







Cicero Cena, Daniel A. Gonçalves, Giuseppe A. Câmara [1] continue:

One last aspect deserves a brief comment: publishers like MDPI enable young researchers to be guest editors for special volumes. This policy minimizes the comparative advantages that well-established graduate programs had until recently in the evaluation cycles promoted by CAPES.

A colleague once reflected that “The dominant force will always resist the emerging one... even though both have problems, the more powerful ones can shape the narrative that suits them... but that’s the game... and the emerging publishers have to respond to this debate.”

This essay does not aim to exhaust the subject, and we acknowledge that there is still much to be considered on the topic. Our reflections are primarily a call to action for the scientific community to engage in a comprehensive and nuanced debate on the complex issues surrounding scientific publishing. Certainly, we can devise smarter solutions for the current model, but we will not do so without a broad debate, where the arguments of various stakeholders are considered. It is time to debate policy decisions based on evidence, considering the diverse interests and perspectives within the scientific ecosystem, rather than in “hallway conversation”.

## 2 Like MDPI and Frontiers several other victims of the Black Lists of the fake Blogs exist

Like MDPI and Frontiers several other victims of the Black Lists of the fake Blogs exist!

Other victims fake Blogs in the past were American Scientific Publishers, Bentham, Benthamopen, WSEAS, IASTED, NAUN, IAENG, ACTA PRESS....

The Publishers American Scientific Publishers, Bentham, Benthamopen, WSEAS, IASTED, NAUN, IAENG, ACTA PRESS were added in the these blogs maliciously and ill-intentioned. We have tested the Publishers: WSEAS, IASTED, NAUN, IAENG, ACTA PRESS, American Scientific Publishers, Bentham, Benthamopen. These publishers are important academic publishers with real peer review and they do not have any relation with "predatory" Scam Machines. See [2], [3], [4], [5], [6], [7].

## References:

- [1] Cicero Cena, Daniel A. Gonçalves, Giuseppe A. Câmara, Should I Buy the Current Narrative about Predatory Journals? Facts and Insights from the Brazilian Scenario, Publications (MDPI), 2024, 12, 7
- [2] Mihiretu Kebede, Anna E. Schmaus-Klughammer and Brook Tesfaye Tekle, Manuscript Submission Invitations from ‘Predatory Journals’: What Should Authors Do?, The Korean Academy of Medical Science, Volume 31, Number 5, May 2017, pp 709-712.
- [3] Kyle Siler, There is no black and white definition of predatory publishing <https://blogs.lse.ac.uk/impactofsocialsciences/2020/05/13/there-is-no-black-and-white-definition-of-predatory-publishing/> May 13th, 2020
- [4] Nikos Bardis, Lambros Ekonomou, Pierre Borne, Klimis Ntalianis, Paolo Mercorelli, Michael N. Katehakis, Nikos Kintzios, Cornelia Aida Bulucea and Maria Isabella Garcia Planas, Business and Economics: Metrics and Peer Review in the journal: “WSEAS Transactions on Business and Economics”, Journal of Physics: Conference Series doi:10.1088/1742-596/1564/1/012025 <https://iopscience.iop.org/article/10.1088/1742-596/1564/1/012025/pdf>
- [5] Papers rejected from WSEAS, but accepted in IEEE, Springer, Hindawi, Elsevier, MDPI in recent years: <http://wseas.org/multimedia/journals/rejected-from-wseas-published-in-ieee-springer-elsevier-etc.zip>
- [6] Quality Control of WSEAS Journals, <https://wseas.com/qualitycontrol.php>
- [7] Megan O'Donnell, Understanding Predatory Publishers <https://instr.iastate.libguides.com/predatory/id>