Background

- The open access (OA) movement increased access to scientific literature through freely available, downloadable content.
- OA publishers rely on subsidization by large organizations and article processing fees (e.g., author fees) to support free article distribution.
- Predatory publishing is an unprofessional, systematic abuse of the OA publication system through financial gain.
- Unscrupulous publishers may operate without transparency, hold research ransom, charge large publication fees, and possibly omit peer reviews.
- Predatory publishing is harmful for the scientific community.

Objective

This study aims to assess the awareness of predatory publishing practices among pharmacists of varying career fields and exposure to scholarly research.

Methods

- Recruitment of 5 pharmacy postdoctorate trainees and 5 faculty members from 20 schools of pharmacy in the United States.
- Distribution of an online survey with informed consent disclaimer for financial gain.
- Survey will present case vignettes involving two unsolicited emails from publishers requesting manuscripts from the reader.
- Questionnaire will examine surveyed pharmacists’ attitudes to the two solicitations in the context of the case.
- Data will be analyzed using descriptive statistics.
- Inclusion criteria: Practicing pharmacists, either in postgraduate training or working in academia, who have read an informed consent statement and have agreed to participate.
- Exclusion criteria: Prior completion of the survey.

Results/Discussion

- Pending IRB approval by the Rutgers Biomedical Health Sciences IRB.
- Analysis of survey responses will be presented at the 2016 Eastern States Conference meeting.
- Questions to examine: Do predatory publishers impact all fields of pharmacy practice equally or to varying extents?
- How heavily does practice field and work or scholarly experience influence susceptibility to predatory practices?
- Predatory publishing has been documented in multiple medical and basic science fields; however, impact in pharmacy has not been assessed.
- This research may unravel a knowledge gap which can be addressed through various educational interventions.

Figure 2. Research Timeline

Draft Survey Questionnaire

1. How trustworthy did the author of Email 1 appear?
   - Not Trustworthy 1
   - 2
   - 3
   - 4
   - Very Trustworthy 5

2. How trustworthy did the author of Email 2 appear?
   - Not Trustworthy 1
   - 2
   - 3
   - 4
   - Very Trustworthy 5

3. To which publisher would you submit a manuscript based on the email information?
   - Publisher 1
   - Publisher 2

4. How long have you been practicing in your field?
   - 0 – 5 years
   - 6 – 10 years
   - 11 – 15 years
   - D. > 10 years

5. How many peer-reviewed manuscripts have you published?
   - A. 0
   - B. 1 – 5
   - C. 6 – 10
   - D. > 10

6. On average, how many professional pharmacy conferences do you attend annually?
   - A. 0
   - B. 1 – 2
   - C. 3 – 5
   - D. > 5

7. How likely would you be to pay a publication fee to publish a journal article (assuming no reimbursement from your employer or grant funding)?
   - Not Likely 1
   - 2
   - 3
   - 4
   - Very Likely 5

8. Have you ever heard about “predatory publishing” in the past?
   - Yes
   - No
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