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Title: Why do researchers publish in predatory journals?

The title indicates that the researchers have determined the reasons. This question is best answered through interpretative (qualitative) approaches. The method used is a survey of about 7 counts out of 13. However, the reasons for selecting these 7 out of the 13 are not made clear.

Background: The background refers to predatory journals, and there is sufficient information in the public domain about their existence and their definition. However, from the writing, it is not clear what definition the authors have used in this paper. The authors have not referred to the extensive literature that is available in this context.

The response rate is 9 percent. It would have been useful if the authors provided some justification for the low level of response rate- through citations of other email surveys or the like.

Methods:

The authors say that they surveyed 1270 authors, and received responses from 114. However, they have not defined these authors. Were they first authors or corresponding authors? The author profile has not described and this is an essential component that is missed to take a call on selection bias if any in the response pattern.

The authors have not justified the link between the 7 questions and knowledge of predatory journals through analytical means. The possible set of questions based on table 3 does not indicate that authors were aware of the ethical implications of predatory journals or otherwise. It is also possible that the understanding of predatory journals is the same among those who did not publish.

Results:

The authors state that ‘Lack of awareness’ was defined as “if they self reported lack of awareness or if they had failed in the test” ; did all those who reported “they were aware” pass the test? If yes, that needs to be clarified in the results section. The answer is in the table but has not been discussed in the results. The outcome variable which is key to the discussion, has not been discussed in detail.

They mention that they have used logistic regression analysis. But it seems like they computed odds using one independent variable regressed against the dependent variable. In that case, this should be clearly stated. However, in case the authors have built a multivariate model, the available sample size is inadequate for such analysis.

For these reasons we are unable to consider the submission for publication.