

Characteristics of Solicitation Emails from Presumed Predatory Journals and Lessons to Be Learned When You Attempt to Recruit Authors



By Jason Roberts, PhD 

Senior Partner
Origin Editorial

The Problem and Why Legitimate Journals Need to Pay Attention

The term “predatory journal” is ubiquitous in both academic and publishing circles, though definitions of what constitutes a so-called predatory journal still remain somewhat opaque. Attempts have been made to characterize common elements of what appear to be predatory journals,¹ and recently a consensus statement was published to try and define predatory journals to help better understand the threats they pose,² but many definitions fall under “I know it when I see it” or rely on a reflexive reach back to whatever Jeffrey Beall said. In a previous *EON* article, I noted several reasons to be cautious about using Beall’s List (which can still be found in various guises if you look), the primary one being no criteria was ever really published that explained the methodology for inclusion on the list.³ The danger, as has been pointed out, is that swept up into broad definitions of what a predatory journal looks like are perfectly legitimate journals that exist beyond the publishing hubs of North America and Europe. Many such journals are commonplace and quite possibly accepted as places to publish, particularly for authors shut out of, or marginalized from, the Western-dominated publishing industry. Such journals often operate on shoestring budgets and cannot deliver sophisticated publishing platforms, industry-standard archiving,

or an online submission system. Therefore, in approaching writing this article there is no assumption on the motives (honest attempt vs. corrupt cash grab) of the journals studied.

The purpose of this article is ultimately to go beyond a description of the characteristics of emails from presumed predatory journals, many of which are delivered straight to the spam folder. The intent is to make honest, legitimate, regular journals (call them what you will) recognize what not to do when writing to potential authors as part of a campaign to solicit submissions. Before those familiar with receiving such emails, or those that know your author base is being inundated with such dubious requests, react by saying such emails are obviously fake or “clearly my journal would do better,” it is important to understand the inspiration for the article. In the space of five days in mid-2020 I received two solicitation emails from two large, non-subject specific open-access journals, both published by well-known international publishers that bore a remarkable number of shared characteristics with the solicitation emails from presumed predatory publishers. Frankly, being stunned that either an editorial office or marketing department could conjure up something so obviously poor quality and quite possibly counter-productive (why would I submit here if this is how they present themselves?), it seemed that it could be a useful, instructive exercise to point out what not to do. Journals, especially those that are still establishing themselves, rely a lot on solicitation campaigns. That job is now much harder thanks to the prevalence of emails from presumed predatory journals. Therefore, legitimate journals need to be very careful in constructing solicitation emails that will be effective and not end up resembling the obviously ‘spamable’ efforts of so-called predatory journals. Also, before reading on, please situate yourself in the world. Understand that what clearly looks bogus to you might look perfectly normal in

parts of the world where you do not live. Also, you may have been exposed to years' worth of such missives. For inexperienced authors, desperate to get a foothold in the published literature, these bogus entreaties may appear perfectly valid.

Methods

A total of 47 unique journal emails were received in my personal email account between July 1, 2020, and August 31, 2020 (during that period several of these journals emailed more than once). No emails were excluded from the study other than those that were duplicate postings. In February 2020, before systematically studying the characteristics of the emails, a 48-point study checklist was derived. Twenty-four of those study criteria have been reported in this study (see Table 1 - Results). Determination of the study criteria was done ahead of surveying the emails to somewhat mitigate against bias and to avoid reporting secondary outcomes once the systematic review of the emails was under way. The criteria for study was based on the common elements of what might appear in an article solicitation email from a legitimate journal with three exceptions, which were based on personal familiarity with spam emails from presumed predatory journals:

- Unusual naming conventions of the person sending the email
- Salutations that garbled the name of the recipient
- The naming of an Impact Factor metric that was non-standard and certainly not the official Impact Factor or an increasingly accepted alternative metric such as, for example, Elsevier's CiteScore.

Though none were included in this study because of the date parameters set, some previous solicitation emails have contained references, either general or specific, to previously published work of this author. My personal favorite was an email from a predatory journal praising me for an editorial I wrote in the *Journal of Sexual Medicine* entitled "Predatory Journals: Illegitimate Publishing and Its Threat to All Readers and Authors!"⁴ This suggests that some "publishers" may be tracking research output and text-mining the email addresses of corresponding authors. Interestingly, as outlined in Appendix A, amongst all the fields of study, rehabilitation medicine was preeminent. In 2014, I published an article discussing reporting standards in rehabilitation medicine journals.⁵ The article was republished by over 30 other journals in the field participating in a drive to improve the quality of scientific

reporting and is likely the reason why I am now regularly targeted by rehabilitation medicine predatory journals. See Appendix A for details of all the subject areas covered by the solicitation emails.

Finally, this author, using the criteria that were finalized before the first email was studied, reviewed each solicitation email. Not having the same criteria crosschecked by a second, independent assessor is a limitation of what, in essence, is already a limited study sample (my email inbox).

Results

If they do not first end up caught by the spam filter, email solicitations from predatory journals can be spotted both by their frequency and, at least for more seasoned observers, by a number of shared characteristics which shall be discussed here. This latter point, however, is worth dwelling on. Through my lens as a peer-review manager and author, I am familiar with what should constitute acceptable email communication practices. I also have only lived and worked in European and North American contexts, which is where the overwhelming majority of legitimate journals are published. Therefore, in my narrow worldview, I am familiar with the communication practices of the major international publishers and they seem like the *norm* for me. Perhaps many of the observations here are not obvious to inexperienced or fledgling authors or are even perfectly acceptable ways of presenting information in some cultural contexts. Therefore, my reporting of criteria is precisely that and nothing more: *observational reports* with no judgment on the sender. Clearly a weakness of this study is that I do not compare similar emails from legitimate journals. However, authors uncertain of the veracity of a journal should know that many elements of emails from seemingly predatory journals are simply not typical characteristics of emails dispatched by legitimate journals and, therefore, very likely represent potential indicators of so-called predatory journals. But, again, we must always be sensitive to the fact that some communication formatting may be appropriate to certain audiences and just because a journal, for example, uses an excessive number of exclamation points or over does the bold type, does not necessarily mean the journal *must* be predatory. One cannot discount that one or more of the journals soliciting my work may well be an earnest publishing effort communicating in a manner that is, perhaps, acceptable in some contexts.

Table 1 outlines the criteria studied. Broadly speaking this study aimed to look for patterns in claims legitimizing the journal, the language used, formatting, information on peer

Table 1. Results

| Study Criteria | Number | Percentage | Notes |
|--|------------------------------|------------|--|
| Number of unique publishers | 29 | | |
| Average length of submission deadline | 16.27 days (range 5-44 days) | | 33 journals expressed a deadline |
| No mention of publication date | 39/47 | 82.98% | |
| Average length to publication date | 26 days (range 14-52 days) | | 8 journals expressed a publication deadline |
| No mention of deadline | 14 | 29.79% | |
| Fields of study | 29 (+ 1 unclear) | | See Appendix A for information on the fields of study |
| Number of unique emails | 47 | | |
| ISSN mentioned | 23 | 48.94% | |
| Impact Factor claimed | 8 | 17.02% | 4 did not specify the Impact Factor provider. See Appendix B for list of Impact Factor Providers |
| Claimed to be indexed | 5 | 10.64% | |
| My name written backwards | 4 | 8.51% | |
| Article type requested | 29 | 61.70% | |
| Publication fee mentioned | 7 | 14.89% | Only 1 journal stated the charge (100 Euros) |
| Journal website referenced in email | 18 | 38.30% | |
| Mention of a peer-review process | 9 | 19.15% | |
| Submission via emailing manuscript to editorial office | 33 | 70.21% | Only 1 journal appeared to have a submission system |
| Submission via a simple webform | 11 | 27.66% | 2 journals made no mention of how to submit |
| Poor grammar/syntax, unconventional language choice | 41 | 87.23% | |
| Spelling errors | 5 | 10.64% | |
| Use of journal logo | 0 | 0.00% | |
| Inclusion of article in a special issue | 3 | 6.38% | |
| Inclusion of article in next issue | 29 | 61.70% | |
| Email signed by Editor-in-Chief | 6 | 12.77% | 5 further journals included a name but no role |
| Email signed by editorial office individual | 36 | 76.60% | In 2 instances an editorial office person and Editor-in-Chief signed the email; 5 further journals included a name but no role |
| Individual signing email has an English first name for a last name | 18 | 38.30% | |
| No location for the editorial office identified | 29 | 61.70% | 13 of 18 emails identifying a location placed the editorial office in the USA |

review and publishing, and any information provided about the editorial office and/or the submission process.

Legitimization Tactics

Perhaps the most worrisome concern studied was the claims of legitimacy that are clearly intended to persuade unsure authors. Such claims are easily verifiable or refutable with a bit of work because the indexes referenced are themselves also known to be bogus. Though I want to stick to my promise to not pass judgment, such practices when proven to be deceptive or misleading, clearly differentiate “journals” that are truly predatory from those titles often lumped in with predatory journals but are honest efforts. Shamseer et al¹ determined that possession of an “Impact Factor” that was not the official scientometric currently provided by Clarivate was a giveaway of a potentially predatory journal. There are several metrics commonly used by predatory journals that are themselves either known to be fake, do not provide any data or methodology to back up scores (thus have no credibility), or simply have no standing in the legitimate publishing world. For legal reasons they will not be identified in this article. However, concerns regarding the use of citation metrics were not conclusively proven in the small sample size of data here with only eight journals (17.04%, 8/47) promoting any kind of “Impact Factor.” Four journals did not specify the source of the “Impact Factor.” The remaining four listed sources that were not either the Clarivate Impact Factor or increasingly used alternatives from known legitimate sources (such as CiteScore). An interesting quirk is that five of the eight journals, provided their “Impact Factor” score with two digits after the decimal point. Typically, the method of displaying an Impact Factor is either three digits after the decimal (e.g., 1.645) or a single digit without a decimal point (i.e., “the journal holds an Impact Factor of 9”). In short, how information is presented regarding an Impact Factor may well be a clue indicating the nature of the journal.

Perhaps mindful of avoiding allegations of fraud, only five journals indicated they were “indexed.” Typically one would take that to mean within PubMed or PubMed Central, for instance for medical journals or, more generally within the Directory of Open Access Journals for open-access journals of all stripes. All five journals blended their claims of being indexed by listing well-known fake sources, or sources with zero credibility (again examples from either category will not be identified in this article), with a legitimate source. However, some of these “sources” simply scan the internet rather than operate a gate-keeper function as to whether the source is included in a listing (e.g., Google Scholar). Three of

the five journals were medical journals but, tellingly, made no mention of PubMed.

The most prevalent of claims, found in roughly half of all the unique emails received (48.9%, 23/47), was the promotion of an ISSN. Using the ISSN portal to investigate, 21 of 23 journal ISSNs were found. One ISSN was recycled by another predatory journal in the study despite being from a different “publisher” — or different brand name at least. Only one ISSN could not be found. So, on the face of it, maybe possession of an ISSN is some sign of legitimacy? If we are charitable, perhaps some titles are attempting steps to be legitimate. More cynically, maybe they are just deploying more sophisticated efforts to seem legitimate. Furthermore, does this finding maybe suggest that there are some issues in the awarding of ISSNs? The country the publisher is in, unless that country does not have its own office, awards ISSNs. No obvious conclusion could be made about the location of the awarding offices: Thirteen cases came from the USA, six from the United Kingdom, and one each from Spain and India.

So, *prima facie*, the data does not suggest presumed predatory journals are being brazenly misleading with claims of publishing legitimacy, at least to any large extent. However, one final thought on this topic: Do legitimate journals when they engage in marketing or solicitation efforts make a big deal of their ISSN? Typically no. Something similar is probably true when stating an Impact Factor: Journals typically just state their Impact Factor rather than name the source, though this behavior may now change as other metrics are gaining credence. Perhaps, one could conclude that by drawing attention to these signs of legitimacy they are, in fact, demonstrating the very opposite: that they are not all that they claim to be. It is doubtful they could be convicted of fraudulent claims in that regard, but their very clumsy attempts to blend in with legitimate journals are what make them stand out.

Use of language

Without any doubt the language used is the most obvious giveaway that the soliciting journal is, at best, a poor facsimile of a proper, well-run journal or, at worst, a fake journal. Problematically, though these are obvious signs to native English-speakers immersed in Western-based publishing cultures such as this author, they may not be so evident to researchers who do not fit that description. Such emails may suggest either computer-generated origins untouched by human hands or a failed attempt at using a translation tool, but others, presumably, have been written by someone with either poor English skills or an individual simply not versed in

typical (read Western-centric) communication standards used by legitimate journals. Neither action, of course, is a crime, but it is, perhaps, eyebrow-raising when the source of the journal purports to be from countries such as the United States or the United Kingdom. If nothing else in such instances, if these truly are legitimate journals, such poor presentation should leave the reader worried about the quality of staff these “publishers” hire and, therefore, what treatment they might expect their paper to receive. Typical clues were poor syntax and grammar/erroneous word choices/misused idiomatic expressions. From the sample population, 41 (87.23%, 41/47) unique emails fell into this category. Interestingly, the occurrence of emails containing spelling errors was much lower at 10.65% (5/47 emails). Though not studied here because it is impossible to prove anything, it was noted that many of the sample emails contained an excessive, and certainly often inappropriate, use of exclamation points.

Formatting

Formatting choices, like language choice, is another nebulous category of study. It is not a fraudulent claim, and the observation and response is utterly reader-dependent. But, once again, patterns can clearly be detected. The most obvious criterion, which I had not planned to study, but ended up discovering as a very clear secondary outcome that I shall disclose here: Every single email contained bold text gratuitously, starting with highlighting a personal salutation (e.g., **Greetings!!!!, I hope you are well in these tough times!**). Seventeen (36%, 17/47) of the emails placed my name in bold type. Almost all other emails that were not addressed to me directly bolded a generic salutation. Another observation was the text highlighted was rarely used to emphasize the point, or at least the most important point in an email.

Interestingly, not a single journal provided a logo either of the journal itself or the publisher and perhaps represents one of the clearest distinguishing signs from legitimate journals, or at least, from efforts dispatched by a legitimate publisher.

There were two other criteria I did not assess but probably have equal importance to those reported above. The first was a request to allow a read-response when an email was opened. It was impossible to note retrospectively (this author always declined the option to acknowledge receipt) when this had happened. The second, as mentioned previously because it was too subjective, was some of the bizarre personal greetings. One of the most over-the-top was “Greetings Esteemed Professor.”

Information on Peer Review and Publication

Genuine, verifiable, information on peer review is hard to fake. It is certainly easy to say a journal conducts peer review (though only nine did so in passing in this study by literally doing nothing more than mentioning they undertook peer review). Conversely, it is equally easy to expose either the illegitimacy or absolute inauthenticity of peer review if the time to publish an article is especially rapid. Eight journals (17.02%, 8/47) mentioned a publication deadline with a mean time to publication of 26 days (range 14-52 days) from the date the solicitation email was sent.

More commonplace across the journal’s surveyed was short deadlines for submission in a bid, no doubt to engender a fear of missing out. Of the surveyed journals, 70.21% (33/47) referenced a deadline with a mean time to deadline of 16 days. Twenty-nine of the 33 journals (87.87%) setting deadlines were to “ensure publication in the next issue.” Three of the 33 journals (9%) referenced a special issue as the reason for a deadline while one email did not make it clear why authors had to rush their submission.

Surprisingly, the journals sampled were rather coy regarding Article Processing Charges (APCs). Only seven journals (14.89%, 7/47) mentioned a fee and only one journal stated the fee amount in the solicitation email (it was for 100 Euros). Two offered discounts on the unstated APC amount if a submission was received by a given date. Two journals mentioned that there would be no “publication fee” but processing and DOI charges (whatever that may be) were to be applied. Obviously, this represents a meaningless promise. A fee is a fee.

Only 18 (38.30%, 18/47) referenced a journal homepage, which would be a typical behavior of a regular legitimate journal. Not that a visit to any of these pages would prove illuminating with most simply repeating the email text with entreaties for every possible type of paper on every combination of subject matter, promises of rapid publication and peer review, and maybe an editorial board listing that may or may not be real.

Editorial Office and Submission Process

Without doubt, two of the most evident characteristics observed were the lack of transparency regarding the real identity of the email sender and the clear lack of a submission process. The former is certainly illuminating, while with the latter, one could at least account for the possibility that the journal does not possess the resources to fund a manuscript management system.

Only six (12.77%, 6/47) journals were signed by an Editor-in-Chief. None identified where the Editor-in-Chief was located. One Editor-in-Chief appeared to be the lead Editor of two other journals (both suspiciously fitting the classical description of a predatory journal) as well as being on the editorial board of three other seemingly predatory publishers' journals. A Google search of the listed institution for this individual revealed no one bearing that name at the institution. Perhaps a case of predatory journals preying on each other's fake editors! A second Editor-in-Chief was found by a simple Google search and, again, appeared to be working another predatory journal as a side-gig. Both he, and the third traceable Editor-in-Chief made no mention of the journal they were associated with on their institutional profile pages. All of which proves nothing but suggests an awful lot.

A total of 36 (76.60%, 36/47) journals identified a member of the editorial office (typically the Managing Editor), and this provided one of the most bizarre study results. With all but two exceptions every name seems to have been output from an Anglo-Saxon random name generator. No German names. No French, Spanish, or Italian. No Chinese, Indian, Japanese, Korean, African of any description, and so on. If we believe what we are told, we know that at least 17 of these journals were based in either the United Kingdom or USA (Switzerland and Italy additionally contributed one each, the rest did not disclose their location). Even in these Anglo-phone countries, especially the United States, that does seem suspiciously coincidental that the names were all derived from Britain or Ireland. On top of that, it was noted that 18 (50%) of the 36 emails signed by an identifiable Managing Editor featured a person with an English-language first name as a last name (e.g., Fred Thomas, Peter Mathew). Such a naming convention is not unusual but equally its prevalence rate is most certainly not 50%, at least in the countries these journal purport to be from.

Of course, a quick bit of internet sleuthing can reveal the truth about a supposed Editor-in-Chief. Unfortunately, to the non-Anglophone, the almost certainly made up names of the editorial staff is probably not something that is evident.

Finally, a common trait of the email solicitations is that 33 (70.21%, 33/47) of journals sampled simply asked for a manuscript to be emailed to the editorial office. Nine journals directed people to use a simple web form to record address details and upload a Word file, while one publication appeared to have a rudimentary submission system of an undetermined origin. The remaining four journals made no mention of how to submit a paper. None of the 47 emails referenced a set of author guidelines, though they may have existed.

What Lessons Can Be Learned?

Obviously the intent of this article is not to provide a roadmap for predatory journals to better blend in, but make no mistake, one of the reasons why predatory journals have proliferated and thrived is because regular journals, themselves, often communicate poorly. So, what should legitimate or reliable journals be conscious of when writing to solicit content?

1. Personalize the request for content if the email is not a general call for papers e-blast. Steps in that regard involve: Include the recipient's name in the email, identify previously published work that shows you are aware of their publishing record (though make sure what you reference is relevant), and outline in detail both the subject matter and the type of article you wish to receive from the recipient rather than list every single possible article format from systematic reviews to "two-page opinion pieces" on any subject ever conceived, which was a common request from predatory journals.
2. Without question, every single article solicitation communication with a prospective author should be signed by the Editor-in-Chief or Editorial Board member of that journal or, though this is less ideal, the Managing Editor of the journal. The Editor should not only include their name and identification as Editor-in-Chief, but also, preferably, identify their institution. Furthermore, the Editor-in-Chief, unless they have good reason not to, should identify on their institution-based profile page that they are the Editor of a particular journal. A common tactic of presumed predatory journals is to sometimes identify editorial board members that are a blend of the impossible to find on the internet and people that are real but may not know they have been included on an editorial board (and thus a giveaway is that they make no mention on their profile page of their "work" with a "journal"). If a solicitation email is to come from a member of the editorial office, the journal should make sure that that individual is identified on the journal's homepage.
3. Far more important than any claim about indexing, and this is especially important for nascent or newly launched journals, is to identify the society and/or publisher behind your journal. Not a single journal in the sample population for the journal identified a supporting society. All but three of the 47 emails studied did identify a publisher, but in every case that

was usually in the “small print” at the bottom of the email or within the email address itself. In other words, you had to look hard to identify the publisher.

4. Ensure that the email sender uses a journal- or publisher-based email address rather than Gmail, Yahoo, etc. Batch mailings can end up getting caught in spam filters. Ideally, solicitation efforts should be targeted and thus emails, even if the text is recycled, should be sent individually if you do not know how to ensure email is successfully delivered when mailed *en masse*.
5. Do not include read-receipt functionality in your email. No legitimate publisher does that, not least because they have more sophisticated ways to check email openings and click-through rates.
6. Where possible, and certainly in a mass mailing, use the logo of the journal and publisher in a solicitation email. If, however, the email is more individualized and being sent either from your email system or from your peer-review management system this may be harder to achieve, so deploy indicators that the message is more personal or include more information that conveys legitimacy such as easily verifiable details.
7. Keep the email presentation clean with bold and italics only used to emphasize a key point such as a deadline or a select metric, and even then, that might not be needed.
8. Tone down the salutation. Dear Dr. X or Dear Prof. Y is perfectly sufficient if you do not know the individual.
9. Think about the subject line. Appendix B lists the subject lines this author received in the sample emails. Most make no sense, are inappropriate, or are certainly not designed to encourage me to open the email. The subject line should state plainly what the email is about. Nothing more. Nothing less.
10. Act like you've been here before. Pointing out every measure of legitimacy is perhaps the most obvious way to suggest you are not legitimate. This may be tempting to do if you are a new launch journal seeking to gain a foothold with your potential author base. However, recognition of a supporting society/publisher and the inclusion of a well-known Editor-in-Chief is infinitely more impressive to a potential author. Again, for new launch journals, interested authors are likely to follow up with further questions about the journal, and that would be the

appropriate juncture to inform them of the status of your campaign to get indexed, etc.

11. Consider adding a line pointing out that if they are unsure of the legitimacy of your journal or, indeed, any journal they submit to, they could visit ThinkCheck-Submit (<https://thinkchecksubmit.org/>) to understand the issues.
12. Refer readers of the email to your journal's website. On your website make sure there is information that describes how to prepare and submit a manuscript as well as information on key metrics for the journal alongside what authors may expect from peer review.

Disclosure Statement

Jason Roberts receives a salary through his work with Origin Editorial, a peer-review management company. Origin Editorial is contracted to provide services by a variety of scientific societies and large journal publishers.

References

- 1) Shamseer L, Moher D, Maduekwe O, et al. Potential predatory and legitimate biomedical journals: can you tell the difference? A cross-sectional comparison. *BMC Med.* 2017;15:28. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12916-017-0785-9>.
- 2) Cukier S, Lalu M, Bryson GL, Cobey KD, Grudniewicz A, Moher D. Defining predatory journals and responding to the threat they pose: a modified Delphi consensus process. *BMJ Open.* 2020;10(2):e035561. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2019-035561>.
- 3) Roberts JL. Predatory journals: know thy enemy — what editorial offices can do to educate their stakeholders. *EON.* 2017;10(11):4-8. <https://doi.org/10.18243/eon/2017.10.11.2>.
- 4) Roberts JL. Predatory journals: illegitimate publishing and its threat to all readers and authors. *Journal of Sexual Medicine.* 2016;13(12):1830-1833. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsxm.2016.10.008>.
- 5) Chan L, Heinemann AW, Roberts JL. Elevating the quality of disability and rehabilitation research: mandatory use of the reporting guidelines. *Archives of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation.* 2014;95(3):415-417. <https://doi.org/10.5014/ajot.2014.682004>.

Appendix A. Field of Study

| Field of Study | Frequency |
|---------------------------|-----------|
| Rehabilitation Medicine | 5 |
| Dentistry | 4 |
| General Medicine | 4 |
| Anesthesia | 2 |
| Obstetrics and Gynecology | 2 |
| Physiotherapy | 2 |
| Psychology | 2 |
| Reproductive Medicine | 2 |
| Sexual Medicine | 2 |
| Urology | 2 |
| Community Medicine | 1 |
| Conservation Research | 1 |
| English Literature | 1 |
| Forensic Science | 1 |
| Gynecology | 1 |
| Internal Medicine | 1 |
| Language | 1 |
| Nephrology | 1 |
| Ophthalmology | 1 |
| Otorhinolaryngology | 1 |
| Psychiatry | 1 |
| Public Health | 1 |
| Rheumatology | 1 |
| Social Sciences | 1 |
| Sports Medicine | 1 |
| Statistics | 1 |
| Study Design | 1 |
| Surgery | 1 |
| Transplantation | 1 |
| Unclear | 1 |

Appendix B. Subject Lines for the Solicitation Emails Studied

Subject Line

*y-Submit now

* Research and Reports

Jason Roberts, Follow up 2: Regarding your manuscript submission

Jason Roberts

Follow up: Article Submission || Gynecology

Internal Medicine -Submit now

Contribute your article in *h Journal

Respected Prof: Jason Roberts; Warm request to submit your valuable research work

Research Article/Case report Dear Jason Roberts

Publish manuscript without publication fee

(Continued)

Appendix B. Continued

Subject Line

*: Anticipating your next article
 Dear Roberts, J: Submitting Your Papers
 Call for Paper: *
 Your Article Add Value to our Journal -*
 Waiting for your response
 We provide an international scientific platform for your research -*
 *_Regarding your Manuscript Submission
 * - Research and Reviews
 * | Special Issue
 Submissions with Huge Discounts: 2nd Follow-up
 Participation for upcoming issue - Dentistry
 Accepting submissions-Waiver on publication charges
 * || Changes, Challenges and Clinical Perspectives
 *rehabilitation
 *: New Issue of the Journal
 Dear Dr. Jason Roberts - Rejoice Your Manuscript
 We need your kind support towards-*
 Accepting submissions for current issue - *
 Special Invite- * Articles
 To Dr. Roberts: Invitation to contribute to journal * [ISSN****-****]: Benefit from early bird discounts
 Re: *: New issue published (July, 2020). Call forpapers August 2020
 Menorrhagia (heavy periods)
 Jason Roberts, Request to submit case report
 Your Contribution Dear Jason Roberts
 Spread your innovations on * Medicine
 Submissions Accepted
 Jason Roberts: Invitation to submit Manuscript-* (ISSN ****-**** & Impact Factor 1.5)
 Request to "Manuscript Submission" for the journal **
 Request to "Manuscript Submission" for the journal ""**
 jason@origineditorial.com (Jason Roberts)
 Deficit of articles
 Hopeful Response
 "Korean Journal of *" seeking your support by your valuable submission.
 Volume 2 Issue 1 Dear Doctor
 Discrepancy of Article Dear Jason Roberts
 Follow-up mail: Request mail to assist our journal with your valuable submission -* (ISSN ****-****)
 Dear Dr. Jason Roberts, Upcoming issue Invitation for ManuscriptSubmission - *