



NAPiD
NATIONAL ACADEMIC
PUBLICATION & INDEXING DATABASE

NAPiD Guidelines for Journal Assessment, Approval and Indexing

Operational guide for journal applicants, assessors and authorised NAPiD
administrators

National Academic Publications and Indexing Database

Guideline Note NAPiD is administered by the League of Academic Journal Editors of Nigeria (LAJEN), in furtherance of the strategic objectives of the [National Policy on the Nigeria Education Repository and Databank \(NERD\)](#) with respect to Special National Indexes of Academic Publications (SNIAP) approved by the Federal Executive Council

October 2026

Purpose of this guide

This guide explains how a journal moves from application or direct URL assessment to assessment in NAPiD-65, administrative vetting, final approval and public listing on napid.net. It also explains how an authorised NAPiD Administrator may use Controlled Administrative Intake where a directly assessed journal does not yet have a formal application.

Core rule

A journal is indexed only after it has been properly identified, assessed and vetted through NAPiD-65, connected to a complete journal application record, administratively reviewed, approved and entered in the approved journal directory. Submission or assessment alone does not constitute indexing.

Scope

- Applications submitted by journal editors, publishers, institutions and authorised representatives.
- Journal URLs entered directly into NAPiD-65 by authorised assessors.
- Linking assessments to existing or future journal applications.
- Controlled Administrative Intake by an authorised NAPiD Administrator.
- Final review, decision, publication and post-indexing verification.

Contents

Purpose of this guide	2
Core rule	2
Scope	2
Contents	3
1. Governing principles	5
2. Roles in the indexing process	5
3. Workflow at a glance	5
4. Route One: formal journal application	6
4.1 Information to be supplied	6
4.2 Submission outcome	6
5. Route Two: Direct URL Assessment.....	6
5.1 Initial classification.....	6
5.2 Permitted routes after assessment	6
6. Controlled Administrative Intake	7
6.1 Conditions for use.....	7
6.2 Step-by-step Controlled Administrative Intake	7
6.3 Minimum information for a controlled intake	8
7. NAPiD-65 assessment procedure	8
7.1 Select the correct journal	8
7.2 Gather and review evidence.....	8
7.3 Complete the criteria.....	8
7.4 Meaning of completion.....	9
8. Linking and identity verification	9
9. Final administrative review	9
9.1 Confirm the assessment requirement	9
9.2 Review the application.....	10
10. Decisions and application statuses.....	10
11. Creation of the approved journal record	10
11.1 Information to verify before publication.....	10
11.2 Duplicate prevention.....	11
12. Public listing and verification	11
13. Exceptions and common problem cases	11
13.1 Direct assessment has no application.....	11

13.2 Application exists but no assessment is visible	11
13.3 Several likely applications are returned.....	11
13.4 Journal title or domain has changed.....	11
13.5 Incomplete or failed crawl	11
14. Audit, security and record integrity	12
15. Operational checklists.....	12
15.1 Assessor checklist.....	12
15.2 Controlled Administrative Intake checklist	12
15.3 Final approval checklist.....	12
Final operating principle.....	13

1. Governing principles

- Assessment and approval are separate controls. NAPiD-65 produces the assessment record, while the administrative review makes the final indexing decision.
- Every indexed journal must have a complete administrative application record, whether submitted publicly or created through Controlled Administrative Intake.
- A direct website crawl is not sufficient by itself. The assessment must be completed, retained and linked to the correct application record.
- A similar journal title is not enough to establish identity. Website domain, ISSNs, DOI prefix, publisher and other identifiers must be checked.
- A journal must not be duplicated. Existing journal records must be updated where appropriate rather than recreated.
- All decisions, notes, links, status changes and administrative actions must remain traceable.

2. Roles in the indexing process

Role	Principal responsibility
Applicant or journal representative	Submits the formal application and supplies accurate journal and ownership information.
NAPiD-65 assessor	Examines the journal, records evidence, completes the assessment criteria and records the assessment outcome.
NAPiD Administrator	Reviews applications, confirms assessment linkage, conducts Controlled Administrative Intake where authorised, resolves administrative issues and makes or implements the final indexing decision within assigned authority.
Quality assurance reviewer	Reviews completed work, investigates complaints or irregularities, and may recommend or undertake corrective action within assigned authority.

3. Workflow at a glance

Stage	Action	Result
1	Formal application is submitted, or a journal URL is entered directly in NAPiD-65.	A journal enters the assessment pipeline.
2	The application or direct URL is identified and opened in NAPiD-65.	The correct journal is selected for assessment.
3	NAPiD-65 assessment is completed and the evidence and scores are retained.	A completed assessment record exists.
4	The assessment is linked to an existing application, a future application, or an application created through Controlled Administrative Intake.	The assessment and administrative record refer to the same journal.
5	The NAPiD Administrator reviews the application, assessment and journal identity.	The application is ready for a decision or further action.

Stage	Action	Result
6	The application is approved, returned for additional information, or rejected.	A reasoned and auditable decision is recorded.
7	An approved journal record is created or updated and the public listing is verified.	The journal becomes discoverable on napid.net.

4. Route One: formal journal application

A journal editor, publisher, institution or authorised representative begins by registering or logging in to napid.net and opening the journal application service.

4.1 Information to be supplied

- Application type, such as a new listing, an update to an existing journal or reactivation.
- Journal title, normalised title, acronym and alternative title where applicable.
- Description, aims and scope, subject areas and keywords.
- Publisher, owner or institution and the relevant location information.
- Official website and online manuscript-submission addresses.
- Print ISSN, online ISSN and DOI prefix where available.
- Publication frequency, first publication year and primary language.
- Access model, peer-review model and publication format.
- Applicant identity, capacity, contact information and authority declaration.

4.2 Submission outcome

When the application is submitted successfully, NAPiD assigns an application reference and records the submission for administrative review. The reference should be retained and used in all enquiries. The appearance of an application in Journal Applications does not mean that the journal has been approved or indexed.

5. Route Two: Direct URL Assessment

An authorised assessor may enter a journal website address directly into NAPiD-65. This route enables assessment even where the journal has not yet submitted a formal application on the main NAPiD platform.

5.1 Initial classification

If no formal journal application is associated with the URL, the assessment is classified as Direct URL Assessment (Awaits Formal Journal Application). The assessor may complete and retain the assessment, including its evidence, criteria, scores, notes and outcome.

5.2 Permitted routes after assessment

Route	When it applies	Required action
Link to an existing application	The journal already has a formal application in the main NAPiD database.	Search for likely matches, verify the identity and explicitly link the assessment to the correct application.

Route	When it applies	Required action
Await a future application	The journal is expected to submit its own application later.	Retain the completed assessment until the application is submitted, then verify and link the records.
Controlled Administrative Intake	The journal has been assessed directly and an authorised NAPiD Administrator elects to supply the required administrative information.	Create a complete administrative application record, record the source and reason, and link it to the assessment before final review.

A Direct URL Assessment does not automatically create a public journal listing. It must be attached to a complete administrative application record and pass through final administrative review.

6. Controlled Administrative Intake

Controlled Administrative Intake is the approved alternative where a directly assessed journal does not yet have an applicant-submitted record. It allows an authorised NAPiD Administrator to provide the required information on behalf of the administrative process, without treating the assessment itself as an application.

6.1 Conditions for use

- A genuine journal website has been identified and assessed in NAPiD-65.
- The journal does not already have a complete formal application that should instead be linked.
- The administrator can establish the journal's identity from reliable sources.
- The required information can be supplied with reasonable accuracy and supporting evidence.
- The action, reason and responsible administrator can be recorded for audit purposes.

6.2 Step-by-step Controlled Administrative Intake

1. Open the completed Direct URL Assessment and confirm that its status and evidence are complete.
2. Search the main NAPiD journal applications and approved journal directory to prevent duplication.
3. Search by normalised website domain, print ISSN, online ISSN, DOI prefix and normalised journal title.
4. If a correct application already exists, stop the intake process and link the assessment to that application.
5. If no suitable application exists, select the Controlled Administrative Intake option.
6. Enter the required journal, publisher, ownership, contact, publication and policy information.
7. Use the journal's official website and other reliable records to verify each material field.
8. Record that the record originated from a Direct URL Assessment and state the administrative reason for creating it.
9. Save the administrative application record and obtain its application reference.
10. Link the completed NAPiD-65 assessment to the newly created application.
11. Review the linked records for title, domain, ISSN, DOI prefix and publisher consistency.
12. Proceed to the normal final administrative review. Controlled intake must not be treated as automatic approval.

6.3 Minimum information for a controlled intake

Information group	Minimum requirement
Identity	Journal title, normalised title and official website URL.
Identifiers	Available print ISSN, online ISSN and DOI prefix, with absence noted where genuinely unavailable.
Ownership	Publisher, institution or owning organisation and country.
Publication profile	Aims and scope, subject area, language, frequency, access model, peer-review model and publication format.
Contact	Available official journal or publisher contact information.
Administrative provenance	The NAPiD-65 assessment reference, intake reason, responsible administrator and date.

7. NAPiD-65 assessment procedure

NAPiD-65 is the journal assessment engine. It supports evidence gathering, criterion-by-criterion assessment, scoring, notes and lifecycle management. Automated observations assist the assessor but do not replace professional judgement.

7.1 Select the correct journal

1. Open NAPiD-65 Assessments from the authorised administrative interface.
2. Choose whether to fetch a journal from the main NAPiD database or assess a direct URL.
3. For a database record, search using the application reference, title, website, ISSN or DOI prefix.
4. Examine the returned candidates and select only the record whose identity has been verified.
5. For a direct URL, enter the journal's canonical website address rather than an article, social-media or third-party listing page.

7.2 Gather and review evidence

- Journal identity, ownership and publisher transparency.
- Website availability, navigation and consistency.
- Editorial board and governance information.
- Peer-review arrangements and author guidance.
- Publication ethics, conflicts, corrections and retraction policies.
- Archiving, preservation, access and copyright information.
- Published issues, articles and publication continuity.
- ISSN and DOI information and their consistency with the application.
- Fees, processing charges and other disclosures where applicable.
- Any warning signs, inconsistencies or claims requiring manual verification.

7.3 Complete the criteria

1. Review every applicable criterion in the assessment workspace.
2. Use the captured evidence and the live journal website to support each assessment.

3. Enter the appropriate assessment value or conclusion for each criterion.
4. Record concise notes where the conclusion is not self-evident or where an exception applies.
5. Do not infer compliance merely because a page exists; examine whether its content is meaningful and consistent.
6. Review the overall and integrity scores generated by the engine.
7. Resolve material omissions or inconsistencies before completing the assessment.
8. Record the final assessment outcome and complete the assessment lifecycle.

7.4 Meaning of completion

A journal has completed NAPiD-65 assessment only when the assessment is no longer a draft, the relevant criteria have been considered, the available evidence and scores are retained, and an authorised outcome has been recorded. A crawl that ended successfully is not, by itself, a completed assessment.

8. Linking and identity verification

The assessment and application must refer to the same journal. Linking should therefore be explicit and based on multiple identifiers.

Identifier	Verification question
Website domain	Does the canonical domain match, after removing harmless variations such as protocol and www?
Print and online ISSNs	Do the available ISSNs match the journal and the application?
DOI prefix	Is the prefix used by the same journal or publisher?
Journal title	Do the normalised titles correspond despite punctuation or minor stylistic differences?
Publisher or owner	Is the named publisher or institution consistent across records?
Country and contact details	Do these details support the proposed match?

Where identifiers conflict materially, do not link the records until the discrepancy has been resolved and documented.

9. Final administrative review

After assessment and linking, the NAPiD Administrator opens Journal Management and selects Journal Applications. The application review page should be used to consider both the submitted or administratively entered information and the associated NAPiD-65 result.

9.1 Confirm the assessment requirement

- A completed NAPiD-65 assessment exists.
- The assessment is linked to this application, not merely to a journal with a similar name.
- The website and identifiers correspond.
- The assessment outcome supports further consideration for indexing.
- Material concerns raised during assessment have been resolved or properly considered.

9.2 Review the application

1. Confirm the application reference, type, status and submission history.
2. Verify the applicant's stated capacity where the record originated from public submission.
3. Review the journal title, publisher, institution, website, ISSNs and DOI prefix.
4. Examine the aims, scope, subject classification, language, frequency and publication format.
5. Check the access and peer-review models against the journal website.
6. Confirm that the record will not duplicate an existing indexed journal.
7. Read the NAPiD-65 scores, findings, evidence and assessor's notes.
8. Request clarification or additional information where a material issue remains.
9. Record the decision and reasons in the application record.

10. Decisions and application statuses

Decision	When appropriate	Administrative effect
Approve	The application is complete, the journal identity is verified, the NAPiD-65 assessment supports indexing, and no unresolved material issue remains.	Create or update the approved journal record and record the decision.
Request additional information	Important information is absent, unclear or inconsistent but may be corrected.	Return the application for the required clarification while preserving the assessment and review history.
Continue or return for review	Further assessment or administrative examination is necessary.	Keep the application within the review workflow and assign the required action.
Reject	The journal does not satisfy the applicable requirements, has unresolved identity concerns, or the assessment does not support indexing.	Record a clear reason and close the application according to the approved workflow.

Approval must be a reasoned administrative decision. A high score, complete form or attractive website is not independently sufficient.

11. Creation of the approved journal record

Following approval, NAPiD creates a new approved journal record or updates the correct existing record. The approved record should contain only verified information and should remain linked to the originating application and assessment history.

11.1 Information to verify before publication

- Official journal title, acronym and alternative title.
- Publisher or owning institution.
- Official website and manuscript-submission URL.
- Print ISSN, online ISSN and DOI prefix.
- Country and relevant location.

- Aims, scope and subject classification.
- Publication frequency and first publication year.
- Primary language, access model and publication format.
- Peer-review model and other approved descriptive information.

11.2 Duplicate prevention

Before a new approved record is created, search existing journals using the website domain, both ISSNs, DOI prefix and normalised title. If the journal already exists, update or reactivate the correct record in accordance with the application type rather than creating a second listing.

12. Public listing and verification

1. Open the public NAPiD journal directory after approval.
2. Search for the journal by title and ISSN.
3. Confirm that the journal title, publisher and identifiers are displayed correctly.
4. Open the journal detail page and test the official website link.
5. Check the subject, access, peer-review and publication classifications.
6. Confirm that no duplicate journal entry has appeared.
7. Where publication is not immediately visible, check the approval status, approved journal link and any applicable cache or publication process before repeating the approval action.

13. Exceptions and common problem cases

13.1 Direct assessment has no application

Use Controlled Administrative Intake where authorised, or retain the assessment as awaiting a formal application. Do not create a public journal listing directly from an unlinked assessment.

13.2 Application exists but no assessment is visible

Search NAPiD-65 by application reference, domain, ISSN, DOI prefix and normalised title. If a correct assessment exists, link it explicitly. If none exists, send the journal through NAPiD-65 assessment.

13.3 Several likely applications are returned

Compare multiple identifiers. Do not select a record solely because its title resembles the assessed journal. Escalate unresolved conflicts for additional review.

13.4 Journal title or domain has changed

Determine whether the change represents the same continuing journal, a formal title change, a transfer of ownership or a different publication. Preserve the history and update the existing journal only where continuity is established.

13.5 Incomplete or failed crawl

Review the URLs reached, retry only where appropriate, and complete the remaining evidence manually. Do not equate a technical crawl failure with an automatic negative indexing decision.

14. Audit, security and record integrity

- Use only authorised accounts and assigned permissions.
- Do not share credentials or perform assessments under another person's identity.
- Keep the application, assessment, evidence, notes, decisions and lifecycle history intact.
- Record reasons for Controlled Administrative Intake, corrections, approvals and rejections.
- Avoid silent replacement of identifiers or journal ownership information.
- Treat applicant contact information and non-public administrative notes as protected information.
- Use the normal workflow for corrections so that changes remain auditable.
- Close or release database and assessment sessions when work is complete and avoid unnecessary repeated runs.

15. Operational checklists

15.1 Assessor checklist

- Correct journal and canonical website selected.
- Application linked where one exists.
- Relevant pages and policies examined.
- All applicable criteria completed.
- Evidence, notes and scores reviewed.
- Material inconsistencies documented.
- Final assessment outcome recorded.
- Direct URL assessment correctly classified if no application exists.

15.2 Controlled Administrative Intake checklist

- No suitable existing application or approved journal record found.
- Completed Direct URL Assessment confirmed.
- Required journal information entered and verified.
- Administrative source and reason recorded.
- Application reference generated.
- Assessment linked to the new application.
- Identity fields checked after linking.
- Record sent through normal final review.

15.3 Final approval checklist

- Complete application record exists.
- Completed NAPiD-65 assessment is correctly linked.
- Journal title, domain, ISSNs, DOI prefix and publisher are consistent.
- Assessment findings and scores have been reviewed.
- Required clarifications have been resolved.
- Duplicate check has been completed.
- Decision and reasons have been recorded.
- Approved journal record has been created or correctly updated.
- Public listing has been checked.

Final operating principle

NAPiD indexing is the conclusion of a documented process, not the consequence of a single form, crawl or score. A journal becomes publicly indexed only when its identity has been established, its NAPiD-65 assessment has been completed and linked, its administrative information has been verified, and an authorised final decision has been recorded. Controlled Administrative Intake provides a lawful and auditable alternative for directly assessed journals, but it does not remove any assessment, review or approval control.