



DIGITAL ACCESS TO SCHOLARSHIP AT HARVARD

Open Access, a breakthrough for science that every neuroscientist should know about

The Harvard community has made this article openly available.
[Please share](#) how this access benefits you. Your story matters.

Citation	Alexei Koudinov and Peter Suber, Open Access, a breakthrough for science that every neuroscientist should know about, Society for Neuroscience Abstracts online, Program No.30.6, September 1, 2004.
Published Version	http://neurobiologyoflipids.org/openaccess/sfn2004.html
Accessed	February 19, 2015 8:21:19 AM EST
Citable Link	http://nrs.harvard.edu/urn-3:HUL.InstRepos:4783840
Terms of Use	This article was downloaded from Harvard University's DASH repository, and is made available under the terms and conditions applicable to Other Posted Material, as set forth at http://nrs.harvard.edu/urn-3:HUL.InstRepos:dash.current.terms-of-use#LAA

34th Society for Neuroscience Meeting

Teaching in Neurosci session # 30.6

OPEN ACCESS, A BREAKTHROUGH FOR SCIENCE THAT EVERY NEUROSCIENTIST SHOULD KNOW ABOUT

**ALEXEI R. KOUDINOV &
PETER SUBER**

MOSCOW - TEL AVIV – WASHINGTON, DC



Neurobiology of Lipids

ABSTRACT

Open Access is the online access to scientific journal literature, free of charge and free of most copyright and licensing restrictions. Open Access was named one of the top science news stories of 2003 by Nature, Science, The Scientist, and The Wall Street Journal. Open Access is supported by major science funding bodies, such as Howard Hughes Medical Institute (USA), the Wellcome trust (UK), the Max Planck Society, the DFG (Germany), the CNRS and INSERM (France). Rapidly rising conventional journal prices have been denounced by leading research universities (Harvard, Stanford, Cornell, Duke, more), found dysfunctional/unsustainable by independent financial analysts (PNB Paribas, Citigroup, Credit Suisse), and are now under investigation by Science and Technology Committee of the United Kingdom House of Commons. The advantages of an Open Access journal are compelling: articles are accessible to everyone with an internet connection; authors reach larger audiences and have greater impact; no permission is needed for copying, printing, distributing, storing or other educational uses; copyright remains with authors. Open Access does not violate copyright, but

uses the consent of the copyright holder. Open Access journals are peer-reviewed and use the same high standards (ex. WAME) as conventional journals. Open Access journals are indexed in major databases (ex. National Institutes of Health, National Library of Medicine PubMed; ISI Science Citation Index) and major search engines (Google, Yahoo). Open Access journals may deposit copies of their articles in central archives (ex. PubMed Central), enhancing their preservation/availability. There are different funding models for Open Access journals in different circumstances; their costs are usually paid by the same sources that fund research. Of a thousand Open Access Journals listed in the Directory of Open Access Journals (DOAJ) many have no publication charge. Some journals are entirely Open Access (ex. PLoS Biology), and some conventional journals are experimenting with Open Access (ex. PNAS). Scientists who publish in conventional journals can provide Open Access to the same articles by depositing them in Open Access archives. Open Access accelerates research, shares knowledge, improves the usefulness and citation of science journals articles. Wider adoption of Open Access depends on educating the scientific community about its benefits.

NEUROSCIENCE 2004 PRESS BOOK ARTICLE

(by Alexei Koudinov)

Web-links rich version of this article is freely available at <http://neurobiologyoflipids.org/openaccess/sfn2004.html>

“Free access to taxpayer funded research globally may soon be within grasp, and make possible the freer flow of medical knowledge that strengthens our capacity to find cures and to improve lives” (An Open Letter to the US Congress Signed by 25 Nobel Prize Winners, 26 Aug 2004)

In a recent Financial Times article Arie Jongejan, CEO, Sci & Tech, Elsevier (May 26, 2004, p.16) stated that "the scientific community has achieved a stable, scale-able and affordable system of [Scientific, Technical & Medical (STM)] publishing that adapts and invests in its information needs".

Apparently, the article by Reed Elsevier top official in a leading UK financial newspaper targeted investors and legislators, and aimed to preserve the centuries-long conventional STM publishing business where Elsevier presently is a biggest player.

What Elsevier S&T CEO calls "a stable ... and affordable system of [STM] publishing" put University Senates across US in great distress, resulted in a wave of cancellations of many subscription-access journals by leading Universities (Harvard, Stanford, Cornell, Duke, more), found dysfunctional and unsustainable by independent financial analysts (PNB Paribas, Citigroup, Credit Suisse), and is now under investigation by The appropriations committee of the US House of Representatives, and Science and Technology Committee of the United Kingdom (UK) House of Commons.

An unaffordable pricing and subscription bundling of Elseviers' Cell Press journals (including the major neuroscience title Neuron, and the most expensive Brain Research) with other Elsevier journals are the reasons for leading scientists' call to boycott these

serials by all those who actually make a scientific publication a prestigious journal, i.e contributors, peer reviewers, and editorial board members. The latter fact made evident the academic world unity in opposing the spiraling cost of subscription based journals and giving away the ownership in the scientific publication(a scientists' ultimate output) in a form of a copyright transfer to a publisher.

I agree with Daniel Greenstein (Associate Vice Provost, Scholarly Info, Univ of California; Univ Librarian, Systemwide Library Planning & California Digital Library) that "the business model of commercial publishing, which once served the academy's information needs, now threatens fundamentally to undermine and pervert the course of research and teaching... If business as usual continues, it will deny scholars both access to the information they need and the ability to distribute their work to the worldwide audience it deserves."

"The formula works, so don't tinker with it" argues FT article headline. Sadly, there is a discrepancy between Elsevier S&T CEO quote of "the stability of an efficient market" and his publishing house recent statement. Thus, just several months ago, on Dec. 3, 2003, Elsevier Today announced that "the existing S&T portals, BioMedNet, ChemWeb, ElsevierEngineering.com will be withdrawn... [and that] this difficult decision has been made in the context of an extremely challenging budget brought about by the continued tough market conditions."

The business will apparently never continue as usual for subscription-based STM publishers. This is because the Internet Age raised Open Access (OA), that is (not to be misled by Elsevier and others defining it as "author-pay" model) the online access to scientific scholar journal literature, free of charge and free of most copyright and licensing restrictions.

An OA journal advantages are obvious. Copyright usually remains with authors, so OA publisher does not violate copyright law, but uses the consent of the copyright holder, allowing articles' unlimited usage for both scientific research and educational purpose. OA journal quality is warranted by the conformity in fulfilling high standard policies (ex. World Association of Medical Editors, WAME) and the peer review. OA journal indexing in major databases (ex. NIH PubMed, ISI Science Citation Index) is subjected to rigorous selection process equal for all journals. To enhance the sustainability, OA journals can deposit articles in central archives and depository libraries (ex. PubMed Central by the NIH).

Open Access critique is based on the publication fee by some OA publishers "such as BioMedCentral (BMC) in the UK and Public Library of Science (PLOS) in the US" as exemplified in the FT article. It is more accurate, however, to identify OA as funded by sources other than subscription revenues. Only a portion of OA journals has a

publication fee, representing an 'authors-pay' business model of OA publishing. However, of a thousand OA journals listed in the Directory of OA Journals (DOAJ) many have no publication charge.

While Open Access movement became powerful, subscription based journals are engaging in experimentation with OA, with the recent most illustrative example by The Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences USA (PNAS), the flagship journal of the National Academy of Sciences. "The benefits to science of unfettered access to the literature are obvious and unassailable," says PNAS Editor-in-Chief Nicolas Cozarelli, in the editorial announcing "[authors-pay] OA option for PNAS contributors (June 8, 2004 p. 8509), whereby authors may pay a surcharge of \$1,000 to make their article freely available online upon publication... Although I have no doubt that open access will be made to work for much of the scientific literature, I am not sure how," adds Professor Cozarelli.

In the most recent editorial (Aug 16, 2004) PNAS Editor further announced "liberalization of PNAS copyright policy: noncommercial use [of publications is now] freely allowed".

Ironically, one way of OA, a deposition of articles in Open Access archives, was recently accepted by Elsevier, according to the letter by Karen Hunter (Elsevier Senior Vice President, Strategy) cross posted at several OA discussion boards (May 23, 2004). According to this Elsevier announcement "an author [of "published articles, whether published electronically or in print"] may post his or her version of the final paper on personal web site and on the institution's web site (including its institutional repository)..." [The permission to post published work in an archive is now introduced by several traditional publishers]

Such a mechanism of Open Access whereby authors (in addition to publication in peer-reviewed journals) deposit their articles in OA institutional repositories, was one of

82 recommendations and specific conclusions of the UK House of Commons Sci Tech Committee report "Scientific Publications: Free for All?" (July 20, 2004). The committee held a thorough inquiry for half a year, conducted four sessions of oral testimony, hearing from 23 witnesses, and received 143 written submissions. It heard from leaders in research, libraries, universities and publishing (including those from the US) who put forward their arguments for and against OA.

At the same time, on July 14, the US House Appropriations Committee adopted a set of recommendations for next year's federal budget. One key recommendation would have the National Institutes of Health (NIH) put a condition on its research grants so that articles based on NIH-funded research would be deposited in PubMed Central, the NIH's OA digital library.

Of major importance is the "strong support for the House Appropriations Committee's direction to NIH to develop an open, taxpayer access policy" by a panel of twenty five

Nobel prize winners. Quoting Nobel Laureates Open Letter to the U.S. Congress (Aug 26, 2004): "The trend towards open access is gaining momentum. Japan, France and the United Kingdom are beginning to establish their own digital repositories for sharing content with NIH's PubMed Central. Free access to taxpayer funded research globally may soon be within grasp, and make possible the freer flow of medical knowledge that strengthens our capacity to find cures and to improve lives... We specifically ask you to support the House Appropriations Committee language as well as NIH leadership in adopting this long overdue reform."

In addition to OA archives and OA journals by big publishing houses (such as non-profit PLoS and for-profit BMC) there is a different Open Access experience. It is provided by the Neurobiology of Lipids (NoL), a non-profit independent scholar serial that I organized, publish and lead as managing editor with no help of a commercial publisher or any online journal publishing provider (ex. Highwire Press, ScholarOne).

Neurobiol Lipids concept is that OA can benefit the Society as a non-profit model for cost-effective independent scholar journals with no publication charge. NoL takes the advantage of an irreversible Internet and desktop publishing technology development and their end user availability at almost no cost.

Similarly to other OA journals, NoL serves all its' content free of charge immediately upon publication. NoL, however, welcomes free voluntary registration by readers in order to build the community of scholars working on or interested in the subject of the journal scope. NoL mission is "to provide worldwide leadership in advancing the knowledge of the neurobiology of lipids and its application to health care." Fats and cholesterol neurobiology are causative to Alzheimer's disease and several other brain pathologies, as my group pioneering research (summarized in another 34th SFN Annual Meeting 2004 teaching session by Koudinova et al.) and studies by others showed several years ago. NoL has no analogs among other neuroscience or lipid research

publications. Perhaps, this is in part a reason an online readership of NoL is comparable with the readership of the worlds' major Journal of Lipid Research (JLR) published since 1959 (four-months average of 52.716 hits per month for NoL vs. 140.000 hits per month for JLR).

Lately, Neurobiology of Lipids publishing experience was translated into the launch of the Doping Journal , another independent OA scholar journal, debuted during the Athens Olympic games 2004. Both journals are running at an annual cost below a publication fee of one article at BMC (500\$).

While wider adoption of Open Access depends on educating the scientific community about its benefits, the wider dissemination of independent publishing in the Neurobiology of Lipids way depends on still missing academic education about the technology and its' end-user friendly capabilities. The commercial publishers (both traditional and Open Access) are not interested in educating the academic world about

the ease of the modern electronic publishing, a critical issue to safeguard the commercial publishing cabal.

Therefore, educational courses on independent publishing technology should be developed and included in higher education curriculum. Furthermore, grant funds, faculty opportunities and academic education for independent publishing should be a priority for governments, charitable institutions, libraries, and academic institutions.

To facilitate the deveopment of new independent Open Access scholar publications Neurobiology of Lipids will provide necessary advisory for quality editorial groups willing to establish and independently run OA non-profit scientific journals.

The complete version of this lay article will be shortly available as Neurobiology of Lipids publication, and is in immediate free access at <http://neurobiologyoflipids.org/openaccess/sfn2004.html>.

OPEN ACCESS OVERVIEW BY PETER SUBER

(Available at: <http://www.earlham.edu/~peters/fos/overview.htm>)

Open Access Overview by Peter Suber is an excellent "introduction to open access (OA) for those who are new to the concept... It's short enough to read, long enough to be useful, and organized to let you skip around and dive into detail only where you want detail. It doesn't cover every nuance or answer every objection; that would require much more space. But for those who read it, it should cover enough territory to prevent the misunderstandings that delayed progress in our early days..."

Once you're acquainted with the general idea of OA, follow new developments through Peter Suber OA News Blog and newsletter, and see what you can do to help the cause.

NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH NOTICE AND CALL **FOR COMMENTS: ENHANCED PUBLIC ACCESS TO NIH** **RESEARCH INFORMATION**

(Notice Number: NOT-OD-04-064, Release Date: September 3, 2004)

Web-links rich gateway citation of this article is at <http://neurobiologyoflipids.org/openaccess/openaccess2004.html>

“The National Institutes of Health (NIH) is dedicated to improving the health of Americans by conducting and funding biomedical research that will help prevent, detect, treat and reduce the burdens of disease and disability. In order to achieve these goals, it is essential to ensure that scientific information arising from NIH-funded research is available in a timely fashion to other scientists, health care providers, students, teachers, and the many millions of Americans searching the web to obtain credible health-related information. NIH’s mission includes a long-standing commitment to share and support public access to the results and accomplishments of the activities that it funds.

Establishing a comprehensive, searchable electronic resource of NIH- funded research results and providing free access to all, is perhaps the most fundamental way to collect and disseminate this information. The NIH must balance this need with the ability of journals and publishers to preserve their critical role in the peer review, editing and scientific quality control process. The economic and business implications of any changes to the current paradigm must be considered as the NIH weighs options to ensure public access to the results of studies funded with public support without compromising the quality of the information being provided. The NIH has established and intends to maintain a dialogue with publishers, investigators, and representatives from scientific associations and the public to ensure the success of this initiative.

This notice is to announce and to seek public comments regarding NIH's plans to facilitate enhanced public access to NIH health related research information. NIH intends to request that its grantees and supported Principal Investigators provide the NIH with electronic copies of all final version manuscripts upon acceptance for publication if the research was supported

in whole or in part by NIH funding. This would include all research grants, cooperative agreements, contracts, as well as National Research Service Award (NRSA) fellowships. We define final manuscript as the author's version resulting after all modifications due to the peer review process. Submission of the final manuscript will provide NIH supported investigators with an alternate means by which they will meet and fulfill the requirement of the provision of one copy of each publication in the annual or final progress reports. Submission of the electronic versions of final manuscripts will be monitored as part of the annual grant progress review and close-out process.

NIH considers final manuscripts to be an important record of the research funded by the government and will archive these manuscripts and any appropriate supplementary information in PubMed Central (PMC), NIH's digital repository for biomedical research. Six months after an NIH supported research study's publication—or sooner if the publisher agrees—the manuscript will be made available freely to the public through PMC. If the publisher requests, the author's final version of the publication will be replaced in the PMC

archive by the final publisher's copy with an appropriate link to the publisher's electronic database.

As with NIH's DNA sequence and genetics databases, this digital archive in PMC is expected to be fully searchable to enhance retrieval and can be shared with other international digital repositories to maximize archiving and to provide widespread access to this information. It is anticipated that investigators applying for new and competing renewal support from the NIH will utilize this resource by providing links in their applications to their PubMed archived information. This practice will increase the efficiency of the application and review process.

NIH trusts that the up to six month delay to public archiving in PMC recommended by the policy will not result in unreasonable or disproportionate charges to grantees. As with all other costs, NIH expects its grantees to be careful stewards of Federal funds and to carefully manage these resources. We will carefully monitor requested budgets and other costing

information and would consider options to ensure that grantees' budgets are not unduly affected by this policy.

Comments

The NIH encourages comments concerning its intentions to enhance public access to NIH-funded health related research information as outlined in this notice. Comments on short term impacts and suggestions for mitigating these are especially welcome. We encourage that all comments be directed to the following NIH website: http://grants.nih.gov/grants/guide/public_access/add.htm. As an alternative, comments may be submitted by email to the following address: PublicAccess@nih.gov. Comments must be received within 60 days of publication of this notice. NIH intends to publish an identical notice in the Federal Register.”

NAS ENDORSES NIH PLAN FOR OPEN ACCESS

Source: <http://www.pnas.org/cgi/content/abstract/0407071101v1>

“The governing Council of the National Academy of Sciences (NAS), which includes five NAS officers and 12 members elected at large, has endorsed the National Institutes of Health proposed (NIH) policy by which papers reporting research funded by NIH would be freely available online at PubMed (PMC) not later than 6 months Central after publication.” ...“We reaffirm our conviction that the interests of both in biomedicine and other areas are best science served by ensuring that ideas and information are as freely and rapidly as possible. We look exchanged to participating in the continuing evolution of forward publishing, and we applaud the NIH for taking scientific this important step.” (*PNAS* October 19, 2004, Vol.101, p.14991)

LEADERSHIP OF THE US LIBRARY ASSOCIATIONS

SUPPORTS NIH PLAN ON OPEN ACCESS

Web-links rich gateway citation of this article is at <http://neurobiologyoflipids.org/openaccess/openaccess2004.html>

“...Our organizations believe that the NIH proposal balances the public interest in having enhanced access to federally- funded NIH research while allowing publishers sufficient market protections and time to implement new economic publishing models. In addition, this initiative is consonant with the market models that many publishers have adopted that place short- term embargoes on access to scientific literature. Timely access to the results of NIH-funded research is critical to maintaining the vitality of our Nation's investment in research and education. Such access is also critically important to taxpayers seeking needed information -- information that they have supported through their tax dollars -- concerning their health and welfare. We applaud your leadership and look forward to working with you as the initiative is implemented.” (Public letter to NIH Director Elias A. Zerhouni, Director by Prudence S. Adler, Association of Research Libraries, Miriam Nisbert, American Library Association; Mary Alice Baish, American Association of Law Libraries; Doug Newcomb, Special Libraries Association)

ORIGINAL STUDY CONCLUSION: OPEN ACCESS ARTICLES HAVE GREATER RESEARCH IMPACT

Web-links rich gateway citation for this article is at <http://neurobiologyoflipids.org/noteworthy/>

Abstract: “Although many authors believe that their work has a greater research impact if it is freely available, studies to demonstrate that impact are few. This study looks at articles in four disciplines at varying stages of adoption of open access --philosophy, political science, electrical and electronic engineering and mathematics-- to see whether they have a greater impact as measured by citations in the ISI Web of Science database when their authors make them freely available on the Internet. The finding is that, across all four disciplines, freely available articles do have a greater research impact. Shedding light on this category of open access reveals that scholars in diverse disciplines are adopting open-access practices and being rewarded for it.” (Park *et al. College and Research Libraries* Sept 2004 **65(5)** Journal FileID=31968)

“SCIENTISTS, CONSIDER WHERE YOU PUBLISH”

(By Michael Seringhaus, fourth-year graduate student in mol biophysics and biochemistry at Yale)

Source: <http://www.yaledailynews.com/article.asp?AID=26120>

“For scientists, publishing a paper in a respected peer-reviewed journal marks the culmination of successful research. But some of the most prestigious and sought-after journals are so costly to access that a growing number of academic libraries can't afford to subscribe. Before submitting your next manuscript, consider a journal's access policy alongside its prestige -- and weigh the implications of publishing in such costly periodicals.

Two distinct problems continue to plague scientific publishing. First, institutional journal subscription costs are skyrocketing so fast that they outstrip the ability of many libraries to pay, threatening to sever scientists from the literature. Second, the taxpaying public funds a terrific amount of research in this country, and with few exceptions, can't access any of it. These problems share a common root - paid access to the scientific literature.

Consider some figures. Subscription fee increases for academic journals have surpassed inflation six-fold throughout the past decade, and the sharpest increases belong to journal titles in medicine and the basic sciences. The Association of Research Libraries examined subscriber spending between 1986 and 2001: by 2001, libraries were spending three times as much for fewer serial titles. With fixed or declining budgets, some academic and institutional libraries can't afford to subscribe to all the journals their scientists demand. Many are cutting acquisitions in the humanities and social sciences to compensate, still unable to keep pace. Scientists are being saddled with a pretty lousy legacy. No wonder the French department hates us.

The dazzling rise in journal subscription costs is logical, considering publishers enjoy a monopoly over the articles in their journals. (If a researcher desperately needs an article published in *Cell*, a subscription to any other journal is useless.) Demand for titles is inherently inelastic, and publishers are free to command whatever prices they choose - schools pretty much have to ante up, until they simply can't afford to pay any more. Annual

fees climbing into seven figures saw one UCSF campus cut off from Elsevier's Cell Press journals last fall. Furious researchers demanded a boycott [AK: See *Open letter on a call to boycott Cell Press*, http://www.podbaydoor.com/mt/mt-comments.cgi?entry_id=1106], and Cell Press quickly renegotiated. But the problem remains -- when even massive state schools like UC cringe at subscription tolls, reform is past due.

This publication industry depends entirely upon scientists: our research articles, and our commitment to contribute time and expertise peer-reviewing the work of others are absolutely essential. Amazingly, we provide these crucial commodities to publishers free of charge. Elsevier has never uncovered a single scientific result, but they sure do make a killing selling our own data back to us. Some publishers aren't content to simply look; they've aimed a night-vision zoom-cam directly into the gift horse's mouth.

This fall is an exciting time: the government is finally taking action to ensure public access to taxpayer-funded research. By Dec. 1, the NIH - backed by the U.S. House of Representatives Appropriations Committee - will begin demanding that a full-text copy of

every NIH-funded manuscript be deposited in the established PubMed Central repository, available free of charge after a six-month holding period. And that's not all: any article whose publication costs were paid with NIH monies must be made available free of charge, immediately.

This open-archiving plan is a welcome development, addressing the urgent need for some form of taxpayer access to publicly funded basic research. But it does little to ease the burden borne by academic libraries. The requisite six-month embargo, among other considerations, ensures that institutions will still need paid journal subscriptions.

Some publishers are furious over the government directive, bemoaning this interference with free enterprise and their imminent loss of revenue. Elsevier has posted outlandish profits and enjoyed pristine stock ratings for years. Now, the spotlight is on them, the people demand open access, and the party's over. Blame my liberal leanings, but I'm unsympathetic to the cries of a cadre of profiteering monopolists.

If you follow science opinion at all, you're probably familiar with the open-access debate, the upshot being something like this: big corporate publishers are evil but terrific for your career, and upstart open access journals are the squeaky-clean also-rans that won't help your chances of landing a job. The prestige of publishing in the old guard journals is undeniable, and by all accounts, intoxicating.

As students and young researchers, you may not yet enjoy ultimate control over the journals in which you publish. You may prefer to place your personal advancement over public access to your work -- and while the entrenched hierarchy continues to reward this behavior, you'll meet little opposition. But before you fire off that next manuscript to Cell, consider this: scientific journals exist to record and disseminate the research results, not to make publishers rich or restrict access to vital information.

Some journals are already working to provide some form of free access to published work - others steadfastly refuse and fight any government pressure to do so. True open access alternatives do exist, and with the arrival of high-profile journals like PLoS Biology they can

be quite prestigious indeed. Familiarize yourself with the landscape before choosing sides. As educated scientists, it may be refreshing to consider that where you publish is but a shorthand for the quality of your work. You do, always, have a choice.” (Michael Seringhaus, Yale Daily News, 8 September, 2004, <http://www.yaledailynews.com/article.asp?AID=26120>)

ABOUT ABSTRACT AUTHORS

Alexei Koudinov is MD, PhD, neuroscientist, biochemist and editor. For over a decade he has been involved in Alzheimer’s research and the basic science on the role of fats in brain function, memory, and brain disorders. He has published more than one hundred refereed articles, scientific correspondence items, and meeting abstracts, and leads independent OA peer-reviewed scholar publications, *Neurobiology of Lipids and Doping Journal*. His personal written evidence for the UK inquiry on Scientific Publication is on the subject of the 'Editorial and Publisher Corruption by major STM journals (also available as Open letter to President G W Bush, <http://neurobiologyoflipids.org/content/3/2>).

Peter Suber is the Open Access Project Director at Public Knowledge, Research Professor of Philosophy at Earlham College, and Senior Researcher at SPARC. He has a Ph.D. in philosophy and a J.D. from Northwestern University. He is the author of the SPARC Open Access Newsletter and editor of the Open Access News weblog. He was the principal drafter of the Budapest Open Access Initiative, and sits on the Steering Committee of the Scientific Information Working Group of the U.N. World Summit on the Information Society, the Advisory Board of A.L.A. Information Commons, and the Board of Governors of the International Consortium for the Advancement of Academic Publishing.

YOUNG SCIENTISTS, TAKE HOME THIS MESSAGE

“As students and young researchers, you may not yet enjoy ultimate control over the journals in which you publish. You may prefer to place your personal advancement over public access to your work - and while the entrenched hierarchy continues to reward this behavior, you'll meet little opposition. But before you fire off that next manuscript to *Cell*, consider this: scientific journals exist to record and disseminate the research results, not to make publishers rich or restrict access to vital information.”

(Source: Michael Seringhaus, Yale Daily News, 8 September, 2004, <http://www.yaledailynews.com/article.asp?AID=26120>)