

Giant Publication Platforms in Social Science Research: a comparative Study

Manik Das¹, Snigdha Naskar²

¹Assistant Librarian, Central Library, JISMSR, Howrah

<http://orcid.org/0009-0009-9181-7668>

²Assistant Professor, Department of Library and Information Science, Rabindra Bharati University, Kolkata

<http://orcid.org/0009-0007-1960-4591>

Abstract:

Just as selecting a robust and high-quality vessel is essential for survival in the deep sea, choosing the right platform to publish high-quality research with the aim of contributing to the body of knowledge is a crucial task for researchers. Factors such as acceptance of their work, citation rates, and the global exchange of knowledge all hinge on this choice. To avoid duplicating existing work, a comprehensive review of research published on the subject over the past 15 years was conducted prior to preparing this paper. This study employed an established descriptive research method and a comparative analytical approach, with comparative analysis serving as the primary tool. An analysis based on ten (10) criteria like, encompassing reliability, credibility, and overall research quality reveals that Elsevier, Springer Nature, Taylor & Francis, and Oxford University Press are considered the leading publishing platforms for social science research. Whereas the scope of 'Wiley, ' 'SAGE, ' and 'Emerald' appears somewhat more limited by comparison.

Keywords: Social Science Research, Academic Publishing, Publication Platforms, Peer Review, Open Access, Citation Impact.

Introduction:

In the modern world, research serves as a fundamental pillar in the development and dissemination of knowledge, shaping the history of a healthy and resilient human civilization. As a vital component of this scholarly pursuit, the social sciences encompass disciplines. Authentic research consistently generates new insights, which attain universality only when they transcend particular confines to engage with the expansive global domain. Therefore, the publication of research findings is regarded as a matter of utmost importance within the contemporary academic landscape.

As we reach the middle of 2026, we all recognize the importance of state-of-the-art technology infrastructure. The use of such technology has ushered in a significant

Published: 06 July 2026

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.70558/IJMRS.2026.v2.i3.301134>

Copyright © 2026 The Author(s). This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0).

transformation in the dissemination of research papers and publications. Publications that were once available only in print have now transitioned into electronic journals, thereby transcending national borders to reach distant continents. While advanced technology enables researchers worldwide to access and review papers at any time, it has simultaneously made maintaining high standards and adhering to international norms in their research work essential.

In recent times, international publishing houses such as Elsevier, Springer Nature, Emerald Publishing, Taylor & Francis, Wiley, SAGE Publication, and Oxford University Press have played an active and successful role in publishing research papers across various branches of the social sciences. Their activities are not limited merely to publication; they also play a crucial role in providing necessary support to researchers in the process of publishing their work.

Selecting a suitable publication venue is a crucial task for researchers, as it determines the acceptance, visibility, and impact of the published paper; choosing the wrong venue can create a negative perception regarding the quality of the research. Publishing through a well-established organization ensures that the paper reaches a vast global audience and garners greater credibility and acceptance in the current landscape. The success of the research largely depends on factors such as international indexing, publication standards, editorial policies, the quality of peer review, and the scope of the research's dissemination and outreach.

Open access has added a new dimension to research publishing at the international level, facilitating the democratization of knowledge and making articles freely available to readers. Renowned publishers such as Springer Nature, Elsevier, Taylor & Francis, and Wiley have adopted the open-access model, resulting in increased research visibility, usage, and citation rates. However, alongside the expansion of open-access publishing, article processing charges (APCs) have created a significant barrier for independent and unemployed researchers, particularly given the varying socio-economic conditions across different countries. Against this backdrop, the study titled “Worldwide Expert Publication Support in Social Science Research: A Comparative Study– evaluates ten (10) key criteria using a comparative approach:

1. Quality of Peer-review
2. Open access support
3. Visibility
4. Citation Impact
5. Editorial reputation
6. Digital infrastructure
7. Author support
8. Ethical Standards
9. Research dissemination
10. Global reach

Literature review:

A review of relevant research from the past 15 years has been conducted to examine previous studies related to this research.

Ghosh and Das (2007). This research paper discusses the development of ‘open access’ in the context of Indian research publications and research-related information.

Bird (2010). His research paper reveals that most publishing houses are currently prioritizing open access and adopting the open access model for research publication; he also sheds light on the aspect of acceptance. Furthermore, the paper analyzes the trend of subscription journals and examines the associated article processing charges. Currently, most authors prioritize rapid publication, the quality of peer review, and impact factors over open-access policies.

Xia (2010). This research paper emphasizes the importance of ‘open access’ and visibility in the current publishing landscape; it notes that this positively influences the international exchange of research and encourages researchers to take an active interest in selecting suitable platforms for publishing their original research papers.

Solomon and Björk (2012). This research paper primarily analyzes the article processing charges (APC) structure of open-access journals and encompasses essential information and discourse regarding publication support provided by foreign publishing houses as well as issues related to the visibility of research papers.

Mongeon and Paul – Has (2016). This research paper presents a comparative study of the journal coverage of Web of Science and Scopus, while also highlighting the importance of indexing coverage for library professionals.

Spezi et al. (2017). The central focus of their research is the concept of ‘open-access mega-journals’; they have meticulously analyzed the associated concepts and characteristics, as well as how their evolution influences communication systems. Through this research, they have unveiled a new perspective on publishing research papers via the open-access model and have placed special emphasis on scientific reliability as a fundamental basis for research papers.

Shen (2017). This study analyzes the characteristics, opportunities, and challenges of open-access journals in the Chinese language. The findings reveal that the majority of these journals transitioned to an open-access model primarily to enhance visibility and academic impact—that is, to fulfill various academic and institutional objectives.

Khode (2019). This research article highlights India as one of Asia's leading nations in the open-access movement within the e-LIS repository and places special emphasis on enhancing visibility in the international arena.

Panda (2021). Has meticulously highlighted the contributions of Indian ‘open access’ journals listed in the DOAJ and has evaluated and analyzed their international standards and contributions.

Das et al. (2022). Have highlighted the positive impact of researchers from Indian government technical institutions' interest in publishing research papers on 'open access' platforms, as well as issues regarding the acceptance of 'open access' and research visibility.

Kole et al. (2022). This research paper highlights the issue of high costs associated with commercial academic publishers and the necessity of the 'open-access' model as an alternative.

In conclusion, a review of national and foreign journals from the past 15 years reveals that previous studies have primarily focused on individual publishing houses, addressing widely discussed topics such as 'open access, ' 'peer review, ' 'indexing visibility, ' and 'article processing charges.' However, there is currently no available research that evaluates seven (7) globally renowned and trusted social science publishing platforms against a set of ten (10) specific criteria..

Objective of the study:

1. A comprehensive analysis of key 'support' aspects related to publishing by leading global Social Science publishing houses.
2. An attempt has been made to assess the publishing quality of global publishers based on a total of 10 indicators.
3. An analysis of the current contributions made by international publisher toward enhancing the visibility of research on open-access platforms.
4. Identification of key areas of best –in-class publishing most beneficial for bsocial science researchers, and the explorations of positive aspects regarding future publishing strategies.

Scope of the study:

The research paper is limited to globally renowned publishing houses; a list of these is provided below.

Table : 1 General Information of the world famous 7th Publication platforms

Sl.No	Name of the Publishers	Established year	Place of origin	Head Quarter	Founder/Originator
1	Elsevier	1880	Rotterdam, Netherlands	Amsterdam	Jacobus George Robbers
2	Springer Nature	2015 (Merger)	Berlin, London	Berlin , London	Merger of Springer Science + Business media & Nature Publishing Group
3	Taylor & Francis	1852	London, Uk	London	William Francis & Richard Taylor

4	Wiley	1807	New York city ; US	Hoboken	Charles Wiley
5	SAGE	1965	New York city ; US	Thousand Oaks	Sara Miller McCune
6	Emerald	1967	Bradford,UK	Bingley	Group of management scholar led by academics associated with MCB University Press
7	Oxford University Press	1586	Oxford ; UK	Oxford	Delegates of the University of Oxford

The global academic landscape depends heavily on an elite group of commercial publishers and university presses to index and curate high-impact research. While some of these giants dominate the STEM sectors, others possess a structural monopoly over high-quality qualitative fields, behavioral sciences, and the humanities.

The top seven academic publication platforms are characterized here by their overall citation volumes, peer-review quality models, and the range of Journal Impact Factors (JIF) across their portfolios.

Metric & Quality Profile of the world famous 7th Publication platforms

Publisher	Citation Density & Database Indexing	Peer Review & Editorial Quality Model	Typical Journal Impact Factors (JIF Range)	Flagship Titles
Elsevier	Massive global footprints via Scopus and ScienceDirect ; accounts for over 25% of global research citations.	Highly automated manuscript tracking with a rigid single/double-blind peer review framework. High desk-reject rates.	1.5 to 15.0+ (Extreme peaks like <i>The Lancet</i> hit 168.0+)	<i>Journal of Business Venturing</i> (8.7) <i>Computers & Education</i> (12.0)
Springer Nature	Massive prestige engine anchored by the Web of Science Core Collection (SCIE/SSCI).	Uses full-time, PhD-level in-house professional editors alongside academic boards to stringently screen novelty.	2.0 to 20.0+ (Flagship <i>Nature</i> titles hover between 30.0 and 56.0)	<i>Nature Communications</i> (18.1) <i>Nature Climate Change</i> (13.0+)
Wiley	Heavily integrated with	Exceptionally high quality	1.8 to 12.0+ (Top medical/materials	<i>Advanced Functional</i>

	prestigious global research societies and professional bodies.	controlled via society-appointed peer review boards; focuses on long-term clinical/practical utility.	<i>journals score significantly higher)</i>	<i>Materials</i> (19.9) <i>Bioethics</i> (3.0+)
Taylor & Francis (Routledge)	The absolute gold standard for humanities, critical theory, and regional social science index tracks.	Deeply values qualitative frameworks, textual critique, and theoretical rigor over pure data volume. Longer review cycles.	1.0 to 6.0+ (Extremely steady citation tracking for niche qualitative domains)	<i>Annals of the American Association of Geographers</i> <i>Journal of Peasant Studies</i>
SAGE	Massive concentration in the behavioral sciences, sociology, evaluation metrics, and education research.	Highly regarded double-blind review system; emphasizes methodology, reproducibility, and cross-disciplinary impact.	1.5 to 11.0+	<i>Review of Educational Research</i> (11.2) <i>SAGE Open</i> (2.4 - Q1)
Emerald Publishing	Highly specialized footprint focusing tightly on business management, accounting, information management, and librarianship.	Practical application-driven peer review. Highly values real-world case studies and executive relevance.	1.5 to 7.0+	<i>International Journal of Information Management</i> (21.0) <i>Journal of Documentation</i>
Oxford University Press (OUP)	High-prestige institutional university press; selective portfolio backed by Oxford faculty validation boards.	Elite, ultra-selective peer review process. Prefers highly polished, definitive, deep academic treatises and book-length arguments.	2.0 to 14.0+	<i>Quarterly Journal of Economics</i> <i>The Library / Applied Linguistics</i>

A brief account of Publisher Ecosystems:

1. Elsevier: As a commercial juggernaut, Elsevier relies on its proprietary database, *Scopus*, to track citations via the *CiteScore* metric. Because they publish thousands of high-volume journals, their impact factors vary from specialized niche journals (JIF ~1.5) to field-defining medical powerhouses like *The Lancet* (JIF 168.9). In the social sciences, they dominate fields like ed-tech, economics, and business metrics.
2. Springer Nature: Following the recent Journal Citation Reports (JCR) updates, Springer Nature retains unmatched prestige. Their flagship open-access mega-journal, *Nature Communications*, stands solid at a JIF of 18.1 (JCR Q1), indicating an incredibly dense citation pattern. They maintain a strict "quality-scaled" model, filtering out 50–60% of submissions at the desk stage before a reviewer ever sees them.
3. Wiley: Wiley acts as the primary publishing partner for many of the world's leading academic societies. Because society members review papers for their own community, Wiley's editorial quality is highly specialized. Their social science and bio-behavioral tracks are noted for extensive multi-year citation longevity rather than short-term trend chasing.
4. Taylor & Francis (Routledge): Under its *Routledge* imprint, T&F publishes the most extensive collection of humanities and qualitative social science journals globally. While qualitative fields naturally accumulate citations more slowly than clinical medicine or AI, T&F journals dominate the upper quartiles (Q1 and Q2) of the Social Sciences Citation Index (SSCI) due to their rigorous peer review.
5. SAGE: SAGE is an independent publisher that has carved out a massive niche in sociology, political science, and psychology. It publishes flagship methodology journals and notable open-access multi-disciplinary venues like *SAGE Open* (JIF 2.4, JCR Q1 in Social Sciences), proving that high-volume open access can still maintain strict, verified peer-review benchmarks.
6. Emerald Publishing: Emerald is the primary target for applied management, corporate strategy, and library information sciences. While their JIF scores sit in a slightly tighter bracket (1.5 to 7.0), they rank remarkably high in specialized business and bibliometric indices. They prioritize the real-world operational impact of research over purely abstract theory.
7. Oxford University Press (OUP): OUP operates under a non-profit, high-prestige mandate. Because their portfolio is significantly smaller than commercial giants like Elsevier, they are highly selective. An acceptance from an OUP journal carries massive academic weight because manuscripts must pass both rigorous external peer review and final sign-off from the university's academic delegates.

Research Methodology:

This research paper is based on descriptive and comparative analytical approaches. A comparative research design was employed to evaluate seven social science publishing organizations from around the world across ten distinct indicators. To ensure the study used

data-driven, secondary sources, including official publisher websites, research articles by various scholars, conference papers, and other relevant books and analyzed them.

Data analysis and interpretation:

First of all, it is necessary to discuss the subjects primarily include in social science. It is presented the table below –

Table :1 Subjects coverage

SL NO	Subject	Elsevier	Springer Nature	wiley	Taylor & Fancis	SAGE	OUP	Emerald
1	Sociology	—	—	—	√	√	√	—
2	Political Science	—	√	—	√	—	√	—
3	Economics	√	—	—	√	—	√	—
4	Anthropology	—	—	—	√	—	√	—
5	Psychiatry	√	—	√	—	√	√	—
6	Education	—	√	—	√	√	—	—
7	Library and Information Science	—	—	—	√	—	—	√
8	Communication & Media Studies	—	—	—	√	√	—	—
9	Social Work	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
10	Human Geography	—	—	√	√	—	—	—
11	Demography	√	√	—	—	—	—	—
12	Public Administration	—	√	—	—	√	—	—
13	Development Studies	—	√	—	√	—	—	—
14	Gender & Womens studies	—	—	—	√	√	—	—
15	Criminology	—	√	—	—	√	—	—
16	International Relations	—	—	—	√	—	√	—
17	Urban & Regional Planning	—	√	—	√	—	—	—
18	Cultural Studies	—	—	—	√	√	—	—

19	Rural Development studies	—	√	—	√	—	—	—
20	Information Science	√	—	—	—	—	—	√

The tick (√) symbol here indicates the publisher's extensive range of publications in the relevant field, and the hyphen (-) indicates the publisher's limited scope regarding the specific subject. An analysis of the publisher's subject-wise publication record, as presented in the table above, reveals the global publishing company '**Elsevier**' has earned significant acclaim for its publications in the fields of economics, psychology, and demography & information science. **Springer Nature**, primarily, has made significant contributions to publications in the fields of political science, education, social work, demography, public administration, development studies, criminology, urban and regional planning & rural development. Wiley has made significant contributions to publications in the fields of psychology and human geography. The publication company '**Taylor & Francis**' has earned a distinguished reputation for its publications in fields such as sociology, political science, economics, anthropology, education, library and information science, communication & media studies, human geography, development studies, gender & women's studies, international relations, urban & regional planning, cultural studies, and rural development studies. '**SAGE**' has earned a distinguished reputation for its publications in fields such as sociology, education, communication & media studies, social work, public administration, gender & women's studies, criminology, and cultural studies. '**Oxford University Press**' has earned

Globally renowned for its publications in the fields of sociology, political science, economics, anthropology, and international relations. '**Emerald**' publishers, such as Library and Information Science. The topic of our discussion now is the ten (10) criteria that a researcher typically prioritizes when publishing an original research paper—

1. Peer-review quality
2. Open access service
3. Indexing visibility
4. Citation impact
5. Editorial reputation
6. Digital infrastructure
7. Author support
8. Ethical standard
9. Research promotion
10. Global reach

Criteria – 1 (Peer-review quality)

Peer review is a process in which subject-matter experts rigorously evaluate and scrutinize the content of a work. It is currently regarded as a crucial benchmark for the universal

acceptance of research papers. The table presents a comparative overview of various publishing organizations.

Table: 2. Peer review quality

Sl.No	Name of the Publishers	Types of peer-review	Result
1	Elsevier	Single/Double - blind	Excellent
2	Springer Nature	Transparent / Double - blind	Excellent
3	Taylor & Francis	Double - blind	Good
4	Wiley	Double - blind	Good
5	SAGE	Double - blind	Good
6	Emerald	Double - blind	Good
7	Oxford University Press	Single/Double - blind	Excellent

Based on an analysis of the aforementioned table 2, it can be concluded that the peer-review processes for Elsevier, Springer Nature, and Oxford University Press are extremely rigorous and extensive, whereas those for Taylor & Francis, Wiley, SAGE, and Emerald are comparatively less rigorous and more limited in scope.

Criteria – 2 (Open access service)

'Open access' refers to a system where readers can freely read and download research papers from the internet according to their needs and preferences; however, the current landscape of academic publishing comprises various models—such as Gold, Green, Hybrid, Diamond, Bronze, Platinum, and Delayed—each with its own distinct operational approach. A comparative analysis of seven organizations based on these open-access models is presented in the table below.

Table: 3. Open access service

Sl.No	Name of the Publishers	Types of peer-review	Result
1	Elsevier	Gold OA, Hybrid OA, Fully OA	Excellent
2	Springer Nature	Gold OA, Hybrid OA, Fully OA	Excellent
3	Taylor & Francis	Gold OA, Hybrid OA	Good
4	Wiley	Gold OA, Hybrid OA	Good
5	SAGE	Gold OA, Hybrid OA	Good
6	Emerald	Gold OA, Hybrid OA	Good
7	Oxford University Press	Gold OA, Hybrid OA	Good

While these seven publishing houses bring valuable research knowledge to general readers through open access and satisfy their intellectual curiosity, the volume of publications and global impact of SAGE, Oxford University Press, and Emerald are significantly lower compared to Elsevier, Springer Nature, Taylor & Francis, and Wiley.

Criteria – 3 (Indexing Visibility)

1. Nowadays, the platforms where publishing houses index original research are a subject of much discussion, particularly for researchers seeking to enhance the quality of their work or establish a reputation in the scholarly community. This is because recruitment agencies and prestigious universities across the country have emphasized Scopus or Web of Science indexing for original research within their PhD regulations. Consequently, researchers face significant pressure in this regard. Indexing and visibility in high-level research are crucial for several reasons:
 - 1.1. They foster global scholarly engagement.
 - 1.2. They help increase citation counts.
 - 1.3. They improve research impact.
 - 1.4. They help enhance the academic standing of researchers.

Table: 4. Indexing Visibility

Sl.No	Name of the Publishers	Scopus	Web of Science	Result
1	Elsevier	√	√	Excellent
2	Springer Nature	√	√	Excellent
3	Taylor & Francis	√	√	Excellent
4	Wiley	√	√	Excellent
5	SAGE	√	√	Excellent
6	Oxford University Press	√	√	Excellent
7	Emerald	-	-	Good

The table above indicates the Elsevier, Springer Nature, Taylor & Francis, Wiley, and SAGE publications are far superior to Emerald Publishing in terms of indexing visibility.

Criteria – 4 (Citation impact)

Citation impact refers to a measure of how many times a published research paper has been cited in other studies. It is a significant factor in the field of research.

Table: 5. Citation Impact

Sl.No	Name of the Publishers	Result
1	Elsevier	Excellent
2	Springer Nature	Excellent
3	Taylor & Francis	Excellent
4	Wiley	Excellent
5	SAGE	Excellent
6	Oxford University Press	Excellent
7	Emerald	Good

The table above reveals that ‘Elsevier’ and ‘Springer Nature’ hold the most influential position regarding citation impact, as the majority of their published research is indexed in Scopus and Web of Science and boasts high impact metrics such as Cite Score, SJR, and SNIP. In comparison, ‘Emerald’ publishing is significantly less influential than ‘Taylor & Francis,’ ‘Wiley,’ ‘SAGE,’ and ‘Oxford University Press.’

Criteria – 5 (Editorial Reputation)

‘Editorial reputation’ is directly linked to the quality of research, the credibility of publication and global acceptance.

Table: 6 Editorial Reputation

Sl.No	Name of the Publishers	Editorial reputation	Editorial Board strength	Academic Prestige	Result
1	Elsevier	√	√	√	Excellent
2	Springer Nature	√	√	√	Excellent
3	Taylor & Francis	√	√	√	Excellent
4	Wiley	√	√	√	Excellent
5	SAGE	√	√	√	Excellent
6	Oxford University Press	√	√	√	Excellent
7	Emerald	-	-	-	Good

Here is the editorial reputation three aspects of analysis are very important –

1. Editorial reputation.
2. Editorial Board Strength.
3. Academic Prestige.

The information provided in the table above indicates that ‘Emerald’ publishing houses has a lower editorial reputation compared to other publishing houses.

Criteria – 6 (Digital Infrastructure)

In the current global landscape, knowledge systems are no longer confined to print media; rather, the important of online platform has grown significantly. In the digital age, digital infrastructure is considered a crucial component for the dissemination of research, the prevention of publication and the process of inquiry.

Table: 7. Digital Infrastructure

Sl.No	Name of the Publishers	Digital platform strength	Online Accessibility	Research analytics metrics	Result
1	Elsevier	√	√	√	Excellent
2	Springer Nature	√	√	√	Excellent
3	Taylor & Francis	√	√	√	Excellent
4	Wiley	√	√	√	Excellent
5	SAGE	-	-	-	Good
6	Oxford University Press	-	-	-	Good
7	Emerald	-	-	-	Good

Three key aspects are prioritized within digital infrastructure:

1. Digital platform strength.
2. Online accessibility.
3. Research analytics metrics. – publishers such as ‘Elsevier’, ‘Springer Nature’, ‘Taylor & Francis’, ‘Wiley’, ‘SAGE’ and ‘Oxford University Press’ provide researchers with advanced services based on these modern digital infrastructure elements – namely digital platform strength, online accessibility, and research analytics metrics. However, Emerald publishing’s digital infrastructure is less advanced compared to these others.

Criteria – 7 (Author Support)

‘Author support’ is currently an important element in the world’s academic publication systems. Preparation of research papers, selection of appropriate subject – based publication platforms, language editing, submission process, and sincere support of publishers in research promotion depends on researchers’ enthusiasm and success in publishing research.

Table: 8. Author Support

Sl.No	Name of the Publishers	Journal Finder	Language Support	Research Promotion tools	Publishing guidance	Submission support	Result
1	Elsevier	√	√	√	√	√	Excellent
2	Springer Nature	√	√	√	√	√	Excellent
3	Taylor & Francis	√	√	√	√	√	Excellent
4	Wiley	√	√	-	√	√	Good
5	SAGE	√	-	√	-	√	Good
6	Oxford University Press	√	√	-	√	-	Good
7	Emerald	-	-	√	√	√	Good

An analysis of the aforementioned table leads to the conclusion that, among the seven publishers three – namely ‘Elsevier’, ‘Springer Nature’, and ‘Taylor & Francis’ – offer superior support to researchers regarding publication. ‘Wiley’ ranks second in terms of ‘Author support’ for publishing research paper. While ‘SAGE’, ‘Oxford University Press’ and ‘Emerald’ share the third position.

Criteria – 8 (Ethical Standard)

‘Ethical standards’ refer to a rigorous code of ethics – supported globally by publishers – designed to ensure the transparency, reliability, and credibility of modern academic research; these standards constitute a vital components of modern research publishing.

Table: 9. Ethical Standard

Sl.No	Name of the Publishers	Ethical policies - 1	Ethical policies - 2	Ethical policies - 3	Result
1	Elsevier	COPE guidelines	Plagiarism detection	Research integrity policy	Excellent
2	Springer Nature	Research integrity	Ethical approval	COPE compliance	Excellent

		policy			
3	Taylor & Francis	Publication ethics	Misconduct Policy	COPE membership	Excellent
4	Wiley	Ethical publishing framework	Research integrity guidelines	-	Excellent
5	SAGE	Publication ethics	Peer review integrity	COPE standards	Excellent
6	Oxford University Press	Publication ethics	Research transparency	COPE compliance	Excellent
7	Emerald	Ethics policies	Anti-plagiarism measures	COPE Guidelines	Excellent

An analysis of the above table indicates that seven (7) publishing organization in the global social science research landscape have maintained high ethical standards of World – Class quality in their publication.

Criteria – 9 (Research Promotion)

Research promotion is now an important part of research publication. Now a day, it is not enough to publish research, activities like promoting it on international stage are very necessary to increase visibility, proper use, citation of research.

Table: 10. Research promotion

Sl no	Publisher	Article Sharing	Mendeley	Plumx Metrix	Social media promotion	Almetric tracking	Press releases	Research marketing support	Research visibility tools	Author promotion recourses	Result
1	Elsevier	√	√	√	√	-	-	-	-	-	Excellent
2	Springer nature	-	-	-	√	√	√	√	-	-	Excellent
3	Taylor & Francis	-	-	-	√	-	-	-	-	√	Very Good
4	Wiley	-	-	-	-	√	-	√	-	-	Very Good
5	Sage	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	√	√	Very Good
6	Emerald	√	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Good
7	Oxford University Press	-	-	-	√	-	-	-	-	√	Very Good

Strategies for promoting publications vary among publishers; in this regard, the research promotion programs of ‘Elsevier’ and ‘Springer Nature’ are particularly robust compared to those of ‘Taylor & Francis’, ‘Wiley’, ‘SAGE’ and ‘Oxford University Press’. However, Emerald publishing research promotion activities are weaker than those of the others.

Criteria – 10 (Global Reach)

'Global reach' refers to a publisher's international presence, author network, and research collaborations, as well as the trust or acceptance their published content enjoys among readers and the research community worldwide.

Table: 11. Global Reach

Sl no	Publisher	180+ countries	Extensive journal network	Global publishing network across continents	Strong international readership & authorship	Extensive global academic partnership	wide reach in social science	Moderate international presence	Worldwide academic reputation & readership	Result
1	Elsevier	√	√	-	-	-	-	-	-	Excellent
2	Springer nature	-	-	√	-	-	-	-	-	Excellent
3	Taylor & Francis	-	-	-	√	-	-	-	-	Very Good
4	Wiley	-	-	-	-	√	-	-	-	Very Good
5	Sage	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	√	Very Good
6	Emerald	-	-	-	-	-	-	√	-	Good
7	Oxford University Press	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	√	Very Good

Elsevier, Springer Nature, and Oxford University Press play a unique role in the global expansion of sociology research. In comparison, the global reach achieved by Taylor & Francis, SAGE, and Wiley is less effective than that of Elsevier, Springer Nature, and Oxford University Press. Finally, it can be said that Emerald Publishing House lags behind the others in terms of global expansion.

Conclusion: 'Elsevier, ' 'Springer Nature, ' 'Taylor & Francis, ' and 'Oxford University Press' hold leading positions in the publication of social science research papers. Needless to say, a key characteristic of these platforms is their strong visibility and presence in major citation indices, such as 'Scopus' and 'Web of Science.' Although 'Wiley, ' 'Sage, ' and 'Emerald' have also achieved international renown, their scope remains somewhat limited compared to the other publishing houses when measured against specific criteria. Nevertheless, these seven publishers have attained a unique stature in the field of social science research publishing.

Suggestion: The following are some suggestions that may vary from person to person.

- Social science publishing houses or platforms should maintain transparency and impartiality in the peer-review process and complete it within 20 to 30 days, avoiding delays; this would encourage early-career researchers to write further research papers, thereby opening up new horizons for social science in the academic sphere.

- b) Alongside the expansion of open-access publishing and the inclusion of various journals in databases like Scopus and Web of Science, additional ‘article processing charges’ (APC) must be eliminated; this would encourage independent researchers and emerging researchers facing financial constraints to participate in the global open-access system with their new research findings.
- c) Regulations regarding publication ethics—particularly COPE guidelines—must be strictly enforced, and support mechanisms for authors need to be further strengthened.

References:

1. Ghosh, S.B., & Das, A.K (2007). Open access and institutional repositories – A developing country perspective. A case study of India. *Information Development*, 23(3), 229-250. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0340035207083304>.
2. BIRD, C. (2010), continued adventures in open access: 2009 perspective. *Learned Publishing*, 23: 107-116. <https://doi.org/10.1087/20100205>.
3. Xia, J. (2010), A longitudinal study of scholars attitudes and behaviors toward open-access journal publishing. *J. Am. Soc. Inf. Sci.*, 61: 615-624. <https://doi.org/10.1002/asi.21283>
4. Solomon, D.J. and Björk, B.-C. (2012), A study of open access journals using article processing charges. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science & Technology*, 63(8): 1485-1495. <https://doi.org/10.1002/asi.22673>.
5. Mongeon, P., Paul – Hus, A.(2016). The journal coverage of Web of Science and Scopus: a comparative analysis. *Scientometrics*, 106(1), 213-228. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-015-1765-5>.
6. Spezi V, Wakeling S, Pinfield S, Creaser C, Fry J, Willett P (2017), "Open-access mega-journals: The future of scholarly communication or academic dumping ground? A review". *Journal of Documentation*, Vol. 73 No. 2 pp. 263–283, <https://doi.org/10.1108/JD-06-2016-0082>.
7. Shen, C. (2017). Open Access Scholarly Journal Publishing in Chinese. *Publications*, 5(4), 22.1-17. <https://doi.org/10.3390/publications5040022>
8. Khode, S. (2019). Indian Contribution to Open Access: A Study of e-LIS. *Indian Journal of Information Sources and Services*, 9(2), 72–75. <https://doi.org/10.51983/ijiss.2019.9.2.620>
9. Panda, S. (2021). Open Access Indian Publications: An Empirical Study of DOAJ. *Journal of Information and Knowledge*, 58(3), 187–196. <https://doi.org/10.17821/srels/2021/v58i3/152952>.
10. Das, A., Mandal, N., Rath, D. S., & Das, S. (2022). Trendline of Open Access Publication by Indian Institute of Technology (IITs) Researchers in India. *Journal of Information and Knowledge*, 59(6), 399–409. <https://doi.org/10.17821/srels/2022/v59i6/168621>

11. Koley, M., Namdeo, S. K., Suchiradipta, B., & Afifi, N. A. (2023). Digital platform for open and equitable sharing of scholarly knowledge in India. *Journal of Librarianship and Information Science*, 55(2), 403-413. <http://doi.org/10.1177/09610006221083678>.
12. Elsevier.(2026, June 20).In wikipedia.Retrieved June 28, 2026, from <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Elsevier>
13. Springer Nature (2026, June 18). In wikipedia.Retrieved June 28,2026, from http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/springer_Nature
14. Taylor & Francis.(2026, June 15). In wikipedia.Retrieved June 28,2026, from [HYPERLINK "http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Oxford_University_Press"](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Oxford_University_Press)http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Taylor_%26_Francis.
15. Wiley.(2026, June 16). In Wikipedia . Retrieved June 28, 2026, from <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/wiley>
16. SAGE Publication.(2026,June 14).In Wikipedia. Retrieved June 28, 2026. From http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/SAGE_publication
17. Emerald Publishing.(2026,June 12).In wikipedia.Retrieved June 28,2026, from http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Emerald_Group_Publishing
18. Oxford University Press.(2026,June 17).In wikipedia.Retrieved June 28, 2026, from http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Oxford_University_Press
19. Garfield,Eugene.(2006).The history and meaning of the journal impact factor.*JAMA*,295(1),90-93.<http://doi.org/10.1001/jama.295.1.90>.
20. Larivière V, Haustein S, Mongeon P (2015) The Oligopoly of Academic Publishers in the Digital Era. *PLoS ONE* 10(6): e0127502. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0127502>
21. Abrizah, A., Zainab, A. N., Kiran, K., & Raj, R. G. (2012). LIS journals scientific impact and subject categorization: A comparison between Web of Science and Scopus. *Scientometrics*, 94(2), 721–740. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-012-0813-7>.
22. De Groote, S. L., & Raszewski, R. (2012). Coverage of Google Scholar, Scopus, and Web of Science: A case study of the h-index in nursing. *Nursing Outlook*, 60(6), 391–400. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.outlook.2012.04.007>.
23. Nederhof, A. J. (2006). Bibliometric monitoring of research performance in the social sciences and the humanities: A review. *Scientometrics*, 66(1), 81–100. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-006-0007-2>.
24. Bornmann, Lutz & Daniel, Hans-Dieter. (2008). What do citation counts measure? A review of studies on citing behavior. *J Doc* 64(1):45-80. <http://doi.org/10.1108/00220410810844150>.

25. Rowlands I, Nicholas D, Russell B, Canty N, Watkinson A (2011) Social media use in the research workflow. *Learned Publishing* 24: 183–195.
<http://doi.org/10.1087/20110306>.
26. Niyazov Y, Vogel C, Price R, Lund B, Judd D, Akil A, et al. (2016) Open Access Meets Discoverability: Citations to Articles Posted to Academia.edu. *PLoS ONE* 11(2): e0148257. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0148257>