

Contents lists available at [ScienceDirect](https://www.sciencedirect.com)

# The Journal of Academic Librarianship

journal homepage: [www.elsevier.com/locate/jacalib](http://www.elsevier.com/locate/jacalib)

## A “Trojan horse” in the reference lists: Citations to a hijacked journal in SSCI-indexed marketing journals

Salim Moussa

Institut Supérieur des Études Appliquées en Humanités, Cité des Jeunes, Gafsa 2133, Tunisie

### ARTICLE INFO

#### Keywords:

Hijacked journal  
Genuine journal  
Marketing  
Citation infiltration  
Scientific integrity

### ABSTRACT

Hijacked journals are publication outlets that are created by fraudulent entities for financial gain. They deceitfully use the names of genuine journals to dupe researchers. A hijacked journal publishes papers in return for article publication charges similar to those of gold open access journals, but they are not authentic. By using the same title of a genuine journal, a hijacked journal may confuse authors who send their manuscripts to it. A hijacked journal may also confuse authors that cite articles published in it, wrongly assuming that they appeared in an authentic journal (a phenomenon herein called citation infiltration). Adopting a case study methodology, the main aim of this paper is to investigate the extent of citations received by a hijacked marketing journal from marketing journals indexed in Clarivate Analytics' Social Sciences Citation Index (SSCI). Results indicate that the hijacked journal received 25 citations from 13 SSCI-indexed marketing journals. The list of the infiltrated journals includes some of marketing's most “prestigious” journals. Ironically, the SSCI-indexed marketing journal that cited the hijacked journal the most (with nine citations) is none other than the genuine journal whose identity has been theft.

### Introduction

Journal of Marketing Management is a double blind peer reviewed international academic journal that publishes scientific research papers on the contemporary practices of marketing [...] It welcomes novel and ground-breaking contributions from a wide range of research traditions within marketing, particularly encouraging innovative ideas in conceptual developments and research methodologies. The journal is completely *open access* which has opened the doors for the millions of international readers and academicians to keep in touch with the latest research findings in the field of *economics and development studies*.

(Source: [jmm-net.com](http://jmm-net.com))

The Trojan horse is a story from the Trojan War about the subterfuge used by the Greeks to enter the independent city of Troy and win the war. The Trojans believed the huge wooden horse was a peace present to their gods and thus a symbol of their victory after a long siege. They pulled the giant wooden horse into the middle of the city. What looked like a gift was synonymous with annihilation. Irrespective of whether the Trojan horse story is based on historical facts or merely a myth, the expression “Trojan horse” has come to mean any trick or stratagem that

causes a target to invite a foe into a securely protected bastion or place.

Taken from [jmm-net.com](http://jmm-net.com), the excerpt presented at the very beginning of this manuscript describes the aims and scope of the Journal of Marketing Management (online ISSN: 2333–6099). It depicts the Journal of Marketing Management as an Open Access (OA) journal. That same extract stresses that by “opening its doors”, this journal has *offered* millions of international readers and researchers the *gift* of keeping in touch with the latest research. The gaffe in that excerpt is the field: Economics and development studies.

As most readers may already have guessed, that excerpt was not taken from the website of the genuine *Journal of Marketing Management* (online ISSN: 1472-1376)—the flagship journal of the UK-based Academy of Marketing ([jmmnews.com](http://jmmnews.com)) — but rather from the website of the hijacked Journal of Marketing Management ([jmm-net.com](http://jmm-net.com)).

A hijacked (also called a clone or a duplicate) journal is “a genuine academic journal for which one (or more) fake website have been generated by a malicious third party for the purpose of fraudulently offering academicians the opportunity to rapidly publish their research online for a fee” (Menon & Khosravi, 2019, p. 1). For the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE, 2019, p. 7), a hijacked journal is a “counterfeit journal [that] adopts a credible and recognizable title of an existing journal”. By doing this, the COPE (2019) states, hijacked

E-mail address: [salimmoussa@yahoo.fr](mailto:salimmoussa@yahoo.fr).

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jacalib.2021.102388>

Received 27 February 2021; Received in revised form 26 April 2021; Accepted 27 April 2021

Available online 5 May 2021

0099-1333/© 2021 Elsevier Inc. All rights reserved.

journals “fraudulently aspire to fool potential authors into believing that they are sending their manuscript to the real, credible journal”. In short, a hijacked journal is an unethical business that considers money far more important than business ethics, research ethics, and publishing ethics (Beall, 2017; COPE, 2019; Menon & Khosravi, 2019).

Hijacked journals are “a subset of predatory journals” (Menon & Khosravi, 2019, p. 1). Predatory journals are “entities that prioritize self-interest at the expense of scholarship and are characterized by false or misleading information, deviation from best editorial/publication practices, lack of transparency, and/or use of aggressive and indiscriminate solicitation practices” (Grudniewicz et al., 2019, p. 211). Hijacked journals are however more problematic and difficult to distinguish than predatory journals (Memon, 2018). They “often receive more submissions than predatory journals because they use the name and reputation of legitimate journals” (Memon, 2018, p. 1620). By using the same title of a genuine journal, a hijacked journal may confuse authors who send their manuscripts to it. A hijacked journal may also confuse authors that cite articles published in it, wrongly assuming that they appeared in a well-regarded journal. This phenomenon is herein called, and to keep with the Trojan horse metaphor, citation infiltration. Citation infiltration occurs when articles published in a peer-reviewed journal cite articles published in a hijacked journal assuming that it is the genuine one. Following this introduction, it should not take much imagination to see how the Trojan horse of Homeric myth offers an excellent analogy and mirror for the phenomena of journal hijacking and citation infiltration.

Adopting a case study methodology, the aim of this paper is twofold: (1) to expose the unscrupulous and unprincipled practices of a hijacked journal; and (2) to investigate the extent of citations received by the hijacked Journal of Marketing Management from a number of marketing journals indexed in Clarivate Analytics' Social Sciences Citation Index (SSCI).

Using Clarivate Analytics' Web of Science (WoS), this study tries to answer the following two research questions (RQs):

- RQ1: To what extent this hijacked journal is cited by SSCI-indexed marketing journals?
- RQ2: Which is the SSCI-indexed journal that cited this hijacked journal the most?

## Background

### *Journal hijacking*

Journal hijacking “represent[s] a type of cybercrime” (Abalkina, 2021, p. 5). Hijacked journals “are of a criminal nature since the mechanism is typical of theft and/or robbery” (Dadkhah et al., 2016, p. 360).

Hijacked journals were detected for the first time by Mehrdad Jalalian in early 2012 (Dadkhah and Maliszewski, 2015). They exploit the gold OA model (also called the “Pay to Publish” model). In contrast to green (i.e., self-archiving of a version of a manuscript into a free to access repository) or diamond (i.e., no fees for authors and readers) OA journals, authors who submit their manuscripts to gold OA journals are required to pay, upon acceptance of their articles, publication fees commonly known as Article Processing Charges (APCs). During the last decade, the number of publishers and journals attracted by the ecstasy of the gold OA model has been increasing at a furious pace (Khoo, 2019). Therefore, claims have been made that the peer review process may not be properly followed, because most of the entities producing these journals are pursuing the major goal of obtaining a financial profit in the form of APCs from the authors (see the sting operation studies by Bohannon, 2013; Dell'Anno et al., 2020). Hijacked journals, along with predatory journals, are tarnishing the gold OA model (Bohannon, 2013; Dell'Anno et al., 2020; Krawczyk & Kulczycki, 2020; Linacre et al., 2019; Sorokowski et al., 2017).

While the number of predatory journals is estimated to be about 14,000 publication venues (Moussa & Linacre, 2020), the total number of active hijacked journals remains undefined. Published in 2016, the article by Dadkhah et al. (2016, pp. 355-360) included a list of up to 106 hijacked journals. Before closing his blog in mid-January 2017 (Strielkowski, 2017), academic librarian Jeffery Beall listed some 115 hijacked journals. An examination of these lists indicates that the victimized journals are mostly journals in science, technology, and medicine. However, as this paper shows, a hijacked version of a genuine marketing journal does exist.

### *The features of a hijacked journal*

Hijacked journals have telltale signs. Jalalian and Mahboobi (2014, pp. 391-392) and Asadi et al. (2017, p. 306) provide two helpful lists enumerating their main features.

A hijacked journal: (1) is a duplicate or clone of a genuine and reputable journal; (2) has no or a poor peer-review process; (3) has no or fake editors/editorial boards; (4) has a very broad scope; (5) claims to be published by a prominent publisher or affiliation to a “prestigious” academic association; and (6) claims to be listed in indexing or abstracting databases, such as Clarivate Analytics' Institute for Scientific Information (ISI) or Elsevier's Scopus.

Hijacked journals have websites that imitate genuine and reputable journals and their websites. For instance, as the introduction section has sought to demonstrate, the Internet domain name of the website of the authentic *Journal of Marketing Management* is <https://www.jmmnews.com>. The one for the website of the hijacked Journal of Marketing Management is <http://www.jmm-net.com>. Note that these two Internet domain names are almost identical.

Hijacked journals have a very short peer-review cycle because there is (little or) no review at all (Jalalian & Mahboobi, 2014; Menon & Khosravi, 2019). The website of the hijacked Journal of Marketing Management indicates that “[t]he review process takes maximum two weeks”. Hence, within a week or two, the “lucky” author(s) will receive an acceptance letter and, most importantly, an invoice of 200USD.

Hijacked journals may in some cases “appoint” eminent/prolific scholars, without their permission, as editors or as editorial board members. In other cases, the editor-in-chief is a fictitious or a deceased person (Menon & Khosravi, 2019). In some other cases, the name of the editor-in-chief is not provided. For instance, the website of the hijacked Journal of Marketing Management offers no indication whatsoever on the identity of the editor-in-chief of that journal. Worse, the first name that appears in that journal's list of editorial board members is the name of a deceased marketing scholar from the Kutztown University of Pennsylvania (who died on 21 August 2017).

Hijacked journals do not often have any specific scope for paper submission and usually support all topics within a research field (Menon & Khosravi, 2019). The scope webpage of the hijacked Journal of Marketing Management indicates that this journal covers 24 topics ranging from advertising to contemporary marketing thought.

The hijacked Journal of Marketing Management was inceptioned in 2013. It is published by the American Research Institute for Policy Development (ARIPD). The ARIPD alleges to be “American” and to have its “headquarters” in Madison, WI. (US), yet the Whois website<sup>1</sup> indicates that the registrant contact of the domain <http://www.jmm-net.com> is located in Dhaka (Bangladesh). For the sake of information, ARIPD publishes 51 other journals.

To attract more submissions and eventually more money in the form of APCs, the authentic journal chosen as a victim must be covered by Scopus, Clarivate Analytics, or other reputable indexes and directories

<sup>1</sup> The Whois website (<https://www.whois.com/whois/>) provides information regarding the registrar of an Internet domain (i.e., dot org or dot net), its date of registration and expiration, its name server, and the registrant contact.

like Cabells' Journalytics or Ulrich's Periodical Directory. The genuine *Journal of Marketing Management* was put forward for Scopus in 2010.<sup>2</sup> The hijacked *Journal of Marketing Management* was launched in 2013. The website of the hijacked journal asserts that this “journal” is “under the monitoring of world's reputed indexing organizations like ISI, Scopus, and *PubMed*” (emphasis added). A marketing journal that is “under the monitoring” of *PubMed*—which is a database of references and abstracts on life sciences and biomedical topics—is another slip-up.

Like the horse left by the Greeks on the shore of Troy, the content of the hijacked *Journal of Marketing Management* is freely available (in OA) to anyone, anywhere, and anytime. It can be downloaded, read, and eventually cited.

To what extent this hijacked marketing journal is cited by SSCI-indexed marketing journals? This is the first RQ that this study tries to answer.

## Methodology

This paper adopts a case study methodology. Case study methodology “scientifically investigates into a real-life phenomenon in-depth and within its environmental context” (Ridder, 2017, p. 282). The case can be an individual, a group, an organization, an event, a problem, or an anomaly (Ridder, 2017). The case study is an accepted research methodology in Library and Information Science (see e.g., Burrell et al., 2020; Namaganda, 2020; Widdersheim, 2018).

According to Ridder (2017, p. 292), there are four case study research designs. One of these is the intrinsic case study design. In an intrinsic case study, “the case itself is of interest. The purpose is not theory-building but curiosity in the case itself” (Ridder, 2017, p. 288). In an intrinsic case study, the case is, by definition, already selected. With an intrinsic case study, “the researcher looks for specific characteristics, aiming for thick descriptions with the opportunity to learn. Representativeness or generalization is not considered” (Ridder, 2017, p. 289).

### Why the hijacked *Journal of Marketing Management*?

The hijacked *Journal of Marketing Management* was selected for analysis for the following reasons:

- It is an active gold OA journal. The hijacked *Journal of Marketing Management* has been published regularly since 2013, with one (e.g., 2013) to four issues (e.g., 2014) per annum. It has published two issues in 2020 (i.e., volume 8). The website of that hijacked journal is currently calling for papers to be published in the first issue of volume nine (i.e., 2021).
- It is a predatory journal listed in Cabells' Predatory Reports (the subscription-based service by Cabells Scholarly Analytics).
- The publisher of that journal (i.e., ARIPD) is a predatory publisher listed in three free and updated lists of predatory publishers: the Dolos list, the Kscien list, and the Stop Predatory Journals list (for further information on these lists, see Koerber et al., 2020 and Moussa, 2021).
- Those at the UK-based Academy of Marketing and Taylor & Francis group (i.e., the publisher of the genuine journal) have “made repeated attempts to contact ARIPD about the possible confusion this duplication in journal name may cause for authors, but as yet have received no response”.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>2</sup> See <https://www.jmmnews.com/jmm-and-the-cabs-academic-journal-guide-2015/>.

<sup>3</sup> See <https://www.jmmnews.com/journal-of-marketing-management-think-check-submit/>.

### The citing SSCI-indexed marketing journals

There are currently 52 marketing journals indexed in the SSCI (see Moussa, 2019, pp. 577–578). Most of these journals are also listed in the 2018 Academic Journal Guide by the UK-based Chartered Association of Business Schools (CABS) (Chartered Association of Business Schools, 2018). In CABS' Guide, marketing journals are classified into five ordered categories (i.e., 1, 2, 3, 4, and 4\*) with “1” intended for a “Recognized journal” and “4\*” for a “World elite journal”. The author will use the CABS rating for the discussion.

### Citation data collection

To collect data on citations in the 52 SSCI-indexed journals to the hijacked *Journal of Marketing Management*, the author used Clarivate Analytics' WoS (accessed via an institutional subscription on 12 February 2021).

In WoS, a Cited Reference Search was performed with the following search query:

- title of the hijacked journal in the search field “Cited Work”;
- volumes one to seven in the search field “Cited Volume”; and
- 2013 to 2019 in the search field “Cited Year(s)”.

## Results

### The citing SSCI-indexed marketing journals

Using the Cited Reference Search and examining each cited reference, the author found 25 citations to the hijacked journal received from 18 articles published in 13 SSCI-indexed marketing journals (see Table 1).

So, 13 of the 52 (i.e., 25%) SSCI-indexed marketing journals have cited the hijacked *Journal of Marketing Management* on one or more occasions. The list of the publication outlets that the “Trojan horse” (i.e., the hijacked journal) has infiltrated includes “World elite” (i.e., 4\*-rated) (e.g., *Marketing Science* and *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*), “Highly-regarded” (3-graded) (e.g., *European Journal of Marketing*), “Well-regarded” (2-rated) (e.g., *Journal of Macromarketing*), and “Recognized” journals (e.g., *Journal of Product and Brand Management*).

Table 1 gives the volume, issue, and page numbers of the journal articles that made reference to the hijacked journal. The Digital Object Identifiers are provided for forthcoming articles (i.e., accepted but not yet assigned to a published volume and an issue).

Table 1 also indicates that the 25 citations were made to 19 unique articles (labeled A to S) that appeared in the hijacked journal.<sup>4</sup> Of these 19 articles, article E stands out as it has received three citations from three articles published in three SSCI-indexed journals.

A visit to the website of the hijacked *Journal of Marketing Management* indicates that this journal has published 128 articles between 2013 and 2019. Hence, it could be stated that 14.844% (i.e., 19/128) of these articles were cited on one or more occasions by SSCI-indexed journals.

To examine whether the author(s) of the citing articles is (are) also the author(s) of the cited article (i.e., self-citation), an authorship analysis was performed. As the last column in Table 1 shows, none of the 25 citations is a self-citation. This finding suggests that the citations made to these articles were not driven by self-promoting motivations.

### The most citing SSCI-indexed journal

The most infiltrated journal is, unfortunately, the genuine *Journal of*

<sup>4</sup> The titles of these 19 articles are not mentioned to avoid citation infiltration. The list of these 19 articles is available upon request.

**Table 1**  
Citation infiltration.

The citing SSCI-indexed marketing journal (CABS rating)	Citations to the hijacked marketing journal	Citing article(s) (volume, issue, page)/Digital Object Identifier	Cited article(s)	Is it a self-citation?
<i>Asia Pacific Journal of Marketing and Logistics</i> (not rated)	1	Vol. 31, Issue 1, p. 300	A	No
<i>European Journal of Marketing</i> (3)	1	Vol. 52, Issues 1–2, p. 35	B	No
<i>Journal of Brand Management</i> (2)	1	Vol. 23, Issue 6, p. 714.	C	No
<i>Journal of Macromarketing</i> (2)	1	Vol. 39, Issue 2, p. 205	D	No
<i>Journal of Product and Brand Management</i> (1)	1	Vol. 30, Issue 1, p. 101	E	No
<i>Journal of Services Marketing</i> (2)	1	<a href="https://doi.org/10.1108/JSM-01-2020-0002">https://doi.org/10.1108/JSM-01-2020-0002</a>	E	No
<i>Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science</i> (4*)	1	Vol. 47, Issue 3, p. 392	F	No
<i>Journal of Vacation Marketing</i> (1)	1	Vol. 25, Issue 1, p. 98	G	No
<i>Marketing Science</i> (4*)	1	Vol. 38, Issue 6, p. 947	F	No
<i>Journal of Consumer Behaviour</i> (2)	2	Vol. 17, Issue 4, p. 415	H	No
		<a href="https://doi.org/10.1002/cb.1898">https://doi.org/10.1002/cb.1898</a>	I	No
<i>Marketing Intelligence &amp; Planning</i> (1)	2	Vol. 36, Issue 3, p. 316	E	No
		Vol. 37, Issue 4, p. 412	J	No
<i>Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services</i> (2)	3	Vol. 45, Issue Nov, p. 110	K	No
		Vol. 45, Issue Nov, p. 229	H	No
		Vol. 57, Issue Nov, e102228, p. 10	L	No
<i>Journal of Marketing Management</i> (2)	9	Vol. 35, Issues 15–16, pp. 1428–1430	M, N, O, P	No
		Vol. 36, Issues 1–2, p. 146	K, P, Q, R, S	No
Totals: 13 journals	25 citations	18 citing articles	19 unique cited articles	No self-citation

*Marketing Management* (with nine citations to the hijacked Journal of Marketing Management). Hence, the first and foremost victim of citation infiltration is the genuine journal whose identity has been stolen. The authentic *Journal of Marketing Management* is currently serving as the primary conduit for the hijacked version of that journal to validate its articles, and thus its existence.

## Discussion

Investigating references to one hijacked journal in 52 SSCI-indexed marketing journals, the author has found that 25% of them have been already infiltrated at least once. Citation infiltration occurred irrespective of the CABS category the citing journal represents. The list of the infiltrated publication outlets comprises some of marketing's "World elite", "Highly-regarded", and "Well-respected" journals. The results

also point out that the 25 citations are referring to 19 unique articles. This means that about 15% of the articles that appeared in the hijacked journal (between 2013 and 2019) received one citation or more from the SSCI-indexed journals. None of these 25 citations is a self-citation.

While fairly alarming, these results are comprehensible for most of the journals under scrutiny as their editorial and review board members are, in all probability, unaware of the existence of this hijacked journal. The level of citation infiltration is however less excusable for the genuine *Journal of Marketing Management*. Both the Academy of Marketing and Taylor & Francis are fully aware (since July 2016) that their journal has been hijacked. Results indicate that of the 25 citations received by the hijacked Journal of Marketing Management, nine (i.e., 36%) were from the genuine *Journal of Marketing Management*.

Someone may argue why not cite articles published in this hijacked journal. After all, they could be of high quality since most of those researchers who submitted their manuscripts to the hijacked journal believed, at the time of submission, that they were dealing with a valid and reputable journal. A response to that objection is the following: it is also highly likely that there are unethical researchers that have deliberately forwarded their questionable manuscripts to this hijacked journal with the intents of doping their CVs and duping naïve and uninformed tenure and promotion committees' members, research institutions, and funding agencies. As Linacre et al. (2019, p. 217) state, researchers publish in a hijacked journal for two fundamental reasons: (a) they are unaware the journal they have submitted their article to is hijacked, or (b) they are aware, but sadly they have little or no ethical qualms about doing so.

In either of these two cases, the articles published in this hijacked journal were validated by an imaginary peer-review process performed by non-existent (or deceased) review board members. Citing an unvetted and improperly peer-reviewed article that was published in OA in a deceptive and fraudulent journal is like pulling the giant wooden Trojan horse to the bastion and secure place: the scholarly records of the marketing discipline. By citing articles that appeared in a hijacked journal, scholars are inadvertently:

- Legitimizing an illegitimate journal;
- Promoting findings that might be of poor quality, unethical, or even fabricated; and
- Contributing to the dissemination of probably false or erroneous research that can harmfully influence not only science integrity but also policies, decision making, and practices.

## Recommendations

Though the hijacked journal being here investigated is a marketing publication venue, this study can hold broader implications. Citation infiltration is a phenomenon that is likely to not be unique to marketing and it may harm the integrity of any scientific field. Citation infiltration must now be counteracted. Counteracting this phenomenon is the duty of the entire scientific community (including authors, academic librarians, editors, associate editors, reviewers, journals, publishers, and academic associations).

### For authors

In medicine, a discipline severely contaminated by predatory and hijacked journals (Cukier et al., 2020), the *International Committee of Medical Journals Editors* (2019, p. 17) recommends that "[a]uthors should avoid citing articles from predatory or pseudo-journals".

Researchers should not base their research activities on poorly peer-reviewed or even fabricated findings and cite these in the reference lists of their publications. The author's recommendation for every researcher is: read each paper, check its content and source before citing it (read, check, cite). A citation is a tribute and honor that stays forever in the records of a discipline. Researchers should take citing and citations more



seriously. One more piece of advice is that not every journal covered by Google Scholar is legitimate. Google Scholar is not an index like Clarivate Analytics' SSCI or Elsevier's Scopus but rather is a search engine (Halevi et al., 2017).

#### For academic librarians

The phenomenon of citation infiltration could be curbed through awareness campaigns. While academic departments may play a part in awareness campaigns against journal hijacking, academic librarians should lead such campaigns. To raise awareness about hijacked journals and citation infiltration, academic librarians may, for example, organize seminars and workshops aimed at helping faculties and junior researchers in distinguishing genuine from hijacked journals. During these seminars and workshops, librarians should not solely advise researchers to avoid citing hijacked journals but also inform them about the pitfalls of purposely publishing in such fraudulent publication venues. A publication in a hijacked journal is not neutral on a CV or *résumé* but an active demerit that might harm the reputation of an aspiring academician. Confirmed as well as junior researchers should also be encouraged to consult a designated competent librarian for clarifications on suspected hijacked journals (Ifjeh, 2017).

Academic librarians can also work hand in hand with the members of tenure and promotion committees to curtail any confusion. Imagine the case of two candidates for tenure/promotion that have published articles each in a different version of the same journal. The first candidate has published in the authentic journal. The second one has published in the hijacked version of that journal. Imagine now that the members of the tenure and promotion panel are unaware of the existence of the hijacked journal. This fictive yet highly probable scenario will surely result in an unfair decision. Academic librarians are of crucial importance for the proper and fair assessment of academic output.

#### For editors, reviewers, and journals

The COPE advises that reviewers, editors, and journals should “[d]iscourage citation of articles published in fake journals” (COPE, 2019, p. 12). Editors ought to introduce procedures to reduce the risk of citation infiltration. They can begin by alerting their review board members to the need to check the reference lists of the submitted manuscripts scrupulously. New journal submission guidelines must be created. They have to ask prospective authors to assess the cited literature meticulously.

#### For the genuine journal, the academic association it is affiliated with, and its publisher

The legitimate *Journal of Marketing Management* suffers twice from its hijacked version. First, the hijacked journal acts as a parasite preventing the authentic journal from receiving manuscripts that could be of high quality. Second, as this study has shown, the authentic *Journal of Marketing Management* is currently serving as the primary channel for the hijacked version of that journal to validate its articles, and thus its continued existence.

The ongoing editor-in-chief and the editorial team at the authentic *Journal of Marketing Management* have to be doubly vigilant. For example, an article published in 2019 in the genuine journal cited up to four papers published in the hijacked *Journal of Marketing Management* (see Brill et al., 2019, pp. 1428–1430). Another article published in 2020 in the genuine journal has cited up to five papers that appeared in the hijacked journal (see Arruda Filho et al., 2020, p. 146). The acknowledgment section of that article states the following: “We would like to thank the editor [...] for overseeing the process and for his important feedback on the research, as well the three reviewers for their valuable comments, suggestions, and requirements” (Arruda Filho et al., 2020, p. 144). Regrettably, neither the editor-in-chief nor the three peer

reviewers have noticed that this article is replete with references to the counterfeit journal. Is the editor-in-chief of the genuine *Journal of Marketing Management* unaware that the journal he serves has been hijacked? If the answer is a yes, then why he was not informed by the publisher of that journal or the academic association the journal represents? If the answer is a no (i.e., he is aware), the editor-in-chief of the genuine journal must be held accountable.

The genuine *Journal of Marketing Management* should take steps to further distinguish itself from the hijacked journal. This could be done in a collaborative effort between Taylor & Francis and the Academy of Marketing. For example, each published article should include the logo of the Academy of Marketing. Taylor & Francis's webpage for the *Journal of Marketing Management* should state that this journal is the unique official journal of the Academy of Marketing and warn both readers and authors that there is a counterfeit journal that uses the same title. Another suggestion is to choose a country-name domain for [jmmnews.com](http://jmmnews.com) and use .uk instead of .com. Taylor & Francis and the Academy of Marketing have to initiate, urgently, legal actions against the hijacked journal and the person(s) behind it. The infamous predatory publisher OMICS Group Inc. has been ordered to pay over 50.1 million USD to resolve the US Federal Trade Commission charges (Linacre et al., 2019).

#### Limitations and further research directions

While this study provides several original insights, it has some limitations. However, these limitations point out questions that could be the subject of future research. First, this study is based on a single case (i.e., a single Trojan horse). Single-case studies have been characterized as lacking generalizability, being subjective, and biased. However, these limitations are unlikely to have affected the validity and reliability of the findings because this study's objective was not to generalize but to provide anecdotal evidence. Furthermore, anyone can verify the reported evidence by simply reproducing this study. Future research may investigate citations to a larger number of active hijacked journals. But before undertaking such an endeavor, future researchers must initially determine the total number of active hijacked journals since extant lists of hijacked journals are either outdated (see e.g., Dadkhah et al., 2016, pp. 355–360) or now extinct (e.g., Beall's list of hijacked journals). Second, this study investigated and found references to the hijacked journal in 13 SSCI-indexed journals. Future studies may investigate citation infiltration for non-SSCI-indexed journals. Third, this study has used Clarivate Analytics' WoS to investigate citation infiltration. Future research may use other citation sources like Elsevier's Scopus or Google Scholar.

#### Conclusion

The emergence of a single hijacked journal poses several threats and challenges to any discipline or field of inquiry. A hijacked journal that fakes or neglects peer-reviewing pollutes the scholarly record of a discipline with false or fabricated findings.

Journal hijacking imposes two significant menaces on any applied domain of inquiry: The first menace posed by this phenomenon is that not (truly) peer-reviewed manuscripts, published in a fake journal, which are available without a subscription wall to anyone and anywhere become a source of “knowledge” for practitioners (e.g., marketers, managers, and organizational decision-makers). The second menace is that not (really) peer-reviewed articles published in OA in a hijacked journal become a source of “knowledge” for academic researchers who use it to develop new hypotheses, frameworks, models, meta-analyses, and findings that can be used to attack the validity of both previous and future studies (Jalalian, 2014). The phenomena of journal hijacking and citation infiltration should be combated by the entire scholarly community.

## Funding

The author received no financial support for this paper.

## CRedit authorship contribution statement

Salim Moussa: Reviewed the literature; Conceived and designed the analysis; Collected the data; Performed the analysis; Wrote the paper.

## Declaration of competing interest

The author declares no potential conflicts of interest regarding this paper. The author would like to mention that his intent is not to “name and shame” those publication outlets that cited the hijacked journal or their former or ongoing editorial teams. The author has published papers in three of the citing journals. The author wants to add that he is not using this study or its results as retribution to any of those journals that rejected his manuscripts, the genuine *Journal of Marketing Management* included.

## References

- Abalkina, A. (2021). Detecting a network of hijacked journals by its archive. arXiv preprint. <https://arxiv.org/ftp/arxiv/papers/2101/2101.01224.pdf>.
- Arruda Filho, E. J. M., Simões, J. D. S., & De Muijder, C. F. (2020). The low effect of perceived risk in the relation between hedonic values and purchase intention. *Journal of Marketing Management*, 36(1–2), 128–148.
- Asadi, A., Rahbar, N., Asadi, M., Asadi, F., & Paji, K. K. (2017). Online-based approaches to identify real journals and publishers from hijacked ones. *Science and Engineering Ethics*, 23(1), 305–308.
- Beall, J. (2017). What I learned from predatory publishers. *Biochemia Medica*, 27(2), 273–278.
- Bohannon, J. (2013). Who's afraid of peer review? *Science*, 342(6154), 60–65.
- Brill, T. M., Munoz, L., & Miller, R. J. (2019). Siri, Alexa, and other digital assistants: A study of customer satisfaction with artificial intelligence applications. *Journal of Marketing Management*, 35(15–16), 1401–1436.
- Burress, T., Mann, E., & Neville, T. (2020). Exploring data literacy via a librarian-faculty learning community: A case study. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 46(1), 102076. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acalib.2019.102076>
- Chartered Association of Business Schools. (2018). Academic journal guide 2018. Retrieved from <https://charteredabs.org/academic-journal-guide-2018/>. (Accessed 28 January 2021).
- Committee on Publication Ethics. (2019). *Predatory publishing. Discussion document*. <https://doi.org/10.24318/cope.2019.3.6>
- Cukier, S., Helal, L., Rice, D. B., Pupkaite, J., Ahmadzai, N., Wilson, M., et al. (2020). Checklists to detect potential predatory biomedical journals: A systematic review. *BMC Medicine*, 18, 104. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12916-020-01566-1>
- Dadkhah, M., & Maliszewski, T. (2015). Hijacked journals—threats and challenges to countries' scientific ranking. *International Journal of Technology Enhanced Learning*, 7(3), 281–288.
- Dadkhah, M., Maliszewski, T., & Teixeira da Silva, J. A. (2016). Hijacked journals, hijacked web-sites, journal phishing, misleading metrics, and predatory publishing: Actual and potential threats to academic integrity and publishing ethics. *Forensic Science, Medicine, and Pathology*, 12(3), 353–362.
- Dell'Anno, R., Caferra, R., & Morone, A. (2020). A “Trojan horse” in the peer-review process of fee-charging economic journals. *Journal of Informetrics*, 14(3), 101052. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joi.2020.101052>
- Grudniewicz, A., Moher, D., Cobey, K. D., Bryson, G. L., Cukier, S., Allen, K., et al. (2019). Predatory journals: No definition, no defence. *Nature*, 576, 210–212. <https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-019-03759-y>
- Halevi, G., Moed, H., & Bar-Ilan, J. (2017). Suitability of Google Scholar as a source of scientific information and as a source of data for scientific evaluation—Review of the literature. *Journal of Informetrics*, 11(3), 823–834.
- Ifijeh, G. (2017). Emergence of predatory publishing in library and information science: Issues and implications for scholarship among academic librarians in Nigeria. *Bilgi Dünyası*, 18(1), 149–161.
- International Committee of Medical Journals Editors (2019). Recommendations for the conduct, reporting, editing, and publication of scholarly work in medical journals. Retrieved from <http://www.icmje.org/recommendations/> (Accessed January 28, 2021).
- Jalalian, M. (2014). Hijacked journals are attacking the reliability and validity of medical research. *Electronic Physician*, 6(4), 925.
- Jalalian, M., & Mahboobi, H. (2014). Hijacked journals and predatory publishers: Is there a need to re-think how to assess the quality of academic research? *Walailak Journal of Science and Technology*, 11(5), 389–394.
- Khoo, S. (2019). Article processing charge hyperinflation and price insensitivity: An open access sequel to the serials crisis. *LIBER Quarterly*, 29(1), 1–18.
- Koerber, A., Starkey, J. C., Ardon-Dryer, K., Cummins, R. G., Eko, L., & Kee, K. F. (2020). A qualitative content analysis of watchlists vs safelists: How do they address the issue of predatory publishing? *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 46(6), 102236. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acalib.2020.102236>
- Krawczyk, F., & Kulczycki, E. (2020). How is open access accused of being predatory? The impact of Beall's lists of predatory journals on academic publishing. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 46(3), 102271. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acalib.2020.102271>
- Linacre, S., Bisaccio, M., & Earle, L. (2019). Publishing in an environment of predation: The many things you really wanted to know, but did not know how to ask. *Journal of Business-to-Business Marketing*, 26(2), 217–228.
- Memon, A. R. (2018). Predatory journals spamming for publications: What should researchers do? *Science and Engineering Ethics*, 24(5), 1617–1639.
- Menon, V. G., & Khosravi, M. R. (2019). Preventing hijacked research papers in fake (rogue) journals through social media and databases. *Library Hi Tech News*, 36(5), 1–6.
- Moussa, S. (2019). Is Microsoft academic a viable citation source for ranking marketing journals? *Aslib Journal of Information Management*, 71(5), 569–582.
- Moussa, S. (2021). Citation contagion: A citation analysis of selected predatory marketing journals. *Scientometrics*, 126(1), 485–506.
- Moussa, S., & Linacre, S. (2020). Guest post: A look at citation activity of predatory marketing journals. The Source. Retrieved from <https://blog.cabells.com/2020/11/18/guest-post-a-look-at-citation-activity-of-predatory-marketing-journals/> (Accessed January 22, 2021).
- Namaganda, A. (2020). Continuing professional development as transformational learning: A case study. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 46(3), 102152. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acalib.2020.102152>
- Ridder, H. G. (2017). The theory contribution of case study research designs. *Business Research*, 10(2), 281–305.
- Sorokowski, P., Kulczycki, E., Sorokowska, A., & Pisanski, K. (2017). Predatory journals recruit fake editor. *Nature News*, 543(7646), 481–483.
- Strielkowski, W. (2017). Predatory journals: Beall's list is missed. *Nature*, 544(7651), 416.
- Widdersheim, M. M. (2018). Historical case study: A research strategy for diachronic analysis. *Library & Information Science Research*, 40(2), 144–152.

Salim Moussa is an Assistant Professor in Marketing at the Higher Institute of Applied Studies in Humanities, University of Gafsa, Tunisia. He holds a Ph.D. in Management Sciences with a focus on marketing from the University of Tunis, Tunisia. His current research interests include scientometrics, marketing journals, and marketing analytics. Salim has hitherto published in the *Journal of Informetrics*, *Scientometrics*, *Aslib Journal of Information Management*, *Journal of Brand Management*, *Journal of Consumer Behaviour*, *Marketing Intelligence & Planning*, *International Journal of Consumer Studies*, and *International Journal of Market Research*.