

From evidence to a correction plan

Demonstration Journal of Research Practice

24 October 2026

A teaching example of public-information and metadata review. All observations, quotations, people and example.org references are invented. Links are illustrative identifiers, not live evidence. This excerpt is not a completed client review or an exhaustive DOAJ, Scopus or Web of Science assessment.

6	1	1
Correction examples	Consistent evidence example	Unresolved evidence example

What the editor can do next

Start with A01-A03: the wrong file and conflicting public statements. Then address A04-A06: metadata, publisher identity and board details. These are workflow priorities within this invented scenario, not official indexer rankings.

What the files let your team do

Use the report to understand each issue. In the workbook, match the same item ID to its action and evidence references, assign an owner, add a due date, and record progress. Keep closure evidence before asking for a re-check.

Do not read this as an eligibility verdict

Eight selected examples do not cover every criterion. No acceptance probability, guaranteed outcome, client result or academic-quality judgment is implied. The quantity of findings in a real review depends on the evidence, not a target count.

First corrections - conflicting public information

All observations and references on this page are fictional.

A01 Article link opens the wrong PDF

Observed: The example article page says 'Community water use', but its PDF opens 'Soil sampling methods'.

Action: Replace the wrong file or download link, then compare the PDF title and authors with the article page.

Closure evidence: Corrected article and PDF URLs; matching title and author information on both.

Example references: <https://example.org/journal/article/01> | <https://example.org/journal/files/01.pdf>

A02 Fee information conflicts across pages

Observed: The fictional author guide states 'No publication fee'; the fees page states 'USD 150 per article'. Neither page explains the difference.

Action: Confirm the applicable fee with the publisher and update both pages to the same policy, including any applicable exceptions.

Closure evidence: Both public pages show the agreed fee policy and any exceptions consistently.

Example references: <https://example.org/journal/author-guide> | <https://example.org/journal/fees>

A03 Licence wording differs between page and PDF

Observed: The fictional article page labels the work CC BY 4.0; the PDF footer says 'All rights reserved' with no explanation.

Action: Confirm the intended rights and licence with the authorised publisher contact. Align the public article and PDF statements; do not choose a new licence merely to close the item.

Closure evidence: Consistent, authorised rights and licence statements on the article page and PDF.

Example references: <https://example.org/journal/article/02> | <https://example.org/journal/files/02.pdf>

Next corrections - records and identity

All observations and references on this page are fictional.

A04 Author omitted from the metadata record

Observed: The fictional published PDF lists Lina Noor and Omar Sami. Its article-page metadata lists Lina Noor only.

Action: Check the authoritative published author list and correct the article metadata. Check any downstream deposit separately after updating the source.

Closure evidence: Article metadata agrees with the authoritative author list; any affected deposit is checked.

Example references: <https://example.org/journal/article/03> | <https://example.org/journal/files/03.pdf>

A05 Publisher name is inconsistent

Observed: The fictional home page names 'Research Practice Press'; the contact page names 'Research Practice Society', without explaining their roles.

Action: Confirm the operating publisher and clarify the roles of both entities on the affected pages.

Closure evidence: Home and contact pages consistently identify the publisher and explain any other entity's role.

Example references: <https://example.org/journal> | <https://example.org/journal/contact>

A06 Board affiliations are missing

Observed: The fictional board page lists editor names but gives no institutional affiliations. Affiliations have not been inferred from names.

Action: Ask the journal to verify the current board members and publish accurate affiliations where applicable.

Closure evidence: Current board page identifies the verified members and their applicable affiliations.

Example references: <https://example.org/journal/board>

What is supported - and what remains open

E01 Evidence consistent: Contact details agree across the reviewed pages

The fictional home and contact pages show the same editorial email and publisher contact. This verifies consistency in this example only, not responsiveness or identity beyond those pages.

Next step: No correction indicated by this selected consistency check.

Evidence needed: Retain the reviewed page references. Revisit if the details change.

Example references: <https://example.org/journal> | <https://example.org/journal/contact>

L01 Further assessment: A metadata gap does not establish a publication gap

The invented external-source extract contains no 2024 records. The journal's complete issue archive and publication dates have not been checked.

Next step: Check the full archive and dated articles before drawing a conclusion. If articles exist, investigate the source metadata separately.

Evidence needed: Archive evidence and publication dates establish what was published. Until then, no publication-failure finding is made.

Example references: <https://example.org/journal/archive>

Scope of this public sample

This is a selected-findings excerpt, not a full three-framework roadmap or a complete article dataset. The paid service scope and terms remain those published on jqcreview.com. No new evidence-pack, free assessment or extra review entitlement is offered here.

Result colours in the workbook

Red: Action needed. Green: Evidence consistent in the stated check. Amber: Further assessment. Text labels remain visible; colour is not a readiness score. Progress is a separate editable field and does not change the original review result.

Questions before ordering

Ask about scope at <https://jqcreview.com/ask> or contact@jqcreview.com. Only the relevant indexing organisation can decide inclusion.