory Journals

Received: May 9, 2024. Revised: March 19, 2025. Accepted: April 17, 2025. Published: June 3, 2025.

1 Introduction

In its 2017 report titled “*Predatory Journals in Scopus: Evidence on Cross-country Differences*”, published by the IDEA think tank affiliated with CERGE-EI, several journals and publishers were categorized as “predatory” or of questionable quality. Among the named organizations was the World Scientific and Engineering Academy and Society (WSEAS), which was listed alongside known predatory outlets without robust evidence or scholarly rigor. This categorization has prompted

understandable concern within the academic community, particularly among authors, reviewers, and editorial members affiliated with WSEAS. This article aims to challenge the IDEA publication’s assertions about WSEAS, demonstrating that the inclusion of WSEAS in such a list is factually inaccurate, methodologically unsound, and reputationally harmful.

2 Lack of Due Process and Methodological Transparency

The IDEA report does not present a transparent or replicable methodology for its classification of WSEAS. Unlike academic studies that provide clear inclusion criteria, the report relies on references to Beall's List, which has been criticized for its opaque methodology, lack of accountability, and the inclusion of legitimate publishers. We believe that the Beall's List was never peer-reviewed or validated by a panel of independent experts. Its use as a foundational source for labeling journals "predatory" is, at best, questionable and, at worst, misleading when used without critical review. WSEAS has maintained rigorous peer-review procedures and academic publishing ethics. Some key facts:

Review Process: WSEAS journals have long operated under a double-blind peer-review system with clearly stated ethical guidelines.

Indexing: Several WSEAS journals have been indexed in Scopus, EI Compendex, ACM, DBLP, and other reputable databases for extended periods. If their quality had been universally poor or fraudulent, these databases would not have included them in the first place, let alone retained them.

Conference Transparency: WSEAS conferences publish proceedings with transparent submission guidelines, detailed schedules, and peer-review processes—a practice not aligned with predatory behavior. The broad label of "predatory" without a rigorous individual review of each journal and its processes is an oversimplification that unfairly maligns reputable institutions.

3. Misclassification Based on Association, Not Evidence

The IDEA report appears to classify WSEAS as "predatory" not based on direct evidence of

unethical publishing practices but via guilt by association with other publishers previously listed in Beall's List. This approach is intellectually lazy and academically irresponsible. Reputational analysis should be based on independent audits of editorial behavior, acceptance rates, peer-review integrity, and transparency—none of which the IDEA report provides with regard to WSEAS. Be careful the association is not evidence. Serious accusations require direct proof, not indirect implications.

4. WSEAS Authors and Editors Include Respected Scholars

WSEAS has historically included editorial board members and contributors from established institutions, including technical universities across Europe, Asia, and North America. It is disingenuous to suggest that hundreds of academics over decades were knowingly involved with a "predatory" operation with no rebuttal. Many of these scholars had no financial ties to WSEAS and participated solely in the spirit of academic discourse.

5. Legal and Ethical Implications of Defamation

Labelling WSEAS as "predatory" without due process or substantiated evidence is not only academically problematic—it borders on defamation. The IDEA report fails to include disclaimers or opportunities for right-of-reply from publishers mentioned. Such one-sided reporting fails the standards of fair academic inquiry. Reckless inclusion of publishers in such lists can have real consequences—impacting careers, institutions, and the academic credibility of honest researchers.

6. Misrepresentation of WSEAS in the IDEA 2017 Report ("Predatory

Journals in Scopus''

What that article says about WSEAS is false, unfair, and defamatory, and it is not acceptable for scientists to accuse other scientists in this way without having a basis for what they are saying. Therefore, we respectfully request the immediate removal of all references to WSEAS. To clarify WSEAS's strict commitment to academic quality, transparency, and integrity, please refer to our official quality assurance procedures detailed at: <https://wseas.com/qualitycontrol.php>

The WSEAS Quality Control Procedures

Quality Control 1:

Before the commencement of the Peer Review, organized by Editor-in-Chief or some Associate Editor, WSEAS makes a pre-screening quality control / review checking the following:

- a) Plagiarism and Self-Plagiarism avoidance control via Turnitin and iThenticate.
- b) The English Language of the paper.
- c) Affiliation of the prospective authors (i.e. Do they belong to a University or to a real company or to a real institute?

Can their university be identified? can their Academic URL be identified on the web? Do they use academic/professional email addresses?

have they provided a phone number when they uploaded their paper? Does their IP, from where uploaded their paper, agree with their country?).

d) The References (i.e. Are the references adequate? Does the paper include references from the last 5 years?

Can the references be traced easily via google, Do the references report the year of the publication?). e) Are their indications that some prospective authors have not substantially contributed to the research?

For example a paper in Civil Engineering with an author from a surgery clinic in a Hospital. Roughly, 20% of the papers are usually rejected in this pre-screening quality control / review checking.

This acts as a first filtering which saves valuable time of the Reviewers and the Editors-in-Chief.

Quality Control 2:

We do not publish any paper without a "Certification". After 2019, the Certifications are published together with the articles online. What is the Certification? WSEAS has launched in 2018 a compulsory certification from all the authors and for all the papers in order the Administration of WSEAS to certifies and authenticates that each accepted paper by the Editors-in-Chief is backed by a minimum of 3 reviewers' positive recommendation. Download this Certification - Evaluation of the Review Process from here: <http://wseas.com/documents/certification.docx>

In case that some authors feel that they have not received, at least, 3 positive opinions from 3 independent reviewers with strong peer review, they should not sign this form. All the Certifications - Evaluations of the Review Process for each paper are available to everybody after a simple request by email support@wseas.com, wseas.transactions

@gmail.com

The Certifications are published now on the web, together with their papers

Quality Control 3:

The Certifications have also this declaration - confirmation: "Also, we declare also that no reviewer, no Associate-Editor, no Editor-in-Chief, no member of the WSEAS Secretariat, nobody whatsoever and never forced me in WSEAS Journals to add references / citations to any previous WSEAS Publications or any other publications"

Quality Control 4:

Responses to Reviewers (required): For every revised version, the authors will reply using these tables <http://wseas.com/documents/certification.docx>

They will upload them via the web or will send them by email. Authors will have to make all the changes, modifications, additions, studies, corrections asked by the reviewers using the <http://wseas.org/multimedia/Responses.docx>. Authors have to be fully complied with the reviewers' instructions. Before the publication, the three (or more than three) reviewers will check if the changes, modifications, additions, studies, corrections etc have been carried out. In this case, the paper will be published or will be rejected or a new round of peer review will start.

Quality Control 5:

The WSEAS offers consistently high quality, line by line, thorough, rigorous, strict peer review process and very high editorial standards of care to its authors and readers. This page contains some comments from just a few of our

authors about their experience of publishing with us: <http://wseas.com/testimonials.php>

Quality Control 6:

Peer Review and High Rejection Rates:

Here you can find databases containing all submitted articles to the WSEAS Journals for the recent years <http://www.wseas.com/documents/journals-database.zip>. You can see what papers have been accepted and what papers have been rejected. Acceptance rates, which are approx 20%, can be found within.

Quality Control 7:

A huge list of more than 13500 Reviewers:

List of Reviewers can be found here: <http://wseas.com/reviewers.php>

Quality Control 8:

What do the Editors-in-Chief say about the review process in our Journals: <http://wseas.com/documents/Statement-of-Peer-Review-signed-by-the-editor-in-chief-1.pdf>

<http://wseas.com/documents/Statement-of-Peer-Review-signed-by-the-editor-in-chief-2.pdf>

<http://wseas.com/documents/Statement-of-Peer-Review-signed-by-the-editor-in-chief-3.pdf>

<http://wseas.com/documents/Statement-of-Peer-Review-signed-by-the-editor-in-chief-4.pdf>

<http://wseas.com/documents/Statement-of-Peer-Review-signed-by-the-editor-in-chief-5.pdf>

<http://wseas.com/documents/Statement-of-Peer-Review-signed-by-the-editor-in-chief-6.pdf>

<http://wseas.com/documents/Statement-of-Peer-Review-signed-by-the-editor-in-chief-7.pdf>

<http://wseas.com/documents/Statement-of-Peer-Review-signed-by-the-editor-in-chief-8.pdf>

<http://wseas.com/documents/Statement-of-Peer-Review-signed-by-the-editor-in-chief-9.pdf>

<http://wseas.com/documents/Statement-of-Peer-Review-signed-by-the-editor-in-chief-10.pdf>

<http://wseas.com/documents/Statement-of-Peer-Review-signed-by-the-editor-in-chief-11.pdf>

<http://wseas.com/documents/Statement-of-Peer-Review-signed-by-the-editor-in-chief-12.pdf>

<http://wseas.com/documents/Statement-of-Peer-Review-signed-by-the-editor-in-chief-13.pdf>

<http://wseas.com/documents/Statement-of-Peer-Review-signed-by-the-editor-in-chief-14.pdf>

<http://wseas.com/documents/Statement-of-Peer-Review-signed-by-the-editor-in-chief-15.pdf>

<http://wseas.com/documents/Statement-of-Peer-Review-signed-by-the-editor-in-chief-16.pdf>

<http://wseas.com/documents/Statement-of-Peer-Review-signed-by-the-editor-in-chief-17.pdf>

<http://wseas.com/documents/Statement-of-Peer-Review-signed-by-the-editor-in-chief-18.pdf>

<http://wseas.com/documents/Statement-of-Peer-Review-signed-by-the-editor-in-chief-19.pdf>

<http://wseas.com/documents/Statement-of-Peer-Review-signed-by-the-editor-in-chief-20.pdf>

<http://wseas.com/documents/Statement-of-Peer-Review-signed-by-the-editor-in-chief-21.pdf>

<http://wseas.com/documents/Statement-of-Peer-Review-signed-by-the-editor-in-chief-22.pdf>

<http://wseas.com/documents/Statement-of-Peer-Review-signed-by-the-editor-in-chief-23.pdf>

<http://wseas.com/documents/Statement-of-Peer-Review-signed-by-the-editor-in-chief-24.pdf>

<http://wseas.com/documents/Statement-of-Peer-Review-signed-by-the-editor-in-chief-25.pdf>

<http://wseas.com/documents/Statement-of-Peer-Review-signed-by-the-editor-in-chief-26.pdf>

<http://wseas.com/documents/Statement-of-Peer-Review-signed-by-the-editor-in-chief-27.pdf>

<http://wseas.com/documents/Statement-of-Peer-Review-signed-by-the-editor-in-chief-28.pdf>

<http://wseas.com/documents/Statement-of-Peer-Review-signed-by-the-editor-in-chief-29.pdf>

Quality Control 9:

Papers rejected from WSEAS, but accepted in IEEE, Springer, Hindawi, Elsevier etc <http://www.wseas.com/documents/rejected-from-wseas-published-in-ieee-springer-elsevier-etc.zip> or <http://www.wseas.com/documents/rejected-from-wseas-published-in-ieee-springer-elsevier-etc.rar>

Quality Control 10:

What we check during the review <https://wseas.com/form/reviewers-form/upload-form/index.php>

Quality Control 11:

New Associate Editors, New Members in the Editorial Boards, New Guest Editors in Special Issues are welcome provided that the Advisory Board of WSEAS will approve them after peer review in their Biographies and checking their recent publications record in Scopus, EI Compendex, SCIE, ESCI, IET etc

Quality Control 12:

New Reviewers are welcome provided that the Advisory Board of WSEAS will approve them checking their recent publications record in Scopus, EI Compendex, SCIE, ESCI, IET etc WSEAS can sponsor financially or technically some conferences provided that a) The Organizers/Chairmen of these Conferences are Professors in reputable Universities, b) The Organizers/Chairmen of these Conferences have important academic records of recent publications record in Scopus, EI Compendex, SCIE, ESCI, IET etc, great participation in research projects and have supervised at least 1 Ph.D. dissertation c) The Organizers/Chairmen of these Conferences will provide to the WSEAS the list of their reviewers (Names, Academic Affiliation, Academic Web Address, Phone, Academic Email), d) The Organizers/Chairmen of these Conferences will provide to WSEAS the reviewers' comments of 20 papers randomly selected by the WSEAS from the conference program (as a sample), e) The Deadlines of these Conferences do not generate concerns for the conference peer review.

We hope this information demonstrates the seriousness with which WSEAS approaches academic integrity and the peer review process.

Any misrepresentation of our organization may cause reputational damage and is subject to legal review. Therefore, we trust that IDEA will act promptly to remove the incorrect references.

WSEAS: A Reputable Academic Publisher with No Ties to Predatory Practices

WSEAS is a well-established academic publisher with no affiliation whatsoever to predatory publishing. This is substantiated by several key facts grounded in objective academic standards. First and foremost, WSEAS currently publishes over 16 journals indexed in **Scopus**, one of the most respected and selective bibliographic databases for peer-reviewed scientific literature. Managed by Elsevier, Scopus employs stringent criteria for indexing, including rigorous peer review, citation metrics, ethical publishing practices, and editorial quality. Journals such as *WSEAS Transactions on Systems and Control* and *WSEAS Transactions on Environment and Development* exemplify the publisher's adherence to these high standards. Their inclusion in Scopus serves as strong, verifiable evidence of academic credibility and categorically rules out any association with predatory practices. Historically, WSEAS was mentioned in the now-defunct Beall's List, a controversial and subjective compilation that included many legitimate publishers. Beall's List has been widely criticized for its lack of transparency, inconsistent methodology, and absence of peer oversight. Importantly, WSEAS no longer appears in any updated version or equivalent of Beall's List and is not listed in any recognized database of predatory publishers, such as Cabell's Predatory Reports.

WSEAS also maintains active collaborations with internationally accredited universities and research institutions. Its conferences have been co-organized with reputable faculties, including the National Technical University of Athens, Technical University of Sofia, Obuda university, University of Bern, University of Exeter, City University of New York as well as

numerous universities throughout Europe and Asia. Such academic partnerships would be impossible for predatory publishers, which are known for fabricating or exaggerating institutional affiliations.

The peer-review process at WSEAS is blind and clearly documented on its official websites. Editorial boards, author guidelines, and ethical policies are transparent and aligned with internationally accepted standards, including those set by the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE). WSEAS does not guarantee acceptance, and all submissions undergo thorough technical and scientific evaluation before publication.

Another testament to WSEAS's legitimacy is its long-standing presence in academic publishing. Active since the 1990s, WSEAS has maintained a consistent schedule of journal publications and scientific conferences for over 25 years—a track record that predatory publishers, many of which disappear within a few years, simply do not possess. Furthermore, WSEAS ensures long-term access to its published articles, which are archived and readily available for citation and scholarly use.

Finally, WSEAS is not blacklisted or banned by Scopus, the Directory of Open Access Journals (DOAJ), Web of Science, or Cabell's—further distinguishing it from genuinely predatory publishers, which are typically unindexed, non-transparent, short-lived, and deceptive in their operations.

In conclusion, the inclusion of WSEAS journals in Scopus, its transparent and ethical peer-review process, enduring collaborations with respected academic institutions, long publishing history, and absence from any authoritative list of predatory publishers collectively prove that WSEAS is a legitimate, ethical, and academically rigorous publisher. There is no factual basis for linking WSEAS to predatory publishing in any way.

7. Conclusion

The inclusion of WSEAS in the 2017 IDEA report on predatory journals is misleading, unsupported by direct evidence, and unjust. Without a transparent evaluation of WSEAS's individual publishing practices, peer-review standards, and editorial ethics, such accusations remain speculative and defamatory. A fair reassessment, based on journal-level data and transparent methodology, is necessary to correct the record and avoid damage to institutions and individuals whose only fault was engaging with a misunderstood platform.

References:

- [1] J. Macháček and M. Srholec, *Predatory Journals in Scopus: Evidence on Cross-country Differences*, IDEA Think Tank, CERGE-EI, 2017. [Online]. Available: https://idea-en.cerge-ei.cz/files/IDEA_Study_2_2017_Predatory_journals_in_Scopus/files/basic-html/page1.html
- [2] WSEAS, "Quality Control Procedures," WSEAS, 2023. [Online]. Available: <https://wseas.com/qualitycontrol.php>
- [3] WSEAS, "Certification – Evaluation of the Review Process," WSEAS, 2019. [Online]. Available: <http://wseas.com/documents/certification.docx>
- [4] WSEAS, "Responses to Reviewers," WSEAS. [Online]. Available: <http://wseas.org/multimedia/Responses.docx>
- [5] WSEAS, "Journals Database," WSEAS. [Online]. Available: <http://www.wseas.com/documents/journals-database.zip>
- [6] WSEAS, "Reviewers List," WSEAS. [Online]. Available: <http://wseas.com/reviewers.php>
- [7] WSEAS, "Statements of Peer Review Signed by the Editors-in-Chief," WSEAS.

[Online]. Available:

<http://wseas.com/documents/Statement-of-Peer-Review-signed-by-the-editor-in-chief-1.pdf>

(and following in the series up to 29)

[8] WSEAS, "Papers Rejected from WSEAS but Accepted in IEEE, Springer, Elsevier, etc.," WSEAS. [Online]. Available:

<http://www.wseas.com/documents/rejected-from-wseas-published-in-ieee-springer-elsevier-etc.zip>

[9] WSEAS, "What We Check During the Review," WSEAS. [Online]. Available:

<https://wseas.com/form/reviewers-form/upload-form/index.php>

[10] WSEAS, "Testimonials from Authors," WSEAS. [Online]. Available:

<http://wseas.com/testimonials.php>

Contribution of Individual Authors to the Creation of a Scientific Article (Ghostwriting Policy)

The authors equally contributed in the present research, at all stages from the formulation of the problem to the final findings and solution.

Sources of Funding for Research Presented in a Scientific Article or Scientific Article Itself

No funding was received for conducting this study.

Conflict of Interest

The authors have no conflicts of interest to declare that are relevant to the content of this article.

Creative Commons Attribution License 4.0 (Attribution 4.0 International, CC BY 4.0)

This article is published under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License 4.0

https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/deed.en_US