

# Panel meeting (1) 29.4.2026

**Place:** House of Sciences and Letters, Kirkkokatu 6, Helsinki (Room Salokas)

**Present:** Risto Korhonen (Chair), Klaus Nordhausen, Joonas Ilmavirta, Oscar Kivinen, Tero Laihonen, Jani Lukkarinen, Vanni Noferini, Eveliina Peltola, Ville Suomala, Oluwafemi Balogun, Sampsa Pursiainen, Yury Nikulin

**Secretariat:** Anna-Kaarina Linna, Leena Wahlfors

## **1. Opening**

The Chair opened the meeting at 13.00.

## **2. Announcements**

Introductions of the new panel members Oscar Kivinen and Yury Nikulin

## **3. The Evaluation of level 2 Publication Channels**

The Panel identified the needs for revising the level classifications and prepared a preliminary proposal for the new Level 2 classification.

The preliminary new classification will be open for consultation within the scientific community throughout the summer, after which the panel will decide on its final classification proposal at its autumn meeting. The JUFO Steering Group will confirm the panel's proposal at the end of the year. The new classification will enter into force on 1 January 2027.

The panel asked whether it is possible to switch publication channels between panels. This is possible if the chairs of both panels approve the switch. In this panel, there are borderline cases, especially between the channels of panel 2.

## **4. Complementary evaluation: the level "other identified publication channels"**

In complementary evaluation, upgrades in level classification take effect immediately once the panel chair has confirmed the evaluation ("other identified evaluation channels" -> 1).

By contrast, downgrades from level 1 (or level 2) to the category "other identified evaluation channels" are decided at the spring panel meetings on the basis of the evaluations made in the JUFO portal by the chair and the panel members. Channels whose level the panel has decided to lower at its meeting are confirmed after the

meeting by the secretariat. This is because the lowered level will only take effect at the beginning of the following year (2027).

The panel decides on proposals to lower the levels of publication channels. List of channels under consideration:

Jufo_ID	Level	Name	Grounds	Decision
75286	1	JCMCC	The publication channel has been removed from Scopus in 2025, reason journal change policy.	Other
58146	1	International electronic journal of algebra	The publication channel has been removed from DOAJ in 2024, reason journal not adhering to best practice.	Other
59988	1	Journal of computational analysis and applications	The publication channel has been removed from Scopus in 2023, reason journal change policy, however, the journal states on its website that it is indexed in the Scopus database.	Other
51810	1	Ars combinatoria	The publication channel has been removed from Scopus in 2025, reason journal change policy.	1
58221	1	International journal of agricultural and statistical sciences	The publication channel has been removed from Scopus in 2022.	1
56727	1	Global journal of pure and applied mathematics	The publication channel has been removed from Scopus in 2016.	Other
55800	1	European journal of pure and applied mathematics	The publication channel has been removed from Scopus in 2025. Currently on hold and under re-evaluation in WOS.	Other
62190	1	Jp journal of algebra, number theory and applications	The publication channel has been removed from Scopus in 2017.	Other
53819	1	Communications on applied nonlinear analysis	The publication channel has been removed from Scopus in 2025.	1
84789	1	Formalized Mathematics	The publication channel has been removed from Scopus in 2016.	Other
61047	1	Journal of modern applied statistical methods	The publication channel has been removed from Scopus in 2019, channel does not have a working website.	Other

Key indicators that a journal is not adhering to DOAJ best practices include:

- Weak Peer Review: Signs of poor or non-existent peer review processes.
- Transparency Issues: Opaque or unclear information regarding the editorial board, article processing charges (APCs), or copyright/licensing terms.
- Editorial Misconduct: Suspected misconduct, such as plagiarism, citation manipulation, or data falsification.
- Operational Failure: Lack of a clear digital archiving policy or failure to comply with DOAJ guidelines during reapplications.
- Misleading Information: Claiming to be in DOAJ or using its logo when they are not, or for journals that have been removed.

Scopus re-evaluation criteria are identical to the Scopus content selection criteria for newly suggested titles. Titles can be flagged for re-evaluation in different ways: concerns about the journal's publication standards or the journal shows outlier or unexpected publishing performance. Journal change policy include, but are not limited to, changes to the title name, ISSN, ownership, or editorial oversight of the journal.

Scopus content selection criteria

- Journal policy: Convincing editorial policy, type of peer review, broad geographical distribution of editors, broad geographical distribution of authors
- Content: Academic contribution to the field; clarity of abstracts, quality of and conformity to the stated aims and scope of the journal, readability of articles
- Journal standing: citedness of journal articles in Scopus, editor standing
- Publishing regularity: no delays or interruptions in the publication schedule
- Online availability full journal content available online, english language journal home page available, quality of journal home page

**Discussion:** The panel discussed the proposed level changes and the grounds for them.

**Decision:** The panel decided to lower the classification of the channels as listed above.

### **Reform of the JUFO evaluation process**

On 13 February 2026, the secretariat proposed to the JUFO Steering Group for consideration that, beginning in 2027, some of the panels' complementary evaluation tasks should be transferred to the secretariat, following the Norwegian JUFO model. The criteria for level 1 are very clear, which would make it possible for the secretariat as well to carry out high-quality evaluation work.

The panels would continue to be responsible for:


- channels that are already indexed and for which the scholarly community proposes a change in level, either upward or downward; and
- cases which, in the secretariat's view, require in-depth knowledge of a specific field of science and its publishing practices (including update evaluations every four years).

Each year, Publication Forum carries out four supplementary evaluations in which the panels assess channels to be added to level 1 or lowered from level 1 to the category "other identified publication channels." In 2025, the panels evaluated a total of 658 publication channels that had not previously been classified in JUFO. Of these, 312 journals/series and four book publishers were accepted at level 1. In addition, the panels considered 145 justified proposals for level changes submitted by the scholarly community through the JUFO portal (proposals to raise channels

from the category “other identified publication channels” to level 1, or proposals to lower channels from level 1 to the category “other identified publication channels”).

Transferring routine and technical tasks to the secretariat would save a significant amount of panel working time. The panels could then focus on identifying the highest-level publication channels and devote more attention to other tasks requiring particular scholarly expertise. As a result of the change, from 2027 onward panel meetings would be held only once a year instead of twice. This would reduce the workload of panel members. Correspondingly, secretariat time would be freed up from one annual round of panel meetings. This time could instead be used for evaluating level 1 channels and channels in the category “other identified publication channels,” for developing the new JUFO evaluation portal that is to be introduced, for identifying so-called grey-zone journals, and for the further development of the JUFO classification. In addition, it would make it possible to implement separate development projects, including measures to develop the assessment of the societal impact of publishing activities and to support the publishing activities of learned societies.

Proposed new evaluation process:



The secretariat requests the panel’s view on the following proposal:

From the beginning of 2027, the secretariat will assume responsibility for checking whether new publication channels received from the VIRTAPublication information service and proposed by the scholarly community for inclusion meet the criteria for level 1, and will confirm them either at level 1 or place them in the group “other identified publication channels.” The panels will continue to be responsible for channels that are already indexed and for which the scholarly community proposes a change in level, either upward or downward, as well as cases which, in the

secretariat's view, require in-depth knowledge of a specific field of science and its publishing practices (including update evaluations every four years).

The matter will be brought to the Steering Group meeting of 7 September 2026 for decision. Feedback received from the panels will be taken into account in the decision-making.

**Discussion:**


The panel unanimously supported the secretariat's proposal.

**Decision:**

In accordance with the proposal.

**6. Steering Group Proposal on the Reclassification of Book Publishers**

At its meeting on September 8, 2025 the Jufo steering group drew attention to the fact that the majority of level 2+3 book articles are published by a few very large international publishers. These channels should be examined in light of the updated level 1 criteria (Figure 1 in Finnish).



It is to be discussed whether the Panel considers that:

- a) Book publishers Springer and Elsevier should be downgraded to level 1; or
- b) All book publishers should be downgraded to level 1, but they can be proposed again on a case-by-case basis for level 2 (panels reassess channels based on documented evidence and feedback from the research community).

**Discussion:** The panel did not consider the matter relevant from the perspective of the disciplines it represents, but supported option b.

## **7. Closing**

The Chair closed the meeting at 16.00.