

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,...) ↓↓ |
| ↑ Displays 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 ↓↓↓↓ |
| CONTENT | | | CONTENT |
| | | -2 | Confusing ↓↓ |
| ↑ Impartial or Objective | +1 | -3 | Grammatical errors/typos ↓↓↓ |
| ↑↑ Balanced arguments (multiple perspectives) | +1 | -5 | No quotations, no citation ↓↓↓↓ |
| ↑↑ Verifiable facts and data | +2 | -2 | Few or weak citations ↓↓ |
| ↑ Logical reasoning | +1 | -1 | Outdated, superceded by newer editions ↓ |
| ↑ Well written (clear, without errors) | +1 | -1 | Natural science, medicine : not in English ↓ |
| ↑ Bibliography : many accurate citations | +1 | -5 | Retracted ↓↓↓↓ |
| ↑ Bibliography : excellent sources | +2 | -3 | Generalizations or radical statements ↓↓↓ |
| ↑ At least 10 pages | +1 | -3 | Conclusion is forced, lacks nuance, unyielding ↓↓↓ |
| ↑ Abstract faithful to the content | +1 | -5 | <i>Fringe science</i> , pseudo-science, para-sciences [isolated research community] ↓↓↓↓ |
| ↑↑ Methodology explained | +2 | | |
| ↑↑ Conclusion is nuanced and contextualized | +2 | | |
| ↑ Challenges what you already know | +1 | -1...-5 | SPECIAL MALUS : an identified element (author, publisher,...) already belongs to your blacklist ↓... |
| + ____ - ____ = ____ | | | |