

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 ↓↓↓↓
↑↑ Tenured professor (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	+1	-2	Dubious university (not accredited, for profit,...) ↓↓
↑ Display conflicts of interest	+1	-3	Academic misconduct (<i>PubPeer</i> ...) ↓↓↓
		-1	Journalist or university press release ↓
PUBLISHING PROCESS			PUBLISHING PROCESS
↑↑ Article: on <i>Web of Science</i>	+2	-1	Author never cites or quotes ↓
↑↑↑ Peer-reviewed article (verified with <i>Ulrich</i>)	+3	-1	Author not cited anywhere ↓
↑↑ Book: university press or scholarly society	+2	-1	Book: publisher of theses ↓
↑ Institutional Review Board approval or grant	+1	-1	Book: <i>vanity publishing</i> ↓
↑↑ Cited often by others	+2	-1	Book: <i>rogue publishers</i> ↓
↑↑ Replicated study	+2	-1	No editor ↓
↑↑↑↑ Meta analysis or systematic review	+5	-5	Article: predatory journal ↓↓↓↓
↑ Preregistered study	+1	-3	Newspaper or popular magazine ↓↓↓
↑ Open access to the research data	+1	-5	Information ONLY found on social media ↓↓↓↓
		-0	Not in open access (paywalled) : to discuss
CONTENT			CONTENU
↑ Impartial or Objective	+1	-2	Confusing ↓↓
↑↑ Balanced arguments (multiple perspectives)	+1	-3	Grammatical errors/typos ↓↓↓
↑↑ Verifiable facts and data	+2	-5	No quotations, no citation ↓↓↓↓
↑ Logical reasoning	+1	-2	Few or weak citations ↓↓
↑ Well written (clear, without errors)	+1	-1	Outdated, superceded by newer editions ↓
↑ Bibliography : many accurate citations	+1	-1	Natural science, medecine : not in English ↓
↑ Bibliography : excellent sources	+2	-5	Retracted ↓↓↓↓
↑ At least 10 pages	+1	-3	Generalizations or radical statements ↓↓↓
↑ Abstract faithful to the content	+1	-3	Conclusion is forced, lacks nuance, unyielding ↓↓↓
↑↑ Methodology explained	+2	-5	<i>Fringe science</i> , pseudo-science, para-sciences [isolated research community] ↓↓↓↓
↑↑ Conclusion is nuanced and contextualized	+2	-1...-5	SPECIAL MALUS : an identified element (author, publisher,...) already belongs to your blacklist ↓...
↑ Challenges what you already know	+1		
	+ ___ - ___ =		