

Should I use this source in my paper?

The « Bullshit-o-meter »

Circle and calculate the potential hogwash of the source

Brings <u>value</u> to the source	↑	↓	Raises <u>doubt</u> about the source
AUTHOR			AUTHOR
↑ Professor	+1	-5	Anonymous or pseudonym ↓↓↓↓↓
↑↑ Professor's title (and/or department chair, head of laboratory, ...)	+2	-3	Subject outside author's expertise ↓↓↓
↑ From an esteemed or highly rated university	+2	(-1..)	Other dubious publications (↓)
↑↑ Has affiliations to institutes	+2	-2	Dubious university (not accredited, for profit,...) ↓↓
		-3	Academic misconduct (<i>PubPeer</i> ...) ↓↓↓
		-1..	Journalist ↓ or university press release
PUBLISHER			PUBLISHER
↑↑ Article: on <i>Web of Science</i>	+2		
↑ Article: on <i>Scopus</i>	+1	-1	Publisher never cites or quotes ↓
↑↑↑ Article: on <i>Ulrich</i> <u>with</u> peer review	+3	-1	Author never cites or quotes ↓
↑↑ Book: university press or scholarly society	+2	-1	Book: publisher of theses ↓
↑ Institutional Review Board approval or grant	+1	-1	Book: vanity publishing ↓
		-1	Book: <i>rogue publishers</i> ↓
		-1	No publisher ↓
CONTENT			
↑ Impartial or Objective	+1	-5	Article: predatory journal ↓↓↓↓↓
↑↑ Balanced arguments (multiple perspectives)	+1	-3	Newspaper or popular magazine ↓↓↓
↑↑ Verifiable facts and data	+2	-5	Information ONLY found on social media ↓↓↓↓↓
↑ Logical reasoning	+1		
↑ Well written (clear, without errors)	+1	-2	Confusing ↓↓
↑ Bibliography : many accurate citations	+1	-3	Grammatical errors/typos ↓↓↓
↑ Bibliography : excellent sources	+2	-5	No quotations ↓↓↓↓↓
↑ At least 10 pages	+1	-2	Few or weak citations ↓↓
↑ Table of Contents	+1	-1	Outdated, superceded by newer editions ↓
↑↑ Methodology explained	+2	-5	Retracted ↓↓↓↓↓
↑↑ Conclusion is nuanced and contextualized	+2	-3	Generalizations or radical statements ↓↓↓
↑ Challenges what you already know	+1	-3	Conclusion is forced, lacks nuance, unyielding ↓↓↓
↑↑ Cited often by others	+2	-5..	Fringe science, pseudo-science, para-sciences [isolated research community] ↓↓↓↓↓ &+
	=		