

# MPRA

Munich Personal RePEc Archive

## **The Clarivate Controversy**

Zaman, Khalid

The University of Haripur

24 March 2023

Online at <https://mpra.ub.uni-muenchen.de/116822/>  
MPRA Paper No. 116822, posted 26 Mar 2023 14:09 UTC

## **The Clarivate Controversy: How CiteScore Rank Provides a Response to Arbitrary Delisting**

**Khalid Zaman (corresponding author)**

Department of Economics, The University of Haripur, Haripur Khyber Pakhtunkhwa  
22620, Pakistan. E-mail: khalid\_zaman786@yahoo.com

### **Abstract**

Clarivate Analytics, a leading provider of scientific and scholarly research solutions, recently announced the delisting 82 journals from its Web of Science core collection. This decision has far-reaching consequences for publishers, authors, and the broader academic community, as these delisted journals will lose their reputations, impact factors, and recognition, even though many have been publishing for over a decade. In this research article, we argue that Clarivate's decision is arbitrary and unfair. It undermines the efforts of reputable publishers who have worked hard to establish their journals as credible academic research sources. We propose that publishers and university journals consider creating their indexing services based on the CiteScore formula, which measures the number of citations of papers in a journal relative to the total number of published papers. This would provide an alternative solution to the problem of arbitrary delisting and empower publishers to take control of academic publishing.

**Keywords:** Clarivate Analytics; Arbitrary Delisting; CiteScore; Solution.

### **1. Introduction**

For years, Clarivate Analytics has been considered one of the most prestigious indexing services in the academic publishing industry, providing recognition and credibility to thousands of reputable journals worldwide (Teixeira da Silva & Nazarovets, 2018, 2022). However, its recent decision to delist 82 journals from its Web of Science core collection has sparked a heated debate among publishers, authors, and the broader academic community (Predatory Reports, 2023). While Clarivate claims that these journals did not meet its criteria for inclusion, many publishers argue that this decision is arbitrary and unfair and undermines the efforts of reputable publishers who have worked hard to establish their journals as credible sources of academic research.

## **2. Delisting of Reputable Journals**

The consequences of Clarivate's decision are far-reaching and severe. Journals published for over a decade have lost their impact factors, reputations, and recognition, even though they have provided valuable research to the academic community for years. This decision has affected not only the publishers of these journals but also the authors who have published their work. Many authors have invested significant time and effort in their research, and to have their work suddenly delisted is a massive blow to their careers. Moreover, universities that have recognized the work of their faculty members through the publication of their papers in these journals are now facing the prospect of derecognizing their contributions.

## **3. The Need for an Alternative**

The arbitrary delisting of reputable journals by Clarivate Analytics highlights the need for an alternative solution that empowers publishers to take control of academic publishing. Universities and private publishers should consider creating indexing services based on the CiteScore formula. This formula measures the number of citations of papers in a journal relative to the total number of published papers, providing a simple yet effective way to determine the impact of a journal (Roldan-Valadez et al., 2019; Croft & Sack, 2022; Gupta et al., 2023). By creating their own indexing services, publishers can establish their journals as credible academic research sources, free from the arbitrary decisions of third-party indexing services.

## **4. Conclusions**

The arbitrary delisting of reputable journals by Clarivate Analytics is a significant blow to the academic publishing industry. However, it also allows publishers and universities to create indexing services based on the CiteScore formula. By using CiteScore, universities and publishers can avoid the risk of being arbitrarily delisted by a third-party company like Clarivate. They can set their criteria and standards for indexing their publications, ensuring greater transparency and accountability in academic publishing. Moreover, using CiteScore as a basis for indexing would encourage publishers to focus on publishing high-quality and impactful research rather than simply chasing metrics and rankings. This approach would promote a more equitable and ethical academic publishing ecosystem where quality and impact drive recognition and recognition. Creating their indexing services based on the CiteScore

formula is a viable solution for universities and private publishers who wish to ensure greater fairness, transparency, and accountability in academic publishing. This approach would not only protect their publications from being arbitrarily delisted by third-party indexing services. However, it would also promote a more equitable and ethical academic publishing ecosystem that prioritizes quality and impact over metrics and rankings.

## References

Croft, W. L., & Sack, J. R. (2022). Predicting the citation count and CiteScore of journals one year in advance. *Journal of Informetrics*, 16(4), 101349.

Gupta, S., Kumar, N., & Bhalla, S. (2023). Citation metrics and evaluation of journals and conferences. *Journal of Information Science*, <https://doi.org/10.1177/01655515231151411>.

Predatory Reports (2023). Web of Science de-listed 82 journals, including 15 from Hindawi. Online available at: <https://predatoryreports.org/news/f/web-of-science-de-listed-82-journal-including-15-from-hindawi> (accessed on 25th March, 2023).

Roldan-Valadez, E., Salazar-Ruiz, S. Y., Ibarra-Contreras, R., & Rios, C. (2019). Current concepts on bibliometrics: a brief review about impact factor, Eigenfactor score, CiteScore, SCImago Journal Rank, Source-Normalised Impact per Paper, H-index, and alternative metrics. *Irish Journal of Medical Science (1971-)*, 188, 939-951.

Teixeira da Silva, J. A., & Nazarovets, S. (2022). The role of Publons in the context of open peer review. *Publishing Research Quarterly*, 38, 760–781.

Teixeira da Silva, J. A., & Tsigaris, P. (2018). What value do journal whitelists and blacklists have in academia?. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 44(6), 781-792.