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why Open Access?

1. for the good of research

Figure 2. Studies that investigated the citation advantage grouped by their conclusion. The majority concluded that there is a significant citation advantage for Open Access articles. Source: Data from The Open Access Citation Advantage Service, SPARC Europe, accessed March 2016.

why Open Access?

1. for the good of research
2. worldwide access to research results, both inside and outside academia

a majority of results of scholarly research remains inaccessible to a majority of people on this planet

H. Piwowar et al. (2018), 'The state of OA: a large-scale analysis of the prevalence and impact of Open Access articles', DOI: 10.7717/peerj.4375
why Open Access?

1. for the good of research
2. worldwide access to research results, both inside and outside academia
3. financial reasons
So apparently you have to write the journal article for free, and other people review it for free.

And then the people who own the journal charge thousands for anyone to be able to read it.
why Open Access?

1. for the good of research
2. worldwide access to research results, both inside and outside academia
3. financial reasons
4. take back control of scholarly communication
4.2 DYSFUNCTIONING OF THE SCHOLARLY COMMUNICATION

The nature of scholarly communication in the IC significantly. In last twenty years period, many p their digital or online edition, popularly known a new scholarly journals were also launched purely through state support of researchers at state higher-education institutions. In addition, disseminate their research with no expectation of direct financial reward.

Scholarly Communication in Crisis

The formal system of scholarly communication is showing numerous signs of stress and strain. Throughout the 20th century commercial firms have assumed increasing control over the scholarly journals market, particularly in technical, and medical fields. The journal publishing industry has also become increasingly consolidated and is

ISSUES OF STRUCTURE AND CONTROL IN THE SCHOLARLY COMMUNICATION SYSTEM

Charles B. Osburn

This article begins with the identification of the library perception of forces out of control in the scholarly communication system and proceeds to a description of attempts libraries are making to regain a sense of control. In reaction to papers prepared by publishers, the article then addresses points of similarity or contrast between scholarly publishers and research libraries, with emphasis on the concept of selectivity. Possibilities for the restructuring and control of certain aspects of the scholarly communication system are suggested.

Revitalising the role of universities in scholarly communication

17 February 2020 | Eloy Rodrigues, University of Minho Libraries

Scholarly publishing is at a crossroads between commercial vendors and community-driven services. Eloy Rodrigues from the University of Minho
different ways of achieving OA
different ways of achieving OA

1. for the good of research
2. worldwide access to research results, both inside and outside academia
3. financial reasons
4. take back control of scholarly communication

all forms of OA solve the problem of accessibility but not all solve the problem of cost or control
types of OA

OA

open archiving
a.k.a. Green OA

open publishing
a.o. Full Gold OA, Hybrid Gold OA, Diamond OA

Demmy Verbeke (2021), Open Access terminology (bis), https://scholarlytales.hcommons.org/2021/03/25/open-access-terminology-bis/
types of OA

**Open Archiving**  
(a.k.a. Green OA)

- author (self-)archives a digital copy of the work in a repository, and makes this copy available to the public for free
  - infrastructure typically provided by non-profit institutions such as universities
  - often embargo
  - often not the final, published version
- free for readers  
- free for authors

**Open Publishing**  
(a.o. Full Gold OA, Hybrid Gold OA, Diamond OA)

- author publishes work immediately in OA, making the published version of this work immediately available to the public for free
  - infrastructure provided
  - either for-profit (profit-driven publication fees)
  - or non-profit (cost-effective publication fees)
- free for readers  
- not always free for authors
open archiving
open archiving

- often: archival version that is made available in OA is **not the commercial version**

- often: **embargo** (archival version is made available later than commercial version)
open archiving: stages of a manuscript

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>publication stage</th>
<th>definition</th>
<th>synonyms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>submitted version</td>
<td>manuscript before peer review (e.g. first version submitted for publication to journal)</td>
<td>preprint, work in progress, submitted manuscript, author's original draft, pre-refereed print</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accepted version</td>
<td>manuscript after peer review, accepted for publication</td>
<td>postprint, accepted manuscript, AAM: author's accepted manuscript, post-refereed print</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>published version</td>
<td>final version, after peer review and with complete and finalised publisher’s layout (e.g. DOI, page numbers)</td>
<td>version of record, commercial version, publisher's version</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on C. Iakovakis (2019), Open Access. Increase the visibility of your research, DOI: 10.6084/m9.figshare.7849160.v6
submitted version (preprint) -> peer review -> publisher layout -> accepted version (postprint) -> published version (version of record)

adapted from slidedeck Open Access. Opening up your research (2022) used by 2Bergen Onderzoek (KU Leuven)
Which version can be shared in OA?

- **Preprint**: Work in progress. Typically can be shared in OA without restrictions, but quite often only after embargo.
- **Postprint**: Author-accepted manuscript (AAM). Can typically be shared in OA.
- **Published**: Version of record. Typically only be shared in OA when published in a full Gold or hybrid Gold OA journal.

adapted from diagram by Thomas Shafee & Ginny Barbour, https://commons.wikimedia.org/w/index.php?curid=87548648
example of open archiving: Belgian copyright legislation (since 2018)

rights of the author:

• share accepted version of journal articles (not published versions and not other publication types such as books, book chapters, conference proceedings, etc.) in open access after an embargo of 6 months (STEM) or 12 months (HSS) can be shared both in institutional repository and on personal websites/social media/… > anywhere author wishes
• compelling: prevails over any agreement signed with a publisher
• retroactive: applies retroactively to older journal articles

open archiving: black open access

black (a.k.a. illegal, rogue, guerilla) open access = distribution of scholarly research regardless of copyright law, so quite often illegal distribution of scholarly publications

e.g. scholars making their work available on Researchgate or Academia.edu, while they are not allowed to do this according to their author’s contract

e.g. Library Genesis or Sci-Hub: “the first pirate website in the world to provide mass and public access to tens of millions of research papers”, willful copyright infringement, Sci-Hub provides access to scholarly literature via full text PDF downloads, coverage in some disciplines >90%

rights retention

author does not transfer full copyright to the publisher

author (or university - depending on national copyright law and/or policy of specific universities) keeps all rights to the accepted manuscript

makes sense for open archiving as well as open publishing

makes sense for all publication types, but institutional and/or funder mandates typically only dictate rights retention for articles (sometimes including contributions to conference proceedings and book chapters)
published behind a paywall, but author/university maintains rights on accepted manuscript and shares it in OA through a repository without embargo

e.g. RRS in the context of Plan S authors include a rights retention statement in their submissions
author/university disseminates the accepted manuscript without delay under a CC BY license via institutional repository

rights retention in the context of open archiving
rights retention in the context of open publishing

• you decide about potential reuse
• you decide about translations
• you decide about text and data mining
cost of open publishing
collective funding
cost of OA

OA = free for readers, however OA ≠ free

open archiving: establishing and maintaining institutional repositories cost money

open publishing: producing a professional scholarly journal/book (even when it only has a digital output) costs money

with OA it is not the consumer who pays this cost (i.e. the reader or libraries buying the finished product)
but the producer (i.e. the author by paying an author fee)
or a third party (e.g. a consortium of university libraries paying for production costs rather than buying the finished product)
types OA

OA

- open archiving
  - a.k.a. Green OA

- open publishing
  - a.o. Full Gold OA, Hybrid Gold OA, Diamond OA

- for-profit:
  - typically with author-facing costs

- non-profit:
  - with or without author-facing costs
you publish your article or book immediately in OA, making the published version of your work available to the public

• for-profit author fees (most privately-owned publishers)
• non-profit author fees (typically university presses, scholar-led and/or library-based publishers)
• no author fees (publishing infrastructure is subsidized, typically through collective funding, so that neither authors nor readers need to pay)
collective funding

costs of open publishing and open infrastructure are carried by a group of supporters (e.g. consortium of libraries)

costs are typically not calculated on the level of an individual article or book

equitable solution: does not exchange a barrier to reading with a barrier to publishing
  e.g. Diamond OA made possible thanks to collective funding

punctum is one of the very few Open Access (OA) presses in the world that does not charge what are known as Book Processing Charges, because we feel they are inherently anti-democratic and exacerbate the historic inequities of academic publishing. Yet they are fast becoming the standard protocol for Open Access publishing. If you are curious to know more about this, as well as about how much it costs to create an

We are the leading independent Open Access publisher in the Humanities and Social Sciences in the UK: a not-for-profit Social Enterprise run by scholars who are committed to making high-quality research freely available to readers around the world. All our books are available to read online and download for free, with no Book Processing Charges (BPCs) for authors. We publish monographs and textbooks in all areas, offering the academic excellence of a traditional press combined with the speed, convenience and accessibility of digital publishing. We also publish bespoke Series for Universities and Research Centres and invite libraries to support Open Access publishing by joining our Membership Programme.

Publishing with us is great for many reasons.

- **No fees** - The publication of a book in Language Science Press is free of charge for both authors and readers
- **Retain copyright** - you retain copyright and are free to disseminate your article, make copies for any use, and/or deposit in any repository or archive you like.
- **Support the community** - by publishing your book with us you support the linguistic community and enable young scientists to read your work
- **Be read** - because our books are free to everybody, more people access the books and cite you.
LYRASIS Open Access Community Investment Program (OACIP): https://www.lyrasis.org/content/Pages/oacip.aspx

Open Book Collective (OBC): https://openbookcollective.org/

Global Sustainability Coalition for Open Science Services (SCOSS): https://scoss.org/
collective funding

for example: KU Leuven Fund for Fair OA

basically: library budget set aside to spend exclusively on non-profit and community-governed publishing infrastructure (e.g. Diamond OA programs)

inspired by the principles set out by the Fair Open Access Alliance
  ▪ transparent ownership structure
  ▪ controlled by the scholarly community
  ▪ copyright retention
  ▪ any fees charged are low, transparent, and in proportion to the work carried out
examples: OA journals and publishers

For the full overview, see:
https://www.kuleuven.be/open-science/what-is-open-science/scholarly-publishing-and-open-access/open-access-kuleuven/fair-oa-initiatives
examples: Open Scholarship infrastructure

currently support for 30+ mission-aligned OS publishers, infrastructures and initiatives

For the full overview, see: https://www.kuleuven.be/open-science/what-is-open-science/scholarly-publishing-and-open-access/open-access-kuleuven/fair-oa-initiatives
reverse investment priorities

all too often: investing in for-profit approaches to Open Science comes first, investing in other approaches only happens when there is money left over
should be: invest first in cost-effective approaches that respect the values and independence of researchers, and only then consider costly approaches that do not share scholarly values and erode academic freedom

in other words: stop being “wallets with a serious case of Stockholm Syndrom”
in other words: stop playing the victim and become an architect
rethink scholarly communication
rethink scholarly communication

“It is a delusion to regard the science journal as a reflection of current science research.

... It would certainly seem undesirable if the distribution procedures of the electronic system are more or less direct equivalents of the present situation.”

are journals and books still the most efficient way to organize scholarly communication?

what if we de-couple scholarly communication from research evaluation?

what if we rethink the role of peer review as a factor in dissemination?
we can keep it as an instrument for quality control, but does it need to play such a central role (causing delays) in publication?

Björn Brembs et al. (2021), ‘Replacing academic journals’, DOI: 10.5281/ZENODO.5526635
first publish, then review

publish article on a preprint server; article is immediately available to everyone
article is reviewed after publication (peer review process can be closed or open)

various possibilities
1. preprint does not progress any further
2. preprint is afterwards published in traditional journal (which may or may not re-do
   peer review process)
3. journals can be curated as collections of articles about a specific topic which have
   been published as preprints and have been flagged as particularly noteworthy by
   peer review

in other words:
articles are first published and then reviewed (and can be updated after that review)
peer review does not delay dissemination
first publish, then review: example

https://open-research-europe.ec.europa.eu/

OA publication platform for researchers with Horizon 2020, Horizon Europe or Euratom financing

no author fees, for all scholarly domains
**Article Submission**
Submission is via a single-page submission system. The in-house editorial team carries out a comprehensive set of prepublication checks to ensure that all policies and ethical guidelines are adhered to.

**Publication & Data Deposition**
Once the article has passed the prepublication checks, a fully typeset version is published with a DOI, enabling immediate viewing and citation, as well as indexing in Google Scholar. Once the article is published, it cannot be sent to another journal for publication.

**Open Peer Review & Article Revision**
Expert reviewers are selected and invited, and their reviews and names are published alongside the article, together with the authors’ responses and comments from registered users.

**Send to Indexers & Repositories**
Authors are encouraged to publish revised versions of their article. All versions of an article are linked and independently citable. Articles that pass peer review are indexed in external databases such as PubMed, Scopus, and Google Scholar.
Investor demand in syndicated EFSF/ESM bond issuances [version 1; peer review: awaiting peer review]

Martin Hillebrand, Marko Mravlak, Peter Schwendner

Abstract

European Financial Stability Facility (EFSF) and European Stability Mechanism (ESM) were set up at the peak of the European sovereign debt crisis to issue bonds and lend to countries under current funding stress. This study analyses investor demand in syndicated bond issuances of EFSF and ESM from 2014 to 2020 on an unprecedented granularity level using a...
Knowledge sharing and discovery across heterogeneous research infrastructures [version 3; peer review: 2 approved, 1 not approved]

Siamak Farshidi, Xiaofeng Liao, Na Li, Doron Goldfarb, Barbara Magagna, Markus Stocker, Keith Jeffery, Peter Thijsse, Christian Pichot, Andreas Petzold, Zhiming Zhao.
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This article is included in Research Infrastructures gateway
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ENISA: 5G design and architecture of global mobile networks; threats, risks, vulnerabilities; cybersecurity considerations [version 3; peer review: 3 approved]

R. Andrew Paskauskas

This article is included in Digital Security collection

This article is included in Horizon 2020 gateway

This article is included in Wireless Communications collection

Abstract

Abstract — The literature on 5G design and architecture numbers in the hundreds of thousands, which makes analyzing this
innovative publication platforms

A public infrastructure to publish all kinds of academic output - in all stages of the research process - in open access, while preserving academic quality and integrity.

Non-profit and community-governed to ensure sustainability and digital sovereignty of universities and other academic institutions.

E.g. recommendations of the Public Infrastructure Taskforce (PIT) of the League of European Research Universities (LERU).
innovative publication platforms

PubPub: the open-source, community-led, end-to-end publishing platform for knowledge communities

PubPub supports over 3000 communities, from peer-reviewed scholarly journals and books to novel community publishing experiments, and everything in between. These communities are created and maintained by university presses, society publishers, library publishers, independent scholar-led publishers, academic departments, research labs, ad-hoc communities, individuals, and many others.

PubPub provides infrastructure for each part of the publishing process, from drafting documents, conducting peer review, and hosting entire journal and book websites to collecting and displaying reader feedback and analytics.

https://www.pubpub.org/
The KU Leuven Open Science Day is an annual event where KU Leuven researchers from all career stages share knowledge and exchange examples of how they implement Open Science principles in their research. It offers a platform where researchers can inspire, learn from each other, and discover how their research can benefit from these principles. The proceedings offer a record of the presentations, panel sessions, and posters, which demonstrate how KU Leuven researchers embed Open Science practices during the different stages of their research.

The KU Leuven Open Science Day is organized by KU Leuven Libraries in collaboration with the Research Coordination Office and the Information & Communication Technology & Systems Office (ICTS) and under the auspices of the KU Leuven Open Science task force.

Proceedings 2021  Proceedings 2022  Proceedings 2023
main take-aways

- be aware that there are various types of OA
- be aware that there are various business models to finance OA
- all types solve the problem of accessibility, but only open archiving and non-profit open publishing also solve the problem of cost and (often) control

- be aware that for-profit open publishing is very expensive
- be aware that for-profit open publishing maintains the current power balance in scholarly publishing
- be aware that there are non-profit open publishing alternatives (both traditional - journals and books - and innovative)
- at the very least share your work by using open archiving

***whispers*** all of scholarly communication is a social construct. it's just implicit understandings between scholars about what counts as legitimate. there's no reason we can't build a better, more open, system.

Elsevier launches new open-access Social Sciences & Humanities (yes, that's right, all of them) journal. Just $500 to submit on an initial discount. Or you could come to @openlibhums instead where it's OA, free to publish, and we have more than 1 person on the editorial board.