Ref.: No.R&P/17/2026/159   Date: 12.01.2026

NOTIFICATION

Subject: **Guidelines for Consideration of Publications for Academic Purposes**

1.   The Guidelines for Consideration of Publications for Academic Purposes (annexed) are notified herewith for the information of all concerned.

2.   These guidelines are effective from 01.01.2026, and will be applicable to direct recruitments in the University and its Colleges, and to promotions under the Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) in the departments of the University.

3.   These guidelines have been approved by the Executive Council vide Resolution No. 57 (57-4) in its meeting held on 12.12.2025

This issues with the approval of the Competent Authority.

12/01/2026

Deputy Registrar
(Recruitment & Promotion)

Copy to:

1. Director, Delhi University Computer Centre: For uploading on the University website
2. Joint Registrar (Teaching): For information to the Heads of the Departments of the University
3. Office of the Vice-Chancellor: For kind Information
4. Office of the Registrar: For kind Information
5. Joint Registrar (Colleges): For Circulation to the Colleges
6. Guard File

12/01/2026

Section Officer
(Recruitment & Promotion Branch)

UNIVERSITY OF DELHI

> E.C. Resolution No. 57 (57-4)
> Dated: 12.12.2025

57/- The Executive Council approved the following recommendations made by the Academic Council at its meeting held on 05.12.2025. The recommendations of the Academic Council are reproduced below.

Further, the Council resolved that the following draft amendments in Appendix-II to Ordinance V(2) of the Ordinances of the University be accepted and recommended for consideration and approval of the Executive Council. The Academic Council has also recommended that the consequential amendments to the relevant Ordinances of the University be made accordingly:

57-4/ The Council resolved that the guidelines for identifying journals for academic purposes with an aim to uphold standards and ensure alignment with the University's academic and research objectives be accepted with minor modifications.

The Executive Council further resolved that the guidelines are valid for direct recruitments in the University & its Colleges and promotions under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) in University Departments and the same shall be implemented w.e.f. 01.01.2026. (**Appendix-18**)

University of Delhi

GUIDELINES FOR CONSIDERATION OF PUBLICATIONS FOR ACADEMIC PURPOSES

The University of Delhi has consistently upheld a tradition of academic excellence, as reflected in its distinguished national and international standings. In pursuit of enhancing the quality, credibility, and transparency of scholarly publishing, guidelines have been developed to provide a standardized framework for the evaluation of research publications for academic purposes across all departments.

1. **Applicable Publication Criteria**
   - To ensure consistency and academic rigor, only publications from credible indexing sources or approved peer-reviewed journals shall be considered.

1.1 **For Faculties of Science, Interdisciplinary & Applied Sciences, Mathematical Sciences, Technology, Applied Social Sciences and Humanities, Commerce & Business Studies, Management Studies, and Medical Sciences:**
   - Publications must appear in journals indexed in the *Web of Science* (Science Citation Index Expanded, Arts & Humanities Citation Index, or Social Sciences Citation Index), or *Scopus*, or any other equivalent indexing database as may be approved by the University of Delhi from time to time.

1.2 **For Faculties of Arts, Music, Social Sciences, Education, and Law:**

   Publications must meet at least one of the following criteria:

   - Appear in journals indexed in the *Web of Science* (Science Citation Index Expanded, Arts & Humanities Citation Index, or Social Sciences Citation Index) or *Scopus*; **or**
   - Published in peer-reviewed journals shortlisted by the concerned department and approved by the IQAC, University of Delhi, in accordance with the parameters outlined under the section "**Comprehensive Journal Evaluation Framework**" (refer **Appendix A**).

1.3 **For Indian Languages:**

   Publications must meet at least one of the following criteria:

   - Appear in journals indexed in the *Web of Science* (Science Citation Index Expanded, Arts & Humanities Citation Index, or Social Sciences Citation Index) or *Scopus*; **or**
   - Published in peer-reviewed journals shortlisted by the concerned department and approved by the IQAC, University of Delhi, in accordance with the parameters outlined under the section "**Comprehensive Journal Evaluation Framework**" (refer **Appendix A**); **or**
   - Appear in journals published by Central or State Government bodies.

2. Journal Evaluation Criteria

To standardize the assessment of peer-reviewed journals, the following criteria are used:

2.1 Preliminary Journal Standards

Purpose: To verify the authenticity, transparency, and scholarly infrastructure of journals.

2.1.1 Title & ISSN:

A unique and verifiable journal identity strengthens trust and traceability. The journal must have a unique, verifiable ISSN (print and/or online) matching the title listed on ISSN databases (ISSN Portal, NSL ISSN Process).

2.1.2 Minimum Publication History:

Publication history reflects editorial maturity.

Journals must demonstrate at least 3 years of consistent publication.

2.1.3 Publication Frequency:

Regular publishing ensures predictability and accountability.

Journals must specify and adhere to a consistent schedule as declared in the ISSN records.

2.1.4 Publisher Transparency:

Clear publisher information strengthens legitimacy.

Clear identification of publisher, physical address, society affiliations (if any), and verifiable contact details.

2.1.5 Peer Review Policy:

Transparent review processes uphold scholarly rigor.

The type of review (e.g., single/double-blind) must be explicitly stated, and all research publications must undergo peer review.

2.1.6 Website & Hosting:

Digital professionalism reflects academic credibility.

Websites must be secure, up-to-date, and linked to publisher platforms.

2.1.7 Access Policy:

Clear access models aid authors and readers alike.

Journals must specify if they follow open access or subscription-based models, and list any applicable fees.

2.1.8 Repository Integration:

Linkages with repositories improve discoverability and citation. It is desirable that Journals are connected to platforms like CrossRef, ORCID, ONOS, OpenDOAR, CORE, PMC, or Zenodo.

2.1.9 Digital Identifiers (DOIs):

DOIs ensure persistent linking and proper citation.

All articles must be assigned valid, verifiable DOIs.

2.1.10 Reputed publisher

Ensures quality scientific journal

A journal published by a reputed publisher is generally regarded as a quality scientific journal. However, its mere inclusion in a publisher's catalogue alone does not guarantee its quality. Therefore, the journal must also meet the evaluation criteria outlined in these guidelines.

2.2 Editorial Board Evaluation

Purpose: To assess the editorial integrity, academic leadership, and transparency of the journal's governing structure.

2.2.1 Board Composition:
Editorial boards reflect academic stewardship.
Full names, roles, affiliations, and identifiers (ORCID/ResearcherID) of all editorial members must be listed. Editorial members should have recognized academic standing aligned with the journal's scope.

2.2.2 Diversity & Expertise:
Academic diversity enhances global relevance.
Board members must represent multiple institutions and geographies and align with the journal's scope.

2.2.3 Editorial Independence:
Independence prevents undue influence and bias.
Efficient, impartial peer review workflows with documented timelines and responsiveness to reviewer feedback

2.3 Editorial and Ethical Policies

Purpose: To ensure alignment between editorial policies, declared aims, and ethical best practices.

2.3.1 Aims and Scope:
Clarity of focus ensures scholarly relevance.
Journals must declare specific thematic and disciplinary coverage.

2.3.2 APCs and Fee Transparency:
Hidden fees undermine trust.
Article Processing Charges must be clearly stated. Excessively low or high charges should be flagged.

2.3.3 Publishing Timeline:
Timeliness enhances author satisfaction.
Journals should declare and adhere to realistic submission-to-publication timelines.

2.3.4 Acceptance Rate:
Selectivity reflects review rigour.
Acceptance statistics should be disclosed and should reflect genuine screening.

2.3.5 Ethical Alignment:
Global standards ensure responsible publication.
Adherence to COPE or equivalent standards must be reflected in journal policies.

2.4 Content Quality Standards

Purpose: To evaluate academic originality, policy relevance, and conformity to journal scope.

2.4.1 Research Contribution:
Publications must demonstrate innovation and scholarly merit.
Articles should reflect theoretical advancement, evidence-based analysis, and real-world applicability.

2.4.2 Scope Conformity:

Consistency across title, theme, and output is essential.
Published articles must align with the journal's stated scope and thematic priorities. The journal should maintain a consistent theme.

2.5 Presentation and Technical Standards

Purpose: To uphold credibility and ensure optimal dissemination of scholarly work through design, accessibility, and consistent publishing practices.

2.5.1 Citation Format:
Accurate and uniform citation practices strengthen academic attribution and traceability.
Journals should use a standardized referencing style (e.g., APA, MLA, Vancouver) and include a "Cite as" recommendation in each article to promote consistent citation usage.

2.5.2 Design & Readability:
A professionally formatted journal enhances readability and reflects editorial integrity.
Journals must use legible fonts, consistent formatting, and adequate spacing. High-quality visuals such as tables, graphs, and infographics must be clearly labelled and support the article's content.

2.5.3 Archiving & Accessibility:
Long-term preservation and ease of access are essential for sustained research visibility.
Journals should provide full-text content online. Subscription-based journals must list article metadata, while open-access journals must ensure complete availability. Archival mechanisms (e.g., LOCKSS, Portico) should be clearly documented.

2.5.4 Multilingual Availability:
Language diversity enhances inclusivity and local research impact, especially in the Indian context.
Journals are encouraged to publish in Indian languages in addition to English to broaden accessibility.

2.5.5 Submission Platform:
Secure and structured submission systems foster transparency and process integrity.
Manuscripts must be submitted through an online submission portal. Journals accepting submissions via email should be excluded from consideration.

2.5.6 Avoidance of Rapid Publication Claims:
Unrealistic promises of quick publication often signal compromised peer-review processes.
Journals that highlight "rapid review" or "instant publication" as marketing claims should be avoided unless backed by transparent editorial policies.

2.5.7 Print Continuity:
Print consistency demonstrates editorial discipline and enhances the journal's professional identity.
Journals with print editions should maintain uniformity in layout, design, and formatting across all issues.

2.5.8 PDF Accessibility and Permissions:
Unrestricted access to published content facilitates academic sharing and citation.
Journals must not use copy-protected or locked PDFs. Downloadable, citation-friendly formats must be provided.

2.6 Research Ethics and Compliance
Purpose: To ensure that journals adhere to established ethical frameworks, protect academic integrity, and promote responsible research practices.

2.6.1 Ethical Guidelines for Authors:
Authors must adhere to clear publication ethics as defined by the journal.
Journals must publish and enforce comprehensive ethical policies. Journals should have formal structures to oversee ethical compliance.

2.6.2 Plagiarism Prevention:
Maintaining originality and academic honesty is paramount.
Journals must ensure strict compliance with UGC Level 0 plagiarism norms (Less than 10% similarity).

2.6.3 Conflict of Interest Disclosure:
Transparent disclosure practices uphold integrity across stakeholders.
Any potential conflicts involving authors, editors, or reviewers must be declared.

2.6.4 AI Content Disclosure:
Responsible use of AI in research must be clearly disclosed.
Journals should require authors to disclose any AI-generated or AI-assisted content.

2.6.5 Research Integrity Policy:
Journals must align with globally accepted codes of research conduct.
Endorsement of standards like COPE, WAME, or the Declaration of Helsinki must be visible.

2.6.6 Intellectual Property:
Respecting ownership and licensing enhance academic trust.
Policies on copyright, licensing, and author rights must be clearly outlined.

2.6.7 Post-Publication Corrections:
Timely corrections ensure reliability of the scholarly record.
Retraction and correction procedures must be publicly available.

2.6.8 Data Sharing and Reproducibility:
Encouraging open science practices benefits the wider research community.
Journals should support data availability, replication, and reuse.

2.6.9 Complaints and Appeals:
Fair and documented grievance mechanisms promote accountability.
A transparent process must exist for handling complaints and appeals. Allegations of misconduct must be addressed using COPE or equivalent guidelines.

2.7 Journal Visibility and Impact Metrics
Purpose: To evaluate the reach, academic influence, citation performance and influence of journals within the scholarly community.

2.7.1 Indexing in Reputed Databases:
Indexing enhances discoverability and academic credibility.

Journals should be listed in databases such as Scopus, Web of Science, Education Resources Information Center (ERIC), Directory of Open Access Journals (DOAJ), PsycINFO, HeinOnline, or LexisNexis.

2.7.2 Impact Metrics:
Impact metrics serve as indicators of scholarly reach.
Valid Impact Factor (Clarivate), CiteScore (Scopus), or SJR. Journals using misleading or unverified metrics (SJIF, Cosmos, GIF, etc.) will be disqualified.

2.7.3 Citation Rate:
Citations reflect the utility and relevance of published work. Journals should demonstrate citation frequency commensurate with their scope.

To have a quantifiable evaluation of Peer-reviewed Journals based on the detailed parameters discussed above, the following Comprehensive Journal Evaluation Framework shall be used by the concerned departments.

3. Comprehensive Journal Evaluation Framework

To ensure objective assessment, departments must use the accompanying 150-point framework across six categories:

Evaluation Domain	Maximum Points
1. Journal Identification & Authenticity	30
2. Editorial Board & Governance	30
3. Peer Review & Publishing Process	30
4. Website & Infrastructure	20
5. Metrics & Indexing	20
6. Ethics & Compliance	20

Scoring Guidelines

- **Total Points: 150**
- **Minimum Acceptance Threshold: 120/150**
  Journals meeting a minimum of 120 points out of 150 are acceptable only.
- **Automatic Rejection Triggers:**
  Journals exhibiting any of the following fundamental flaws shall be automatically excluded from consideration:

  - Invalid or fake ISSN;

  - Anonymous or unverifiable publisher;

  - Absence of a clearly stated peer review policy;

  - Absence of an appropriate Manuscript submission mechanism;

  - Use of non-standard or predatory metrics (e.g., Scientific Journal Impact Factor (SJIF), Cosmos Impact Factor, CiteFactor, General/Global Impact Factor (GIF), AE Global Index);

7

- Absence of a publicly available research ethics and publication policy;

- Use of cloned or deceptively similar journal titles mimicking reputed journals;

- Inclusion in recognized blacklists (e.g., Beall's List, Cabell's Predatory Reports, DOAJ's list of journals claiming to be indexed in DOAJ or the UGC CARE Excluded List);

- Not included in the various databases mentioned on the journal website;

- Engagement in unethical research or publishing practices.

For detailed scoring rubrics and indicators under each evaluation domain, refer to the attached "Comprehensive Journal Evaluation Framework" (Appendix A).

Power to remove difficulties: If any doubt or difficulty arises in the interpretation of or giving effect to the provisions of these guidelines, the competent authority may do anything deemed necessary to remove such doubt or difficulty, within the power invested to it by the Act, Statutes and Ordinances of the University of Delhi, as amended from time to time.

Comprehensive Journal Evaluation Framework

Sub-Criterion	Evaluation Method	Max Points	Quantitative Indicator	Red Flags	Verifiable Sources
1. Journal Identification & Authenticity (30 pts)					
ISSN Verification	Must match across all sources	5	ISSN match Yes = 5 No = 0	Not found on ISSN portal	https://portal.issn.org, https://nsl.niscpr.res.in/
Distinct Title	Matched via similarity checks	5	Unique = 5 Cloned = 0	Mimics known titles	Scopus, WoS, ERIC, PsycINFO, IEEE Xplore, DOAJ
Publisher Legitimacy	Verify with Goods and Services Tax (GST), Registrar of Companies (ROC)	5	Registered = 5 Anonymous = 0	No legal identity	GST, ROC
Journal History	Verified 3+ years of issues	4	>3 yrs = 4 2–3 yrs = 3 1–2 yrs = 2 <1 yr = 1	New/discontinued	Archive.org, journal archive
Publisher Transparency	Must list the owner, address, and contact details	4	Full = 4 None = 0	Shell/anonymous	Publisher's site, CrossRef google.be/maps/
DOI Verification (if applicable)	Must resolve through DOI.org	4	Valid DOI = 4 Fake = 0 If not applicable = 4	Broken links	CrossRef, DOI.org
Reputed publisher	Must be published by professional publishers, Learned or scholarly societies, University Presses	3	Yes = 3 No = 0	Not published by reputed publisher	-
2. Editorial Board and Governance (30 pts)					
Verified Affiliations	50% sample cross-check	4	≥90% = 4 Otherwise = 0	Fake/ Fabricated board	ORCID, Institution sites
Geographic & Institutional Diversity	≥3 countries (for International) 5+ institutions (for National)	4	3+/5+ = 4 In-house = 0	Monolithic board	Editorial Page
Editor-in-Chief Visibility	h-index check	6	h-index ≥15 = 6 10 – 14 = 4 5 - 9 = 2 <5 = 0	Inactive/unknown	Google Scholar, Scopus
ORCID/ID Availability	≥50% members	3	≥50% = 3 Otherwise = 0	None	ORCID, Publons

Special Issue Editors	Named with affiliation	3	Yes = 3 No = 0	Guest editors hidden	Journal Issues
Editorial Activity	3–5 years of publication/research involvement	4	Verified = 4 None = 0	Dormant	Grants.gov, websites
Independence Declaration	Policy on editorial freedom	3	Yes = 3 No = 0	Publisher control	Journal policy page
Author-Editor Overlap	<10% per issue	3	<10% = 3 10–20% = 1 >20% = 0	>20%	Article review data

3. Peer Review & Publishing Process (30 pts)

Type of Review	Specified clearly	6	Double-blind/Single-blind = 6 Unclear = 0	No peer review	Review Policy Page
Reviewer Pool Acknowledged	Publicly listed	2	Public pool = 2 Sample = 1 None = 0	No reviewers shown	Journal page
Review Timeline	Submission to the decision	6	More than four weeks = 6 1 to 4 weeks = 3 <1 week = 0	Unrealistic durations	Article metadata.
Peer Review History	Timeline published	4	≥80% of articles = 4 50–79% = 2 <50% = 0	No data	Metadata fields
Acceptance Dates Consistency	Submission precedes acceptance	4	Yes = 4 No = 0	Backdated acceptances	Article dates
Appeals Process	Clear process posted	4	Yes = 4 No = 0	No grievance route	Submission guidelines
Retraction/Correction Policy for publication	Public COPE-aligned policy	4	Yes = 4 No = 0	No retraction protocol	Journal policy

4. Website & Infrastructure (20 pts)

Language Quality	Checked for grammar/plagiarism	3	Clean = 3 Major = 0	Major issues	Grammarly, Copyscape
Metadata Standards	Schema.org, OAI-PMH used	3	Full = 3 None = 0	None	OAI-PMH validators
Citation Format	Standardized style	3	APA/MLA = 3 Unclear = 0	Inconsistent	Author guidelines
Archive Access	≥5 years of content	2	≥5 yrs = 2 2–4 yrs = 1 <2 yrs = 0	No archive	Journal site
Author-oriented rather than reader-oriented	Journal site	3	Yes = 0 No = 3	Submission possibilities are highlighted. Information regarding publishing	Journal site

				possibilities, such as quick peer review, are foregrounded	
Search Functionality	Article search works	2	Yes = 2 No = 0	Broken search	Homepage
Article Licensing	License clearly stated	2	Yes = 2 No = 0	None	Article/PDF
Custom CMS	Unique platform, not generic	2	Customized = 2 Default = 0	Basic template	Page source code
5. Metrics & Indexing (20 pts)					
Indexing in Major Databases	Verified in Scopus, WoS, DOAJ/ERIC/ PsycINFO/ HeinOnline/ LexisNexis	6	Yes = 6 No = 0	Not indexed	Index sites https://doaj.org / https://www.apa.org/pubs/databases/psycinfo https://eric.ed.gov/ https://www.apa.org/pubs/databases/psycinfo https://home.heinonline.org/
Misleading Metrics Used	e.g., SJIF, GIF, Cosmos	6	None used = 6 Used = 0	Fake metric	Homepage
Google Scholar Citations	20 latest articles	6	>100 = 6 50–100 = 3 <50 = 1	Low impact	Google Scholar
h5-index	Verified via Google Scholar	2	h5 > 10 = 2	Low ranking	Google Scholar
6. Ethics & Compliance (20 pts)					
Research Ethics Policy	Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE)/ International Committee of Medical Journal Editors (ICMJE)/ World Association of Medical Editors (WAME)	6	Yes = 6 No = 0	None	COPE (https://publicationethics.org/membership), ICMJE (https://www.icmje.org/) WAME (https://www.wame.org/) Journal website
AI Disclosure	Mandatory in the author guidelines	3	Yes = 3 No = 0	Unclear policy	Policy page
Plagiarism Check	iThenticate/Turnitin	6	Regular check = 6 None = 0	No screening	Similarity report

11

| Community Standards | COPE Core Practices linked | 3 | Yes = 3 No = 0 | Not compliant | COPE.org |
| Conflict of Interest Policy | Journal site | 2 | Yes = 2 No = 0 | Unclear or no policy | Homepage |