

2016

# Converting Scholarly Journals to Open Access: A Review of Approaches and Experiences


David J. Solomon  
*Michigan State University*

Mikael Laakso  
*Hanken School of Economics*

Bo-Christer Björk  
*Hanken School of Economics*

Peter Suber editor  
*Harvard University*

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/scholcom>

 Part of the [Intellectual Property Law Commons](#), [Scholarly Communication Commons](#), and the [Scholarly Publishing Commons](#)

---

Solomon, David J.; Laakso, Mikael; Björk, Bo-Christer; and Suber, Peter editor, "Converting Scholarly Journals to Open Access: A Review of Approaches and Experiences" (2016). *Copyright, Fair Use, Scholarly Communication, etc.*. 27.  
<http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/scholcom/27>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Libraries at University of Nebraska-Lincoln at DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln. It has been accepted for inclusion in Copyright, Fair Use, Scholarly Communication, etc. by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln.

# Converting Scholarly Journals to Open Access: A Review of Approaches and Experiences

By David J. Solomon, Mikael Laakso, and Bo-Christer Björk

With interpolated comments from the public and a panel of experts

Edited by Peter Suber

Published by the Harvard Library  
August 2016



This entire report, including the main text by David Solomon, Bo-Christer Björk, and Mikael Laakso, the preface by Peter Suber, and the comments by multiple authors is licensed under a *Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License*.

<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

## Preface

Subscription journals have been converting or “flipping” to open access (OA) for about as long as OA has been an option. For just as long, OA proponents have been writing arguments on why to flip, recommendations on how to flip, and case studies on individual cases of flipping. But until now, no systematic study has reviewed the literature on journal flipping or distinguished the different pathways, methods, or scenarios for journal flipping.

This report owes its origin to a generous grant from the Arcadia Fund to the Harvard Library, and permission from Sarah Thomas, Vice President for the Harvard Library, to spend some of it on this project. I welcome the chance to thank Arcadia and Sarah Thomas for making this work possible.

I wrote a [request for proposals](#) to start the project, and posted it in March 2015. After reviewing proposals from many qualified individuals and teams, I awarded the contract to David Solomon, Mikael Laakso, and Bo-Christer Björk.

From the heart of the RFP:

The literature review will focus on how journals have converted or might convert to OA, not on why. It will focus on converting non-OA journals, not launching new OA journals. As far as possible, it should identify evidence on the consequences of conversion, e.g. for submissions, readership, quality, impact, and finances. It should identify pathways already taken by converted journals and pathways proposed but not yet tried.

A year later, in March 2016, David, Bo-Christer, and Mikael finished a preliminary draft, which we posted online for a four month public-comment period.

Again, from the RFP:

The purpose of the public comments is to supplement the literature review, make it more complete, more detailed, and more useful. For example, the public comments might add readings omitted from the literature review, extract new recommendations from readings already covered, suggest new clarity or detail for recommendations already formulated, and add notes to help readers consider the merits of the recommendations.

During the year in which the authors conducted their research and wrote it up, I recruited a panel of 20 experts to join the public in commenting on the final draft. The panel has broad experience, including OA and non-OA journal publishing, fee-based and no-fee OA publishing, for-profit and non-profit OA publishing, society and non-society OA publishing, OA publishing in the sciences and the humanities, OA publishing in the global north and the global south, and converting non-OA journals to OA.

I asked the panelists draw upon their experience to endorse the scenarios they found worth endorsing, and advise against the ones they found inadvisable. If a given strategy had some advantages or disadvantages for a certain scholarly niche, when the report didn't already point them out, I hoped that the panelists could point them out. If the report already pointed out some advantages or disadvantages, but the panelists could elaborate, I hoped they would elaborate. Which scenarios did they wish to encourage, or discourage, and in which scholarly niches?

The version we publish today includes selected public comments, all the panelist comments, the full text from David, Mikael, and Bo-Christer's report, and their final edits. Their final edits take into account the comments and their own second thoughts.

The authors' text is in black. Comments from the public and panelists are in gray, indented, and in a slightly smaller font.

The literature review plus the comments from the public and panel make this a uniquely comprehensive and useful picture of the options and best practices for converting subscription-based scholarly journals to open access. Even without the commentary, it's a thorough study of the question, and the first of its kind. But it's also annotated by a wide range of informed commentators. It often reads like a conversation.

David, Mikael, and Bo-Christer distinguish 15 different journal-flipping scenarios: 10 that depend on article processing charges (APCs) and 5 that dispense with APCs. They give examples, evidence, and their own analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of each.

In the process, they correct a large number of myths and misunderstandings. For example, some stakeholders believe that the only economically viable way to flip a journal to OA is to levy APCs. The report shows that this is false. Some believe that flipping a journal must result in lower revenue, lower citation impact, or lower quality. The report shows that this is false. Some

believe that journal-flipping is only realistic for journals in certain fields, or in certain affluent regions of the world. The report shows that this is false.

Why focus this study on flipping subscription journals to OA rather than launching new OA journals? There are three reasons.

First, there are already a good number of guides and recommendations on methods for launching new OA journals. But until now there has been nothing comparable on the side of converting subscription journals to OA.

Second, without question, new OA journals advance the primary goal of providing OA to more and more research. But they don't save libraries money, an important secondary goal. They don't save libraries money unless they justify the cancellation of existing subscription journals. But because different journals publish different articles, journals are not fungible, and free journals do not directly displace priced journals, or justify their cancellation, even when they exist in the same field and at the same level of quality. By contrast, every converted OA journal removes a subscription line from the budget of every subscribing library, without removing access to the journal's research. This frees up money for other good purposes, including the growth and sustainability of OA itself. It helps solve the inescapable background problem that the money needed to support high-quality OA in every field is largely tied up in subscriptions to conventional, non-OA journals. The alternative is to find significant new money for OA, which is as unlikely as it is unnecessary.

Third, new journals start from scratch, while converted journals bring their readership, authors, editors, referees, quality, standards, and reputations with them. This matters because all new journals – OA and non-OA alike – start with a credibility problem aggravated by a vicious circle. They need a good reputation in order to attract good submissions, and they need good submissions in order to build a good reputation. Many born-OA journals have broken this vicious circle through high quality, hard work, and persistence, just as many other high-quality born-OA journals have failed to break it. But converted-OA journals bypass the vicious circle and don't need to break it. Their credibility is continuous and uninterrupted. Conversion brings uncommon benefits that make it desirable even in fields where there is no shortage of high-quality, born-OA journals.

Why focus on the full range of conversion scenarios rather than pick a favorite?

The full range is worth laying out simply because these scenarios have all been tried or proposed, but not yet systematically collected for analysis and consideration. Doing this groundwork is perfectly compatible with picking a favorite. Indeed, it's a wise prerequisite to doing so. The same groundwork also allows different publishers to pick different favorites, or to pick models that best fit their circumstances, even if those models would make a poor fit for other publishers in different circumstances.

More importantly, truncating or oversimplifying the range of options causes harm. For example, as noted, many stakeholders believe that there's only one business model for OA journals, namely, charging APCs. This assumption has never been true and has never even been close. (Every measurement for more than a decade has shown that roughly three-quarters of OA journals charge no author-side fees at all, and in fact, that roughly three-quarters of subscription journals charge author-side fees on top of their reader-side fees.) The false assumption that all OA journals charge APCs stultifies the debate by limiting discussion to the one best-known option. It also stultifies the deliberations of publishers who believe, perhaps correctly, that the best-known option won't work for them, and therefore conclude, prematurely, that no model will work for them.

If a publisher has reasons to consider a move to OA, but only knows about APC-based OA journals, or OA journals in the sciences, or low-quality OA journals, it needs to appreciate this diversity in order to make an informed decision.

There are many different ways to flip a journal to OA, and their strengths and weaknesses differ from scholarly niche to scholarly niche. That's the root rationale for identifying the different pathways and exploring them separately, rather than picking one in advance of that exploration, and recommending it for every domain. It's the same rationale for the diversity of expertise and perspective on the panel.

The chief goal of this work is to help subscription-based publishers think hard about a move to OA. We want to help publishers deliberate intelligently about their options, in part by disentangling different options from one another, and in part by pointing to examples, evidence, strengths, and weaknesses, and in part by framing different journal-flipping scenarios with the comments of knowledgeable participants and observers from many different perspectives. We want publishers to see how other publishers have taken this step. Whether a publisher is for-profit or non-profit, in the sciences or humanities, in the north or the south, other kindred publishers have taken this step and there are lessons to learn from their experience.

Today several recent, high-profile proposals for journal flipping are in circulation, and I hope they all get a fair hearing. Some were announced or foreshadowed before the research on this report closed (in January 2016), and they're covered here to the extent that their contours were known. Some are entirely new since this research closed. Naturally a literature review cannot cover new developments after its own closing date. That's the price for writing about a hot topic in a rapidly-changing world. However, as these and even newer proposals expand the conversation, this report should bring perspective and history to that conversation. It's already an annotated menu for those considering a flip. In addition, it's a platform on which to build out to cover newer ideas.

The report is useful in part because it supports informed deliberation. But it's also useful because it supports reuse. The whole text –the report, the comments, and this preface– stands under a CC-BY license. Please remember this if you'd like to use all or part of it to make the case for conversion to a subscription journal where you may have some influence.

If the report itself is Phase 1, then Phase 2 is to take the results to subscription-based journals or publishers who might be thinking about OA or might be persuaded to start thinking about it. All readers can help here. If you're a journal editor, raise the conversion question with your publisher, point to the carefully articulated range of options, and to their documented strengths and weaknesses in different fields, regions, and economic strata. If you're a regular author or referee for a certain journal, or a regular reader, do the same. If you're an officer or member of a scholarly society that publishes one or more journals, do the same.

If you're an academic librarian, you probably cancel journals every year for budgetary reasons alone. You're in a good position to tell journals that you cancel with regret, not because they are atrocious (the atrocious ones were cancelled long ago), but because the collision between limited library budgets and fast-rising journal prices makes painful choices unavoidable. You're in a good position to make the case that converting to OA is better than cancellation, for everyone, and that new evidence shows that converting to OA can preserve or enhance readership, submissions, quality, and financial sustainability.

For future updates on this project, see the Journal-Flipping Project home page <https://osc.hul.harvard.edu/programs/journal-flipping/>

For real-time news and comment on the topic of journal conversions, follow the

“oa.conversions” tag at the Open Access Tracking Project. (This feed is crowd-sourced, and you can make it more complete by taking part in the OATP.)

<http://tagteam.harvard.edu/hubs/oatp/tag/oa.conversions>

For a list of journals that have converted from toll access to open access, see the steadily growing list at the Open Access Directory. (This list is crowd-sourced and you can make it more complete by contributing in the OAD.)

[http://oad.simmons.edu/oadwiki/Journals that converted from TA to OA](http://oad.simmons.edu/oadwiki/Journals%20that%20converted%20from%20TA%20to%20OA)

I repeat my thanks Arcadia for its generous grant to the Harvard Library, and my thanks to Sarah Thomas for her decision to let this project use some of the grant to commission this research. I thank the entire staff of the Office for Scholarly Communication for its wide-ranging support, which included tool building, file handling, repository deposit, and patience with my periodic preoccupation. I thank Lara Pollock for her very able text crunching. I thank all who took time to write comments, whether they contributed during the public comment period or afterwards as members of the panel.

Finally, I thank David Solomon, Mikael Laakso, and Bo-Christer Björk for their meticulous research, which illuminates both the big picture and small details. Not least, I thank them for their willingness to publish their research alongside the comments from the public and panelists.

Peter Suber

Director, Harvard Office for Scholarly Communication

Director, Harvard Open Access Project

Widener Library

Harvard University

[bit.ly/petersuber](http://bit.ly/petersuber)



# CONVERTING SCHOLARLY JOURNALS TO OPEN ACCESS: A REVIEW OF APPROACHES AND EXPERIENCES

A REPORT TO THE HARVARD LIBRARY OFFICE FOR SCHOLARLY COMMUNICATION

## Submitted by:

**David J. Solomon**  
Professor Emeritus  
Michigan State University  
East Lansing, MI, USA

**Mikael Laakso**  
Assistant Professor  
Hanken School of Economics  
Helsinki, Finland

**Bo-Christer Björk**  
Professor  
Hanken School of Economics  
Helsinki, Finland

We would like to thank Peter Suber for his help and support in completing this project as well as the eight experts we interviewed as part of the project: Dominique Babini, Stefan Busch, Raym Crow, Martin Eve, Jan Erik Frantsvåg, Jackie Jones, Falk Reckling, and Caroline Sutton. We would also like to thank Marlene Delhayé, Alex Holcombe, Diane Johnson, Peter Potter, and Michael Whitton for their thoughtful editorial comments. We also appreciate the many thoughtful comments from the panel of experts who reviewed the report and other people who volunteered substantive comments. These are contained in the document along with the names of those who provided the feedback.

**The literature cited in this report is comprehensive up to January 6, 2016.**

## Table of Contents

Preface.....	1
<b>1 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>2 INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>3 METHODOLOGY .....</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>3.1 Objectives .....</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>3.2 Methods.....</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>4 GOALS FOR CONVERTING JOURNALS.....</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>4.1 Increased Readership.....</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>4.2 Increased Number of Submissions and Published Articles.....</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>4.3 Increased Scientific Quality .....</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>4.4 Securing Public Journal Subsidies .....</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>4.5 Securing Journal Independence.....</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>4.6 Increased Revenue and Financial Viability .....</b>	<b>26</b>
<b>4.7 Promoting Other Products or Services.....</b>	<b>27</b>
<b>4.8 Publisher Wanting to Stay Competitive .....</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>5 ISSUES DURING THE CONVERSION PROCESS .....</b>	<b>29</b>
<b>5.1 Issues Pertinent to All Journals .....</b>	<b>29</b>
<b>5.1.1 Managing the Transition Process.....</b>	<b>29</b>
<b>5.1.2 Financial Planning and Impact Assessment .....</b>	<b>29</b>
<b>5.1.3 Informing Stakeholders .....</b>	<b>32</b>
<b>5.1.4 Article Archive and Subscribers .....</b>	<b>33</b>
<b>5.2 Issues Specific to Society Journals .....</b>	<b>34</b>
<b>6 OVERVIEW OF ALTERNATIVE SCENARIOS.....</b>	<b>38</b>
<b>6.1 Pressure from Stakeholders .....</b>	<b>42</b>
<b>6.1.1 Government and Funder Incentives.....</b>	<b>42</b>
<b>6.1.2 Pressure from Authors, Society Members and Editorial Boards.....</b>	<b>53</b>
<b>6.2 Other Funding (than APCs).....</b>	<b>60</b>
<b>6.2.1 National Journal Subsidies.....</b>	<b>60</b>
<b>6.2.2 Time-limited Funding for the Conversion .....</b>	<b>68</b>
<b>6.2.3 Income from a Paper Version Subsidizing an OA Version .....</b>	<b>71</b>

<b>7</b>	<b>APC-FUNDED SCENARIOS .....</b>	<b>77</b>
7.1	Submission Fees in Addition to or Instead of APCs.....	79
7.2	Gradual Conversion Scenarios.....	85
7.2.1	Via Hybrid OA .....	85
7.2.2	Bundling APCs with Subscription Licenses.....	94
7.2.3	Flipping Journals via Delayed OA .....	99
7.3	Changing Focus and Services During the Flip .....	103
7.3.1	Rebranding and modifying the scope of a Journal .....	103
7.3.2	Spinning-off a Well-defined Section of a Journal.....	105
7.4	Same or New Publisher After Conversion .....	108
7.4.1	Staying with the Same Publisher .....	109
7.4.2	Switching to a Different Publisher .....	112
7.4.3	Partnering with a Low-Cost External Publisher or Publishing Service Provider .	116
7.4.4	Partnering with a Major Global Publisher .....	120
<b>8</b>	<b>NON-APC-FUNDED SCENARIOS.....</b>	<b>125</b>
8.1	Society Subsidy .....	125
8.2	Low Cost Infrastructure and Volunteer Effort .....	129
8.3	Joining Regional Journal Platform .....	135
8.4	Joining Consortium or Library Partnership Subsidy .....	141
8.5	Other non-APC Sources of Funding.....	152
<b>9</b>	<b>Conclusions.....</b>	<b>154</b>
	<b>References .....</b>	<b>156</b>
	<b>Appendix I Annotated Bibliography of the Material Identified in the Study .....</b>	<b>169</b>
	<b>Appendix II List of Converted Journals Mentioned in the Report .....</b>	<b>208</b>
	<b>About the Authors, Panelists, and Editor .....</b>	<b>216</b>

## 1 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report identifies ways through which subscription-based scholarly journals have converted their publishing models to open access (OA). The major goal was to identify specific scenarios that have been used or proposed for transitioning subscription journals to OA so that these scenarios can provide options for others seeking to “flip” their journals to OA.

The report is based on the published literature as well as “gray” literature such as blog posts and press releases. In addition, interviews were conducted with eight experts in scholarly publishing.

The report identifies a variety of goals for converting a journal to OA. While there are altruistic goals of making scholarship more accessible, the literature review and interviews suggest that there are also many practical reasons for transitioning to an OA model. In some instances, an OA business model is simply more economically viable. Also, it is not unusual for a society or editorial board to transition to an OA business model as a means of gaining independence from the current publisher. Increasing readership, the number and quality of submissions, and impact as measured in citations are important goals for most journals that are considering flipping. Goals and their importance often differ for various regions in the world and across different disciplines. Each journal’s situation is unique and it is important for those seeking to flip a journal to carefully consider exactly what they hope to achieve, what barriers they are likely to face, and how the changes that are being implemented will further the goals intended for their journal.

We found that there are many issues that must be addressed in the process of changing a journal’s business model to OA. The transition process is complex and in most cases requires at least a year. For example, it is necessary to address manuscripts in process and how to manage back issues. Obligations to subscribers must be negotiated, particularly when the journal’s subscription is bundled with other journals in multi-journal contracts, called “big deal” agreements. A great deal of effort should go into marketing so that authors and readers are adequately informed of the change. Implementing the transition at the beginning of a volume also helps to avoid confusion.

Society-owned journals have specific challenges, such as losing the membership perk of free or discounted subscriptions for members. The wishes of the society’s membership and its willingness to accept sacrifices, such as increased dues or reduced services, must be considered if the society must give up income to flip.

Commercial publishers have a somewhat different set of goals from nonprofit or small societies. The goals and funding options for flipping journals to OA vary across disciplines and in

different parts of the world. While there are many similarities across journals, each has its own unique challenges when converting from subscription to OA.

There are a variety of factors that facilitate conversion to OA. These forces are both top down and bottom up. Governments, funding agencies, and library cooperatives through large-scale initiatives such as mandates and special funding programs can facilitate conversion and directly and indirectly influence journals converting to OA. Also, individuals and small groups, such as editors, the editorial board, or society members, have converted journals through their own efforts. There is no process that works for all journals and there are important variations in circumstances for each journal.

There are also barriers and risks to consider. Whether or not article processing charges (APCs) are used, ensuring adequate resources to publish the journal over the long term is critical. Unintended consequences are also a concern. APCs, or even just the change to OA, may discourage submissions or decrease their quality. Loss of free or discounted subscriptions may decrease membership for societies. Obtaining a good understanding of the potential risks and benefits of flipping through surveys, focus groups, and pilot programs, such as flipping only a section of a journal, are strategies for understanding and substantially reducing the risks associating with changing the business model.

The scenarios are organized into those based on APC funding and those based on obtaining resources or funding through other sources. A SWOT (strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats) analysis was performed on a number of journal scenario examples to assess the risks and benefits of each scenario.

The report includes an annotated bibliography of the literature, which is organized into four sections:

- Descriptions/discussions of flipped journals (94 references)
- Support programs and descriptions of models for flipping journal (38 references)
- How-to guides and recommendations for flipping (26 references)
- Miscellaneous materials (32 references)

The annotated bibliography is contained in Appendix I.

A list of flipped journals reviewed as part of this study is contained in Appendix II.

**Georg Botz**

I'm surprised to read here that the quality of submissions might decrease as a result of changing the journal's business model to OA. I'm wondering why an uncommon argument like this is mentioned (and thereby highlighted) in the executive summary.

**Ann Forysth**

The scenarios for flipping seem to be a key part of this report but are not dealt with specifically here –the summary mentions that a SWOT analysis was performed, not what its findings were. It would be very useful to include more specifics about potential positive scenarios as well as problematic ones to avoid. They are currently rather buried toward the end of the report. I am also not sure the executive summary needs to exactly follow the structure of the report and to provide so much detail about what was done; rather it could highlight key implications.

**Jean-Claude Guédon**

The report does an impressive job in attempting to classify a large number of significantly different situations and strategies, and in laying out the strengths and weaknesses of each situation. This begins to provide a realistic understanding of the complexity of the situation – a factor that is all too often neglected in discussions about open access. All my comments, even when critical, should be read in this perspective: this is a really important piece of work, but its very success also points to its limitations: in effect, the authors have succeeded in laying out a general structure which now needs to be refined and, in places, partially corrected.

1. Large commercial publishers may want to flip journals, but they may be just as interested in flipping articles. The very existence of hybrid journals demonstrates this point, especially if hybrid journals are not taken as simply a transitional phase toward open access, but rather as a potentially stable way to diversify revenue streams and multiply them.
2. Funders are interested in flipping articles.
3. Authors are interested in flipping their articles, and, to some extent, those of their colleagues that are of interest to them.
4. Libraries, on the other hand, are interested in flipping journals as a way to decrease the financial burden of access licenses.
5. Learned societies, university presses, departments, etc. Involved in keeping a journal alive and well will indeed face the issue of journal flipping rather than article flipping, although they may decide occasionally to flip a few articles as, for example, a marketing strategy, or to highlight a particular topic.
6. Researchers, including students, seek articles, not journals, except for the relatively rare case when their investigation requires studying entire runs of journals.
7. Administrators are interested in journals because they are the units that are used as proxies for evaluation purposes, and the results of where their faculty publish is reflected in rankings. All this is totally spurious, of course, as spurious as impact factors and their enigmatic three decimals, but it is the institutional reality with which they have to live if they are not prepared to challenge that “reality”.

These few examples demonstrate the ambiguous nature of the demand for flipping a journal into OA.

It may turn out that flipping into full and mature OA will dispense with both journals and articles, and bring about forms of collaboration and of authorship, as well as modes of reading that we are only beginning to envision at this stage of our history.

The present report is very valuable because it begins to demonstrate the enormous complexity of the communication system of science we have inherited from print. It is attentive to these variations and it attempts to calibrate responses to each of them. Whether it will help reach the desired goal of OA is one thing, but it certainly is going to help better understand what this communications system rests on and how it is gradually shifting as digitization proceeds apace.

After all, OA itself is nothing more than a spin-off from digitization.

### **Salvatore Mele**

On the complexity of the transition: Our experience with SCOAP3, which is transparent to authors, has been that communication with them has not been complex, and has been run both by publishers, and SCOAP3 partners in different countries, on its own timing. Conversely, communication with libraries is crucial, both as crucial ingredient in generating consensus *before* structuring the consortium but also as a crucial action for assembling the redirection of subscription savings. The costs (on the publisher side) of analogous communication with the same libraries in their roles of customers, shall not be underestimated. They represent a long-term investment which, actually, strengthens the tripartite publisher-researchers-publisher partnership. Also, one should not underestimate the challenges in understanding in cultural/geographical settings further from the Open Access discussion (and in particular flipping) what is being communicated to academic libraries. Indeed, some of those discussions might happen where subscriptions are administered, and Open Access ones at a higher strategic level. In large organizations those are not always directly communicated.

When discussing “society-owned journals” here and in other parts of the report, it would be helpful if the qualification of size and balance sheet of the societies were made more explicit for the reader. Our experience in these discussions is that important factors are of course the scale of revenues, the amounts needed to cover the costs of publications, the particular activities in which profits are re-invested, and whether or not the societies look at these factors synoptically. As in all organizations, with increasing size of society, membership and balance sheet, the direct involvement/understanding of the membership of the publishing process, challenges and transitions, could be actually more remote than the report leads us to believe.

It is not for self-promotion, but to offer concrete examples, that possibly listing SCOAP3 in the very first page as a “large-scale initiative” could be appropriate

Our direct experience is that flipping only a section of a journal carries the same organizational problems as flipping it entirely, and actually compounds it with the need of administering two parallel ways of doing things. Of course, that’s nothing much different than running hybrid models (which is well understood), but best left to those with infrastructure in places for that.

To me, a key point is missing. The fact that flipping models can naturally conserve the existing subscription monies to be reallocated through some mechanisms (SCOAP3-like, but also cooperatives, or publisher-driven) to the flip. In too many parts the flip is seen as equivalent to big upheavals (even changing technology platforms and workflows) or even as the sure loss of funding streams. Conversely, an arrangement that starts with present payors at the center gets to very different conclusions, and need not reply on an APC to flip construction. Personally, I go

to the extreme of not calling a “flip” something which does not include elements of preserving the financial agents of the present revenue structure in a different relationship mode, even without necessarily being SCOAP3-like (partnering libraries and publishers to achieve Open Access, or the creation of a cooperative, or subsidies coming with different conditions)

**Bernhard Mittermaier**

The report seems to have single journals in its focus. Alas, the role of commercial publishers and especially the market power of the big ones isn't reflected adequately. Are there ways to bring one of the big players to convert from subscription to OA (the whole portfolio)? Speaking from a librarian's point of view, the conversion of 100 society journals doesn't make a big difference. The conversion of Elsevier, SpringerNature or Wiley would make all the difference. The next level like Taylor&Francis, de Gruyter, ACS, IEEE, APS, ... would make a major difference as well. To them goes the money.



## 2 INTRODUCTION

The term OA came into wide use around 2002, but the concept itself dates back to the early 1990s when the internet, and in particular the World Wide Web, began to revolutionize the sharing of information. The term “open access” is usually restricted to the sharing of scientific publications, although openness per se is applicable to any information put on the web. Thus, OA means that scientific publications are freely available for anyone to at least read in full text with no restrictions. You can access the text by simply clicking a link.

There are shades of OA. At one end of the spectrum, publications are freely available upon publication and readers are allowed to use the content as they see fit, including data mining and remixing, so long as they provide proper attribution to the original authors. There are a number of more restrictive forms of OA, such as licenses that forbid remixing or building on the material in the article or using the material for commercial purposes. These two ends of the spectrum are often called libre and gratis OA. The various types of OA are described in detail in other sources; Suber 2012 is one example.

There are two main ways to achieve OA. The first is that the original publication is provided in OA through the publisher. This can occur either in journals where all articles or content is OA or in what are called hybrid journals, which are subscription-based journals that allow authors to make their articles OA by paying a fee. This report focuses on fully OA journals, but hybrid OA is part of the overall picture because it can, in some cases, provide a transitional path for the conversion of journals to full OA. Some journals also provide OA to their content after a delay, typically of a year, but this type of OA is usually termed delayed OA.

In addition to OA from the journals themselves, which is often called gold OA in discussions of this model, there is green OA, which means that the author or a third party made a copy available for free in a web-accessible archive that is separate from the published version of the article. Many publishers allow this practice for the accepted version after a delay (Laakso 2014). Illegal copies of the published version are quite often posted on the author’s website or, more commonly, in emerging scholarly forums such as Research Gate or Academia.edu (Björk et al. 2014). The most stable places to legally post green copies are institutional repositories and subject-based repositories such as arXiv for physics or PubMed Central (PMC) for biomedicine. Green OA is beyond the scope of this report.

There are two major varieties of full (or non-hybrid) OA journals—journals that started as OA and traditional, subscription-based journals that converted to OA. Converted OA journals, often called “flipped” OA journals, are the topic of this report. Both born-OA and flipped-OA journals can be split into two major groups. The first is journals that are free from author-side fees (as well as free from reader-side fees). These are sometimes called platinum OA journals and obtain the resources necessary to publish from sources other than authors or author sponsors,

like author funders or author employers. The second group is made up of journals in which the publisher finances its operations by charging the authors or their sponsors for publishing services rather than charging readers for access (APCs).

Many converted journals that do not charge APCs retain a print version from which they collect subscription revenue. This is often the case in regions like Latin America, where portals, such as SciELO and Redalyc, that provide a digital platform for OA have been available for over a decade and are funded by governments or regional consortiums.

From shortly after the initial appearance of OA journals through about 2005, most converted journals were published by societies or universities, often in connection with offering a parallel electronic version to the paper version of the journal (Solomon 2013). In more recent years, the major commercial publishers and the big society publishers have increasingly started to experiment with converting journals to OA (Meadows 2015). They have done this in tandem with opening a hybrid option for the vast majority of their journals that remain subscription-based. As early as 2003, David Prosser proposed hybrid OA as a mechanism for transitioning from subscription-based to OA publishing (Prosser 2003). He also assumed that publishers would retain the same revenue after the gradual transition from full subscription to full OA publication. So far, few journals have converted to full OA via this route due to the low uptake of the hybrid option.

Conversion can be facilitated by a number of factors. One is the availability of free or inexpensive journal management software. [Open Journal Systems](#) (OJS), developed by the Public Knowledge Project, is an excellent example of free, open-source journal management software. There are other open-source alternatives available as well, a [list](#) of which is included in the [Open Access Directory](#) (OAD). A second factor, which is important in many European countries, is public subsidies for the publishing of niche journals in the social sciences and humanities. These journals are deemed essential as outlets for regional scholarship and they are often published in languages other than English. A third factor is mandates for OA from research funders and universities. These mandates require that grantees or faculty at a university to make a copy of the research they publish OA either by publishing it in an OA journal or archiving a version in an OA repository. A fourth factor is that some centralized research funders accept APCs as allowable costs in research grants and contracts or, as has been done in the United Kingdom, Norway, and Austria, set aside dedicated APC funds.

Converting a journal to full OA is never an easy decision. There are many risks involved which include

- Will authors continue to submit high quality manuscripts allowing the journal to maintain the number of articles published and citation rate, especially if the journal requires APCs?
- Will there be adequate resources to support the journal indefinitely?

- Societies often provide free or reduced cost journal subscriptions to their members. If these journals are converted to OA will it affect membership?
- How will the income from very lucrative journals with large subscription bases be replaced?

A journal can make the conversion on its own or in partnership with a professional publisher. The journal may already be published by a third party, in which case the transition may be easier if the current publisher has the expertise and is willing to publish the journal OA. In many cases, the society or university will outsource publishing to a professional publisher that specializes in OA publishing.

We estimate that the number of converted journals is currently in the range 3,000 to 4,000. This estimate is based on extrapolating data from two earlier studies. In a sample-based study of all journals listed in the Directory of Open Access Journals (DOAJ), we estimated that there were 2,395 journals filling the criterion of “subscription-based print journals with OA content online” in 2011 (Laakso and Björk 2012). Their share of all OA journals was 36 percent. In a study of journals indexed in Scopus, we found 2,012 OA journals (simultaneously indexed in DOAJ) in 2010 (Solomon, Laakso, and Björk 2013). Of these, 1,064 we classified as converted journals, with only 130 coming from the four leading publishing countries (United States, United Kingdom, the Netherlands, and Germany). Given that the number of OA journals has risen in the past four to five years (DOAJ is now indexing slightly over 10,000 journals), we feel that 3,000 to 4,000 is our best estimate for the current number. Of these, the vast majority are society- and university-published journals, which started as print-only. Many are published using national or regional OA portals or using open source journal management systems, although some have also collaborated with specialized OA publishers (Solomon 2013). Recently, commercial and big society publishers have also increased conversion of subscription-based journals to OA, but they almost exclusively use the APC model (Morrison et al. 2015).

Very recently, there has been an increase of consortium models wherein groups of libraries, governmental agencies, and foundations fund publication through various mechanisms. The two most notable are the Sponsoring Consortium for Open Access Publishing in Particle Physics (SCOAP3) project, which has used a tendering model to create competition among publishers to reduce costs (Romeu et al. 2014), and the Open Library of the Humanities (OLH), which has created a publishing consortium for journals in the humanities (Eve 2014).

This report aims to chart the landscape of journals converting to OA and to provide some structure for and documentation of the multitude of situations in which journals find themselves before and after conversion. This report also aims to provide concrete models, advice to stakeholders contemplating the conversion of their journals, and guidance on what appears to have worked and what has not.

**Jean-Claude Guédon**

Very good introduction. However, the 3,000-4,000 estimate is not entirely justified. It would have been interesting to look at lists such as Latindex to see how many journals flipped in Latin America only. Moreover, the DOAJ figure has recently diminished by around 3,000 titles because of stricter monitoring criteria.

**Cara Kaufman**

For the dozens of journals each year to which we are privy to recent and projected financials, we have noticed greater growth in optional OA uptake after years of negligible growth.

The development of new OA journals from large and medium societies is another way in which access to literature has been made immediately available. Such journals provide an additional avenue for members and other scientists to publish their quality research and often provide a faster route to publication as the manuscripts (and any reviews) may automatically be transferred with the author's permission for submission from one journal to another. They also increase the overall number of OA publications, as a significant percentage of articles would have otherwise been published in subscription-based journals. Examples of just a few of the many new OA journals that KWF has helped develop on behalf of its society clients over just the past few years include AAAS/*Science Advances*, the Society for Neuroscience's *eNeuro*, and the Endocrine Society's *Endocrine Society Journal*.

I believe that the number of converted OA journals will be increasing in response to continued (speeded up) erosion of subscription revenues from small and medium journals especially and more small and medium journals are dropped from large publisher subscription packages due to ever-increasing demands on library budgets. Some won't survive, but others will be able to convert especially if they have a loyal following among researchers in their community. Also, the new OA journals from larger society publishers will squeeze out smaller subscription journals on the same topics, leaving a net increase in OA publications.

Another reason that we believe we will continue to see an increase in OA journals is that many established society journals are becoming increasingly selective in an effort to attract more and higher quality manuscript submissions especially internationally by lowering the denominator and increasing the Impact Factor (despite its well-recognized deficiencies), and maintain margins as subscription (and advertising) revenues decline and higher investments in digital publishing features and platforms are required. These higher tier journals continue to receive a large number of manuscripts and cannot publish all the quality manuscripts they receive. New OA journals, as mentioned earlier, are an answer.

**Salvatore Mele**

The idea that "conversion can be facilitated" is a strange concept to me. Conversion is actually all staying the same in the point of view of the daily publishing workflow (same platforms, same workflows) and the authors (same submission, same process). It is rather a business and funding arrangement that preserves and augments the value delivered by the journal to the scientific community. While I understand that this is often discussed (societies moving journals away from commercial platforms in a newfound independent publishing structure) I am not sure that the

enormous technical and workflow complexities which are added are not ultimately detracting from the real opportunities of flipping.

On the question whether there will be adequate resources to support the flipped journal indefinitely: I cannot refrain from noting that no business model guarantees indefinite support.

In the eyes of its international governance, the success of SCOAP3 is not only to use a tender, or create competition, as mentioned above, but actually having now a 6 year horizon to run a second phase, steadily publishing 5,000+ articles/year, having allowed 20,000 authors from 90 countries to benefit at no direct cost, and having created a global partnership (among libraries and research institutions, and with publishers in 4 continents).

### **MacKenzie Smith**

This section includes a paragraph on the two varieties of OA journals – born OA and converted from subscriptions – and mentions platinum OA journals in which publication costs are covered from “sources other than authors or author sponsors, like author funders or author employers.” This is meant to distinguish platinum from gold OA journals that cover costs from “authors or their sponsors”. In practice, authors pay APCs from source provided by their funders (via research grants) or their employers (via research funds or library funds), so this distinction between platinum and gold APC-funded journals isn’t meaningful. In both cases the journal is paid for by research institutions and/or funding agencies. The real distinction between these models is the degree of author awareness of the cost of their publication. Gold APC funding requires authors to consider cost, while platinum continues the practice of hiding costs from authors that we have today with subscriptions. While keeping authors out of the business end of publishing might be desirable to publishers, it doesn’t encourage the sort of transformative change in scholarly publishing the OA could potentially create.

The authors state that there are 3,000 to 4,000 converted OA journals today, and I note that the number analyzed for this study was 109. This is a very small fraction of the nearly 30,000 scholarly journal currently published. Here, as in other studies, a lot of assumptions about APC levels are based on small numbers of OA journals, especially those that were born OA, and it’s unclear whether those APC levels will hold as commercial publishers shift towards OA. In particular, commercial publishers that currently enjoy significant subscription revenue can afford to experiment with APC-funded journals as below-cost APC levels but, as their journals become increasing OA-only and they begin to lose subscription revenue, they may charge far higher APC to maintain cover costs and maintain historic revenue levels.

### 3 METHODOLOGY

#### 3.1 Objectives

The goal of this project was to conduct a comprehensive literature review on the process of converting subscription-based scholarly journals to OA publishing models. Part of the work was to explore what scenarios for transitioning journals have been successful, under what conditions, for which types of journals, and why, and to explore what proposed but untried scenarios might be successful

To date, thousands of formerly subscription-based journals have transitioned to OA. Many have been successful in increasing readership, submissions, and, in some cases, citations. Others have not and, in a few cases, have reverted back to using a subscription model. Each journal has a unique story that reflects the nuances of the organization(s) and individual(s) who own the journal; the original publisher; the journal's scope, readership, and availability of sources of funding; and other factors unique to that journal.

#### 3.2 Methods

##### *Literature Review*

Much of the information available on journal flipping is contained in gray literature, such as blogs, press releases, and reports. Thus, a variety of search techniques were used to obtain as much material as possible. We started with the OAD's [list of journals converting from TA \[toll access\] to OA](#), where each conversion listed had a hyperlink to a webpage or appended document. A search of the term "open access" on Scopus generated approximately 3,000 items, which were reviewed manually and reduced to 71 relevant items that were not found in the OAD. These were augmented by web searches on other terms and journals that had flipped as well as our experience with OA publishing. The number of potentially useful publications increased to about 105. Additional material (a continuation of an OA bibliography originally compiled by Charles Bailey Jr.) from the OAD bibliography but not exclusively part of the journal conversion list was added. When reviewing the material located, we were often able to find additional relevant material through the reference lists.

Each publication was reviewed and annotated by one of the project team members. Material that was not relevant or did not contain useful information was removed from the list. The publications that were relevant were organized into four general categories:

- Descriptions/discussions of flipped journals (94 references)
- Support programs and descriptions of models for flipping journal (38 references)
- How-to guides and recommendations for flipping (26 references)
- Miscellaneous materials (32 references)

The references with abbreviated annotations and including the URLs to the actual material, where available, are contained in Appendix I.

### *Interviews*

Based on the literature review, the project team identified a set of interviewees that we felt could provide useful information beyond what was contained in the literature. Eight experts were interviewed:

- **Dominique Babini**, coordinator of open access scholarly communication projects, research, and advocacy at CLACSO; open access scholarly communications researcher at the University of Buenos Aires
- **Stefan Busch**, publisher, BioMed Central
- **Raym Crow**, senior consultant at SPARC and Chain Bridge Group managing partner
- **Martin Eve**, senior lecturer in literature, technology, and publishing at Birkbeck, University of London; founder of the Open Library of Humanities
- **Jan Erik Frantsovåg**, open access adviser, culture and social sciences library, The Arctic University of Norway; chairman of the board of SPARC Europe
- **Jackie Jones**, executive journals editor at Wiley
- **Falk Reckling**, department head, Strategy – Policy, Evaluation, Analysis, Austrian Science Fund (FWF)
- **Caroline Sutton**, publisher and co-founder at Co-Action Publishing; founding chair and board member, Open Access Publishers Association

Each interview was carried out by one of the three investigators. Because the background and experiences of each interviewee were quite different, we did not use a standard protocol for the questions asked. The information gained was summarized and the summaries were provided back to the interviewee to review and edit to ensure accuracy.

#### **Jean-Claude Guédon**

My only concern is that people from India, Africa and South-East Asia should also have been interviewed. The usual North-Atlantic emphasis remains here.

### *Scenarios*

Based on the information gleaned from the literature review and interviews, we developed a scheme to organize the scenarios for journals transitioning from subscription to OA. The organizational scheme was continually revised as the literature review and report-writing progressed. We used a standardized format for presenting each scenario, including a table describing the characteristics of the scenario, SWOT analysis, description, example journals, and summary.

## 4 GOALS FOR CONVERTING JOURNALS

The motivation and ultimate decision to flip a journal can stem from many different sources and be supported by various arguments, depending on the journal, publisher, and the context of the flip. While the majority of this section deals with goals of the individual publishers and, in particular, individual journals, it is important to remember that there is a broader context to consider. Important stakeholders who have goals related to OA include governments and ministries of education, major public and private research funders (such as Austrian Science Fund, Wellcome Trust, and NIH), scientific societies, universities, and university libraries. University libraries have been concerned about the rising costs of subscription access (often called the serials crises). The crisis has significantly impacted budgets, and libraries have made a major goal of decreasing the overall cost for subscriptions and article processing charges by keeping APC levels reasonable (Pinfield et al. 2015; Anderson 2015).

The scenarios we identified showcase the diversity of situations wherein journals are flipped. Some transitions are initiated from the top down by large publishing houses. In other cases, decision-making happens within the environment of independent self-published journals. However, despite the diversity found across the journals that have flipped, there are also some common goals. The purpose of this section is to describe these goals in order to provide insight into the various nuances of flipping we found in the literature review and interviews. The tables presented as part of each scenario highlight the primary goals for journals flipping based on that scenario.

### Salvatore Mele

A missing goal, which is the one which drove CERN to initiate SCOAP3, and immediately resonated with our longer-term partners, was to meet evolving social and community expectations. And that was 2007. Come the 2015 climate and the attention of governments and civil society to openness, this, if any, is for me the very first goal. Close behind it is the need to meet the terms of new OA policies..

### Abel L Packer

One aspect that could be highlighted in the analysis are the risks journals might be incurring in delaying their conversion to OA. Are there indicators journals can observe to accelerate or delay the conversion?

### 4.1 Increased Readership

One of the intrinsic benefits of OA is increasing readership by removing the financial barrier to access. Even for readers fortunate enough to have access through a library, the process of accessing a subscription article can be more cumbersome than if the article was OA and only required “clicking” a link. Research so far has indicated that OA content in journals is read more widely than subscription content (Davis 2011). An increase in downloads has been found in



virtually all studies evaluating the impact of transitioning to OA (Hitchcock 2013; Swan 2010; Wagner 2010). Even though expanding readership does not directly result in higher income in OA publishing, expanding readership still remains an important goal for many journals that choose to transition to OA. Readership is related to impact in the sense that the more research is read and distributed, the higher the chance of creating scientific impact and potentially being cited.<sup>1</sup> Thus, the decision to transition to OA with the goal of expanding readership might stem from a spectrum of reasoning. At one end is the altruistic goal of unrestricted openness to research; at the other is a strategy to increase the scientific impact of articles published in the journal, which would make the journal more valuable and influential. For authors, publishing in journals with high citation rates is a path for career advancement, thus making highly cited journals more attractive to authors.

In interviews, editorials, and other materials wherein journal representatives state the reason behind flipping a journal, maximizing the journal's reach and exposure is almost always present in one form or another.

The publisher Wiley flipped subscription-based [Conservation Letters](#) to an APC-funded OA journal. One motivation for the decision was that the journal had a relatively high impact factor but still had a low number of subscribers due to its exclusion from the subscription packages Wiley offered (Lalasz 2014). Also, the research in the journals was seen as policy-relevant, which increased the value in having the journal published OA so it could reach readers outside of academia who lack access to a large university library.

[Paladyn: Journal of Behavioral Robotics](#) was a subscription-based journal published by Springer for three years after it launched, but flipped to OA through Versita (de Gruyter Open) because the behavioral robotics field is new, and there were, therefore, few subscriptions. According to Michał Berent, the product manager responsible for OA journals at De Gruyter, OA was the most reasonable option (Kieńć 2014). De Gruyter has decided to waive APC charges until 2017 in an apparent effort to increase submissions.

Further examples of journals for which expanding readership was the primary goal of the conversion include [Polar Research](#) (Goldman 2012), [Journal of Diabetes Investigation](#) (Hotta 2014), [Connotations](#) (Bauer 2011), and [Ultrasonography](#) (Yu 2014).

## 4.2 Increased Number of Submissions and Published Articles

Journals commonly aim to increase both the quality and the number of submissions in order to increase the quality of the articles published and thereby enhance the reputation of the journal. Subscription-based journals generally limit the number of articles published due to financial

1 Whether increased readership results in increased citations has been heavily researched but remains somewhat controversial. Most studies have found increased citation rates for flipped journals but are generally correlational and often confounded with other factors such as changing publishers.

constraints. Journals flipping to OA publishing based on an APC-funded business model generally strive toward increasing the quality and number of submissions. Because the APC business model scales well to increased publications, there is not an artificial limit to the number of articles that can be published. Although there is a short-term incentive to increase publications without regard for quality, such a strategy will eventually backfire, seriously damaging both the reputation of the publisher and the journal. Reputable OA publishers realize this fact and have just as much motivation to publish sound science as subscription publishers.

**Peter Potter**

“Journals flipping to OA publishing based on an APC-funded business model generally strive toward increasing the quality and number of submissions.” This feels like an assertion that requires some evidence –particularly given the mention later on of a “short-term incentive to increase publications without regard for quality.” Again, it may be a true statement but some people will have their doubts based on the current wording.

There are many examples of journals that increased submissions and publications after flipping. Alice Meadows (2015) notes that the eight journals Wiley flipped saw an average increase in submissions of 37 percent during the first year. She noted that choosing journals that are well-suited for APC-funded OA is critical for success. Busch and Häussinger (2012) describe how the *European Journal of Medical Research* flipped to OA in 2011 and, after a considerable drop, the number of published papers has rebounded to normal levels. The journal published 30 articles in 2012 and 97 articles in 2015.

### 4.3 Increased Scientific Quality

There is little doubt that transitioning to OA increases readership. That has been shown over and over again in observational studies and even in a controlled trial (Davis 2011). Whether increased readership from flipping to OA results in higher citation rates, however, is controversial. For journals with higher citation rates, the tendency has been that their articles attract larger numbers of readers and higher quality submissions. There are many examples of journals that have seen significant increases in citation rates after flipping to OA (Hitchcock 2013; Swan 2010; Wagner 2010). However, this may be due to additional factors involved in the flip to OA, such as switching to a more prestigious publisher.

Busch (2014b) provides longitudinal data for five journals that flipped to OA using BioMed Central as their OA publisher. These journals had impact factors for at least two years before and after the transition and published at least 30 articles a year. In each case, the journals’ impact factor increased or remained stable compared with other journals in the field, and submissions increased by as much as 50 percent after flipping (Busch 2014b).

In 2012, the journals [Tellus A](#) and [Tellus B](#), owned by the International Meteorological Institute in Stockholm, initiated a publishing agreement with Co-Action Publishing. The editorial announcing the new arrangement stated, “we hope that this change will lead to an increased

number of submissions of high quality papers and, as a consequence, higher status and higher impact factors.” The JCR impact factors for 2010 were 2.06 for *Tellus A* and 3.34 for *Tellus B*. Unfortunately, the impact factors have, in fact, gone down to 1.76 and 2.15 respectively in 2014.

#### 4.4 Securing Public Journal Subsidies

In some instances, flipping a journal to OA can be an opportunity to secure additional external funding, either to sustain the journal while allowing an opportunity to lower or avoid the need for APCs or to achieve a more liberal waiver policy. Some national journal subsidies are only eligible for journals publishing their content OA; as such, this is an incentive for subscription-based journals, where eligible for such subsidies, to transition to OA.

Securing subsidies is, in most cases, not a primary aim of the conversion. More often, stakeholders want to transition to OA for a number of other primary reasons, and the public subsidies is a facilitator that helps make an OA business model feasible. The one exception might be the recent example in Norway, discussed in Section 5.2.1, on national journal subsidies, in which case the subsidy will essentially force journals to publish OA.

#### 4.5 Securing Journal Independence

Flipping to OA often occurs in conjunction with changes in the publishing arrangements of a journal—switching publishers, perhaps transferring to a low-cost OA publisher, or going from collaboration with a professional publisher to self-published. While there may be a number of motivations for such changes in publishing arrangements, regaining some independence in journal operation can be an important goal.

##### Romain Féret

Is there any evidence of the reverse: when a journal flipping to open access it may become more dependent on public subsidies, and lose a part of its political independence. I ask, since it seems to worry quite many French researchers in humanities and social sciences.

An extreme case of independence-seeking can be seen when the core editorial board decides to move from one journal to another due to disagreements with the publisher of the journal. In cases where the journal’s publisher actively resists or does not provide a satisfactory OA option to an editorial board that strongly prefers an OA model, the only option might be for the editorial board to “[declare independence](#)” (Open Access Directory 2016). This has entailed members of an editorial board resigning from the original journal and founding a new OA journal, which is either self-published or partners with a publisher that will publish the journal OA. This, however, necessitates founding of a new journal, which is somewhat different than flipping an existing journal and raises new challenges.

[Open Medicine](#) is one example of this type of flip. Unfortunately, the otherwise very successful journal had to cease publication due to a lack of resources (Canadian Press 2014). Recently,

many of the editorial board members of [Lingua](#) resigned over a disagreement with the publisher concerning access issues and formed a new journal, [Glossa](#). This is discussed in more detail in Section 5.1.3, Pressure from Authors, Society Members and Editorial Boards.

#### Jean-Claude Guédon

In discussing journal declarations of independence, it would have been useful to clarify the point that shifting to a new journal is necessary only when the publisher owns the title. This is what happened with *Lingua*, but this is not a general rule. It would be useful to warn societies seeking to work with a commercial publisher that they should not transfer their ownership of the journal title to the publisher.

### 4.6 Increased Revenue and Financial Viability

For a subscription-based journal with few subscriptions, operating at a loss or minimal profit, flipping to OA can be an opportunity to achieve financial security and long-term sustainability. There are several examples of subscription journals that were on the brink of ceasing publication that have been successful using a number of different OA business models (Daught 2012; Hallberg 2011). Regardless of whether a publisher is society-based, commercial, or nonprofit increasing revenue can be an incentive for flipping a journal. Depending on the journal, transitioning to OA can either significantly improve or hinder the journal's financial situation. By choosing journals carefully, the eight journals Wiley flipped ranged from a 37 percent loss to 150 percent increase in revenue (Meadows 2015).

There are occasions when flipping from a subscription to an OA model may be the only means of salvaging an otherwise viable journal. Changing the business model can provide the journal with a new lease on life in addition to the other benefits of OA. Good quality journals with a narrow scope often have difficulty attracting subscriptions. Because a commercial publisher is likely to see such journals as a burden rather than an asset, it may be quite willing to release such journals from contractual agreements if a society, university, or even an editor is willing to try to save the journal.

The individuals or organization that will operate the journal have two significant hurdles, implementing the transition process from subscription to OA<sup>2</sup> and finding a viable and sustainable business model. The resources needed for publishing the journal can often be reduced through volunteer effort or more efficient publishing options, making the transition to a different business model more feasible. Below are two examples of journals that have made this transition successfully, saving the journal while gaining other advantages of OA.

[New Theology Review](#) was struggling in print but was converted into a successful OA journal largely by the effort of one person, Melody Layton McMahon, who is director of the Paul

2 Described in the section on issues cutting across all scenarios.

Bechtold Library at the Catholic Theological Union (CTU) (Daught 2012). The journal was launched in 1988 by CTU and Washington Theological Union (WTU). The original publisher was acquired by another publisher and the journal was eventually published by Liturgical Press. The subscription base was small, and there is evidence the publisher sought to stop publishing the journal. WTU pulled out of publishing the journal, and CTU explored options for publishing the journal through another commercial publisher but decided the subscription price would need to be too high. A variety of options were explored. McMahon advocated to transition the journal to an OA model and eventually was able to gain support for the transition. The library took over and funded the journal with a budget of 5,000 USD and what appears to be a considerable amount of volunteer effort. The journal transitioned to OA using OJS as a platform and was able to incorporate the back issues of the journal. After three years, the journal appears to be functioning well, publishing a significant number of articles, with the new business model.

[\*International Journal of Qualitative Studies on Health and Well-being \(IJQHW\)\*](#) is another example of a journal that was in danger of ceasing publication. It was launched in 2006 and was published as a paper subscription-based journal until it transitioned to OA and was published digitally by Co-Action Publishing. *IJQHW* received a small university stipend in 2010 and a grant from the Swedish Government in 2011 to help with the transition, but then had to charge an APC of about 600 EUR. This APC has since risen to 1,100 EUR for up to 10 pages. Despite the APC, the journal appears to be quite successful; it publishes 30 to 40 papers per year and has noted a dramatic increase in downloads.

While there appear to be relatively few examples of OA journals that, without the transition, would have ceased publication due to low subscription volume, there are at least two journals fitting this scenario that have become very successful since transitioning. In both cases, the editor was a strong advocate, gaining the support for making a successful transition possible. These examples demonstrate two important points: (1) a single determined person can be the difference between saving and losing a journal, and (2) just because the subscription model is not financially successful does not mean that another business model cannot be.

#### **4.7 Promoting Other Products or Services**

A subscription journal can assume that it is mostly subscribers who visit its website. However, OA provides unrestricted visibility to published content, which drives web traffic and visitors to the hosting website. This increased visitor count can make advertising and cross-marketing of products and services a source of income that allows a journal to flip to OA.

An example is [\*Farmeconomia and Therapeutic Pathways\*](#), which flipped in 2012. The journal was used to increase overall revenue for the publisher's products by providing visibility to the Italian medical publishing house SEEd (Giglia 2012). The [\*British Medical Journal \(BMJ\)\*](#) first

flipped academic articles as early as 1998, but has recently returned to subscription-only content.

#### **4.8 Publisher Wanting to Stay Competitive**

A journal or publisher can flip to an OA business model as a means of staying competitive and profitable. Hindawi started out as a subscription-based publisher but flipped all of its journals to APC-funded OA due to the crowded marketplace created by the established major publishers and the difficulty of attracting subscriptions from university libraries whose budgets were already stretched with existing big deals (Peters 2007). With the significant advantage of being located in Egypt, where inexpensive professional workforce is available, Hindawi has been able to make the APC-funded OA model into an extremely profitable business.

A somewhat different example is [\*Conservation Letters\*](#), which has not been a very profitable subscription journal for Wiley despite a fairly high impact factor. “Conservation Letters is not a moneymaking journal for Wiley, and they’re not really depending on it for that. They want to occupy the niche we fill as much as anything” (Lalasz 2014).

## 5 ISSUES DURING THE CONVERSION PROCESS

Jean-Claude Guédon

Very good section.

### 5.1 Issues Pertinent to All Journals

#### 5.1.1 Managing the Transition Process

The term “flip” is often used to describe a journal transitioning from subscription-based to OA publishing. Although the word implies a rapid transition from subscription to OA, our review of the literature and discussions with those familiar with the process indicate that is most often not the case. Flipping a subscription journal to OA is a process that requires careful planning, preparation, and a number of steps to be successful and not disrupt the publication process or alienate authors or readers. This section summarizes the findings from the literature and interviews that are pertinent for virtually any journal considering flipping. Issues related to specific scenarios are described later in this report.

van Wesenbeeck and Friend (2011) provide practical recommendations and lessons-learned by publishers and scholars experienced in transitioning society journals to OA. The most common theme is that meticulous preparation, broad communication, and change management are the key issues that need to be addressed for flipping a journal to be successful. Other common themes are that journals need to take the opportunity to reconsider their infrastructures and policies in order to maximize the benefits OA has to offer.

The literature suggests that flipping a journal generally takes around a year (Cerejo and Rajagopalan 2015; Meadows 2015) and includes a number of steps that can be grouped into several categories:

- Financial planning, forecasting, and assessing the likely impact of flipping
- Informing key stakeholders and marketing the change to a broader audience
- Addressing articles that are in the publication process, current subscriptions, and back issues
- Issues specific to society publishers

#### 5.1.2 Financial Planning and Impact Assessment

Before making the decision to flip a journal, it is important to ensure the new business model will be viable and provide the necessary resources to operate the journal (Crow and Goldstein 2004). This does not necessarily mean that the same amount of income must be generated or obtained from other sources. Often, expenses can be reduced or replaced by “in-kind services” such as volunteer effort. There must, however, be adequate resources available to publish a professional-quality journal indefinitely. In some cases, it also may be necessary for the journal to generate income beyond what is necessary to cover publishing costs. For example, some



journals published by a for-profit publisher or a society rely on income from the journal to fund other functions of the society. For organizations such as societies, if OA supports the goals of the society, accepting a reduction of income from their journal(s) may be justified. These issues and expectations for the new business model should be carefully considered when deciding whether it is advisable to flip a journal.

The first step is understanding the journal's current financial situation. While this may seem fairly straightforward, it is not always achieved. Organizations, such as small societies, may think their journal(s) are profitable when, in fact, they are losing money; conversely, they may think the journal(s) are losing money when they are, in fact, profitable (Crow, 2015). This is particularly true when there is not a clear delineation between resources used for the journal and for other purposes within the organization. It may be useful to have someone with extensive accounting expertise review the financial records of the organization to help determine the current financial situation of the journal and help develop a financial plan for the new business model, taking into account that there may be significant one-time costs associated with the flipping process. In their report for the Open Society Institute, Crow and Goldstein (2004) provide an in-depth discussion of formulating an OA business model and forecasting financial viability. We highly recommend that an organization, particularly societies that are considering flipping their journals, consult that report. Swan (2012) also notes that while the technical expertise is often available for developing various OA-supporting web services, there is often a lack of business planning and knowhow necessary to secure long-term operations after the initial phase of flipping the journal to a new business model.

It is also important to consider the impact that flipping is likely to have on submissions, readership, and, potentially, citations. There are many examples where submissions, readership, and even citations have remained stable or increased after flipping (Busch 2014a; Bird 2008; Bird 2010). While we found many reports of success stories, it seems reasonable to assume the stories about failures are much less likely to be published. The Canadian journal *Open Medicine* serves as an unfortunate example of what can happen to an otherwise successful OA journal if the resources necessary to publish are not available (The Canadian Press 2014). Although not a true flipped journal, *Open Medicine* was formed by the former editor and a number of the editorial board members of the *Canadian Medical Association Journal* after they left its editorial board over a dispute with the publisher. They were able to operate *Open Medicine* successfully for a number of years, but the journal was eventually shut down because the editorial board was not able to sustain the tremendous amount of volunteer effort needed to operate the journal.

Keep in mind that there are both fixed and variable costs of publishing. One advantage of the APC funding model is that it scales well when there are increasing numbers of submissions and publications. Other funding models, including the use of volunteer labor, may not scale as well for increasing number of submissions. It is possible that the success of flipping a journal can lead to its ultimate demise, which is what happened with *Open Medicine*. Organizations



considering flipping their journals should carefully determine not only whether they will have adequate funding for the number of articles they are currently publishing, but also how they will handle the potential of increased submissions and publications after their journals flip.

**Cara Kaufman**

APCs do not scale with the number of submissions, only with the number of publications. For selective journals (the ones most sought after by authors), the overwhelming majority of the submissions are rejected. It is extremely rare for OA journals to levy submission fees. Thus, (more rejection without external review and) higher APCs are required to cover the cost of checking in new manuscripts and administering the peer review (and often the cost of the peer review system itself).

While the APC-funded business model may scale well to increasing submissions and subsequent publications, it also may discourage authors with limited funding from submitting their manuscripts to the journal. Organizations considering flipping from a subscription business model to an APC business model should consider polling their authors and readers before making a decision. Also, an analysis of published papers, focusing particularly on whether they are based on research grants, can indicate the share of authors who would likely have funding for APCs (White 2014).

Most APC-based funding models include a possibility for waiving or discounting the fee based on some pre-defined criteria, or at the discretion of editorial staff. How the policy for issuing waivers is defined and implemented is important because it has a direct impact on the journal's finances and the actual or perceived editorial integrity. During the initial stages of flipping, all APCs are often waived in order to attract high-quality manuscripts to the journal. How the long-term policy should be defined varies from case to case depending on APC level, research discipline, publisher type, and geographic region. It is also common for publishers to waive or significantly reduce APCs temporarily as a marketing tool.

**Cara Kaufman**

Discounted APCs for members is still viewed as a member benefit of an OA journal, and is especially worthwhile for societies whose members are mostly authors (rather than clinicians, for instance). We work with one society that is offering a substantial discount on its APCs, and is enjoying a consequential increase in membership.

Bird (2008) discusses Oxford Press's experience flipping *Nucleic Acids Research*. They piloted the process with two special issues, which were funded with a very modest APC, and followed up with an extensive survey of the authors and readers before flipping in 2005. Careful planning and researching the acceptance of the APC model, where applicable, will help ensure a successful transition. Jackie Jones (2014) and Alice Meadows (2015) provide excellent discussions of the experience in flipping journals at Wiley. Although many aspects discussed are only relevant to the APC model implemented at a major for-profit publisher, much of the

information they provide could be applied to any organization. Key things learned from their experience include:

- Plan ahead, and carefully time communication of decision to flip.
- Do not flip mid-year. The process of managing subscriptions through a flip is easier if the flip is scheduled to be in effect at the start of the next calendar year.
- Prepare a complete marketing strategy for the first year. This includes application to specific abstracting and indexing services so as to provide maximum visibility to the OA journal from the start.

It is worth mentioning that there are certain journals that are very difficult to flip due to their financial situation. These journals are lucrative and obtain much of their subscription income from non-academic organizations whose employees rarely if ever publish. The best examples are probably clinically oriented medical journals (Sutton, 2015). This is not to say that in theory these journals could be flipped and still obtain enough income or other resources to operate the journal. Rather, it is very hard for a society or other organization to justify a significant loss of income. If, for example, an APC model was used to fund the flipped journal, the APC would have to be exorbitantly high to generate the same level of income because there is so much cost shifting from organizations that are paying subscription fees for the journal but whose employees are unlikely to ever publish in the journal.

### 5.1.3 Informing Stakeholders

Informing stakeholders is a critically important part of flipping a subscription journal to OA. Librarians and other customers with subscriptions will need to be informed, and a transition process will need to be worked out. Single subscriptions are a smaller problem, but reasonable accommodations must also be made for journals included in bundled, or “big deal,” electronic access agreements. As we have noted, it is generally best to implement the transition to OA at the start of a new volume (Meadows 2015). This provides a clear delineation of the transition and will likely simplify the transition away from subscriptions.

The transition for journals with subscriptions to a print version may be more gradual as subscribers may wish to maintain their subscriptions to the print version. Over a four-year period after *Nucleic Acids Research* flipped, the subscriptions for the print version of the journal dropped slowly, by about 20 to 25 percent per year (Bird 2008). This allowed Oxford University Press to retain a substantial income from the subscriptions to printed copies of *Nucleic Acids Research* well after the journal flipped to OA.

Along with informing stakeholders, it may be helpful to conduct surveys of potential authors, readers, and other stakeholders to better understand their reactions and concerns about the change in the business model (Jones 2014). Surveys can also serve as a means of informing stakeholders about the change in business model.

**Cara Kaufman**

Analyzing the number of articles published in other OA journals (especially other large OA journals where the loyalty factor may not be as great as with society journals) may give an indication of the number of manuscripts that might be submitted once a journal converts to OA. If the newly converted OA journal will be as or more selective than it was in the past, authors may stick with the larger OA journals so as to speed time to publication rather than risk rejection and having to resubmit elsewhere.

**Salvatore Mele**

There are several things which we learnt in SCOAP3 here. The first is that things start at the start of a year, rather than a volume. The second is that publication at the start of a calendar year is very different from the way the subscription workflow works, when prices are announced, when packages are (re-)negotiated, when invoices are paid. As an example, the protracted process to close the deals for the first SCOAP3 phase implied a financial process which was set in motion in November, when most libraries were already invoiced, or had even pre-paid. Those had to be reimbursed or credited, what added remarkable complexity. Also, financial years and terms of payments vary across the globe. And cash flow considerations are also important. Therefore, any information has to follow from all these considerations, as they get integrated in the business planning.

**5.1.4 Article Archive and Subscribers**

There are always articles in the “pipeline” between submission and publication. Cerejo and Rajagopalan (2015) mention that the Wolters-Kluwer journal *Medicine* published both subscription and OA content for six months. The length of time between submission and eventual publication can vary considerably (Björk and Solomon 2013). This almost certainly will result in a mixed method of article publication after the journal has been flipped—those manuscripts submitted before the journal was flipped, and potentially even before the announcement about the change in business model, and those submitted under the new OA model. This can be confusing, particularly if a different license is used for articles submitted before and after the flip. It will be necessary to keep the authors informed and take on the effort necessary to address their concerns.

**Stefan Busch**

Allowing “a mixed method article publication”, with OA and closed-access articles being published alongside until the pipeline of pre-conversion submissions has run dry, could be an option, although some software and platforms may not permit any form of hybridity. It may be more practical, apart from it being “cleaner”, to take steps in the pre-conversion period to avoid such a mix. The longer in advance the required decisions and steps are taken, the easier the handling of the practical requirements. These include:

- The website of the to-be-converted journal should inform authors and the wider community way (at least months) in advance that from a certain point in time onwards the journal will switch to OA and that all articles submitted from this time will, if and when accepted, be published under OA conditions and incur, if this is the plan, an APC.
- From this point onwards, new submissions are only allowed under OA conditions (which may in practice be identical with: only be allowed to go through a new website and

submission process). Authors submitting under the old conditions, e.g. through the old website, have to be informed individually about the changes and asked to confirm acceptance of the new conditions. Potentially these authors have to resubmit to the new website/tool; if this is offered as a service, it is important to receive their consent to the OA conditions, where applicable including to APCs.

- Very likely there will also be at least some papers “in the pipeline”, submitted before the new conditions are announced and not gone through peer review in time to be published before the conversion. In addition to these authors having to be given the required information about the new conditions, a solution for APCs (if any) needs to be in place. Retrospectively introducing APCs is or at least will often be seen as unacceptable. Therefore, for such papers waivers may have to be considered. They should be built into the business case for the conversion and, where journals are published by publishing houses on behalf of societies, the parties should agree waiver allowances for such papers.

How to handle back issues of the journal must also be decided. Will they be made OA and under what license? Is making back issues OA even possible given potential licensing issues? If the decision is made to make back issues OA, should authors of the back issues be contacted about the change in the status of their articles?

#### **Stefan Busch**

Licensing and other terms concerning availability of back content require preparation, potentially involving legal advice. The phrasing in the report treats this area in a cavalier way. It should always be possible to make back issues freely available, at least with a delay. However, re-licensing of articles is a complex matter. Somewhat paradoxically, solutions become the more straightforward the less generous journals or publishers were in the pre-conversion past. The more rights had been left with authors and the more authors/papers there are, the more complicated it becomes, fast approaching a practical impasse. But even where rights have been taken “centrally” by a publisher or society, it remains at least a grey area whether the rights granted cover the right to a re-licensing under very different conditions.

Then again, authors’ protests against greater availability of their work remain hypothetical, although relicensing under CC BY, with its re-use and commercial implications, could easily become contentious. It will have to be decided by the journal and rights holders, and possibly the wider community, what the right approach is and, if there is a desire to go beyond making the back content freely available, how to balance practical and, perhaps, common sense solutions with any legal concerns.

## **5.2 Issues Specific to Society Journals**

Societies own about half the scholarly journals published, although about 17 percent are published on their behalf by commercial publishers. The vast majority of societies, 97 percent, own less than three journals each, with over 90 percent owning just a single journal (Crow 2006). While journals are extremely important to societies most societies lack the expertise or the scale to publish their journal(s) efficiently. Unfortunately, these societies often lack the

expertise and bargaining power to get favorable contract terms from professional publishers (Crow, 2015)

Crow (2006) proposes publishing cooperatives as a potential strategy for societies to band together to obtain the expertise, efficiencies of scale, and market power to operate their journals more effectively. Several promising examples of publishing cooperatives exist. SCOAP3 and the Open Library of the Humanities have recently been formed. Please see section 10.4, Joining Consortium or Library Partnership, for more detail about collectives.

**Raym Crow**

SCOAP3 and OLH are collectives, not cooperatives in the specific legal and organizational sense. It's a meaningful distinction to maintain in the context of this report.

**Salvatore Mele**

I am not sure why SCOAP3 is mentioned there, and called a "publishing cooperative".

What we can take away is that most society journal-publishing operations are very small, generally involving a single journal. Society members are experts in their field but generally not in publishing, and their publishing operations often lack adequate scale and expertise to be operated efficiently.

Societies often benefit financially from their subscription journal(s). This can create a dilemma because transitioning their journals to an OA business model may lower the income potential of their journal(s), but making the material in those journals more accessible benefits the society in other important ways. One common issue is that a free or reduced-price subscription to the society's journal(s) is often an important perk of membership. Eliminating that perk could potentially result in losing members. On the other hand, providing those free or reduced-price subscriptions can be expensive for the society, particularly if the journal is published under contract by a professional publisher. In fact, the money saved by doing away with the perk can conceivably cover a significant part of the cost of publishing the journal OA if an efficient publishing model is used (Crow, 2015).

Determining the best option for the society can be difficult, and there are likely to be significant differences of opinion regarding the best course of action. There is no easy solution but it is important to

1. Have a clear, accurate picture of the current financial state of the journal and the likely financial impact of flipping the society's journal(s). Without good data, there is little basis for making an informed decision
2. Involve the whole society in the discussion. Walton, Cousens, and Graf (2013) provide a good example in which editorials are used to communicate author survey results and other evidence. While involving the membership in direct discussion may not be practical, at least allow all members of the society to provide input through surveys or other means. Even

though there may not be complete agreement, failing to give the membership a voice in the decision will create much more resentment.

Once a decision is made to flip the society's journal(s), it may be necessary to cancel or perhaps renegotiate the contract with the current publisher to publish the journal OA.

A comprehensive guide to coping with reviewing and cancelling a contract with a major commercial subscription publisher and finding an OA publisher is provided by Schmoller (2011). It includes information about negotiating with publishers, preparing a request for proposals, comparing received offers, and selecting a service provider. The report highlights that circumstances, such as what function and context the journal fulfills today and what the aims are for the future, matter. The report recommends that at least the following key variables be considered so that the journal has a clearer vision for approaching the flip to OA:

- Is this the single journal of the society, or is it one of many journals?
- Does the journal act as a voice of the society, or does it act more detached from the societies activities?
- Is the journal a crucial source of income, or is it a "labor of love" running at a loss?
- Is it interlinked with conferences organized by the society?
- Does the journal have an existing high number of subscribers and scientific impact, or is it struggling with increasing impact and subscription base?

There are many different routes an established journal can take. Piwowar (2013) sheds valuable light on the options that were on the table when [\*Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association\*](#) re-evaluated its publishing model.

Switching publishers is not something that a scientific society often has to address; however, transitioning to OA might necessitate this if a satisfactory arrangement cannot be achieved with the subscription-based publishing service. Going about the switch is something that can prove daunting and discouraging in itself. Schmoller, Jennings, and Sutton (2012) identified the major stakeholders and their motivation and impact on the process of a scholarly society considering moving a journal to OA. The thorough listing and evaluation of over 30 different stakeholder roles demonstrates the complexity inherent in having a good communication plan as the stages of the flipping process are executed.

#### **Cara Kaufman**

Journal as society membership perk is fading, not as much because of OA but because members gain access to the society journal through their institution's subscription. Thus, we are seeing especially larger societies, with the necessary resources, make the investment in market research and product development to offer new professional development, continuing education, and research outlets to help sustain and grow membership.

Many societies are using their new OA journals to experiment with more streamlined publishing models, hoping to apply them to their more established journals and lower costs there too.

In our consulting practice, we don't see that hybrid OA journals end up serving as an accurate testing ground for OA. The fees are typically higher than what the market would bear for OA journals, rarely are promoted, and typically are there only for authors that need to publish their paper OA. Journals that have offered optional OA for years and had little uptake (1%-5%), are very able to have very successful OA journals.

More money spent on hybrid OA does not necessarily mean more net revenue for the publishers; many publishers lower their rate increases by the amount of hybrid OA revenues.

Many society journals have relied on publications fees (such as page and color charges) and subscriptions fees to offset publishing costs. In some situations, the publications fees rival APCs, making it difficult to convert to OA because not much if any additional revenue can be generated by APCs and the journal would lose all the subscription revenues. On the other hand, it's getting more difficult to explain to authors why they have to pay publication fees but their article won't be published OA. So many societies are questioning whether or not to offer these fees.

## 6 OVERVIEW OF ALTERNATIVE SCENARIOS

Each journal's conversion to OA is, to some extent, unique in terms of the exact circumstances; nevertheless, individual conversions can be grouped into categories, and generalizations can be made. For the purposes of this report, we considered four main aspects where journals differ:

- The type of organization that owns and controls the journal
- The transition mode—direct or via some intermediate stage
- The publishing platform—in-house or outsourced
- The way in which the funding of the converted journal is envisaged

### **Raym Crow**

To the four aspects where journals differ, you might add the controlling organization's financial requirement/expectations for the journal. Although this might be considered a function of the type of controlling organization, the financial requirements do not always conform to publisher type. (For example, a nonprofit publisher may have a higher net surplus requirement than a commercial publisher.)

These four major aspects could be combined in a variety of ways, but we propose to do it in the way shown in tables 1 and 2. One advantage of this particular way of splitting is that most of the categories in table 2 apply only to the non-commercial organizations because most flipping journals owned by commercial publishers would fit into the single APC and mainstream commercial slot.

For clarity of presentation, some of the category labels in the table have not been detailed. For instance, the university press category could also include university publishing offices. Full universities could, in addition to university departments, be publishers of single journals. The category "other" can, for instance, include government institutes, international organizations, etc.

### **Type of Organization**

Commercial publishers and university presses typically have multiple journals, while scholarly societies can be broken into big societies (such as American Chemical Society) and small societies. Big societies often publish multiple journals, which can represent a significant source of revenue. It's typical that they have their own publishing platforms and professional publishing staff. Small societies usually have a single journal (over 90 percent of societies fall into this category) and often outsource the mechanics of publishing the journal (Crow 2006). The same is true for university departments (Solomon 2013). The category "other" includes government institutes and international and trade organizations. It is important to remember that the context for an OA strategy differs between organizations with single and multiple journals. Organizations with multiple journals can experiment with individual journals. Flipping involves more risk for organizations with a single journal.



**Rebecca Kennison**

I find interesting the assertion that flipping a single journal, if that's the only journal published by a society (for example), is more risky than flipping a single journal that is part of a larger portfolio. I'd say that rather depends on the size of the portfolio and how many money-making journals there are versus how many money-losers. It seems to me that what is risky is not the number of journals but the monetary contribution of any given journal to the organization's financial health. A single journal that doesn't make a lot of money would not be risky to flip. A journal that makes considerable revenue from subscriptions that then subsidizes the money-losing journals (or, as is often the case for university presses, their money-losing monographs) would be more difficult to flip. So another scenario that seems to be missing here is a strategy to flip revenue-losing or revenue-neutral journals first, so that they don't drag on the revenue-generating journals and then to flip those revenue-generating journals last — in all cases, using whatever mechanisms (as outlined in the various scenarios) that might make sense. Of course, perhaps no one has tried that approach, which is why it's not listed as a scenario per se, as there are no examples of either success or failure.

**Transition Mode**

In most cases, the transition is direct, from subscription (print only, print/electronic, and, rarely, electronic only) to OA. But for major commercial, university, and scholarly publishers, hybrid OA can be used as testing ground for going full OA. Many scholarly publishers and university presses have also opened up their journals with a delay, and that could also be used as an intermediate stage before going fully OA. Laakso and Björk (2013) found 492 such journals in 2011.

**Jean-Claude Guédon**

It is very important to single out the transition phase and give it a duration of 1-3 years. Identifying this transition as a special phase should also coincide with added support. I say this while thinking in particular about funders that subsidize journals.

**Publishing Platform**

An organization can either publish a journal on its own, or it can outsource these tasks. Many societies, for instance, have partnered with the major commercial publishers who publish their journals on their behalf. Under a subscription regime, big deals are one of the benefits with partnering with a large publisher. When going OA, one of the options is to start using highly efficient, low cost publishers like Ubiquity Press. A very popular option in many countries has been to use regional and national portals like SciELO. Often, that decision has been made by society and university journals when they have decided to start publishing an electronic version.

For in-house publishing there are also alternatives. While early converters may have developed their own sites, using open source solutions like Open Journals System (OJS) has become very popular. The in-house professional solution is mainly used by large societies.

#### Raym Crow

It might make sense to mention library-/campus-based publishing operations as low-cost platform options (e.g., UC's eScholarship, Synergies in Canada, and many individual institutions (e.g., Pitt) that will publish qualifying OA journals without charge).

### Funding Options

APCs have become widely used in the life sciences. Other funding options can be classified into either external or internal. For instance, in many countries, public grants subsidize scholarly journals. Internal funding or "in kind" support can come from sources within the organization. A somewhat controversial option is using society membership fees to cover the costs for publishing the journal, which is also freely available to non-members. The funding options can also be combined in multiple ways.

**Table 1. Type of organization and transition mode**

Type of Organization →		Multiple Journals			Single Journal		
		Commercial publisher	University press	Society		University department	Other
Transition mode ↓							
Immediate							
Gradual	Via hybrid OA						
	Via delayed OA						

While many of the possible combinations in these tables would not occur in practice, others are very common.

**Table 2. Funding and publishing platform**

Funding → Publishing platform ↓		APCs	External			Internal		
			Consortia	Grants	Other	Membership fees	Other revenue	Volunteers, in kind support
External	Mainstream commercial							
	Specialized OA publisher							
	Low cost							
	National portal							
Internal	Professional in-house							
	Open source							
	Self-programmed							

**Salvatore Mele**

Although my viewpoint could be limited to large STM operations, or societies who publish in symbiosis with those, I see a profound difference between flipping as in income rearrangement and flipping as a rethinking of workflows and operations. In my perception I would not even create a matrix as in table 2 to assess feasibility. I would imagine on the one hand a separate analysis of revenue streams which allow (or forbid) flipping. And on the other hand a (business-consultant) analysis of the cost basis and in particular the way a re-arrangement of operations could generate vast savings to go hands-in-hands with flipping (or conversely make it impossible if technology changes ought to happen simultaneously).

## **CONVERSION FACILITATORS**

There are a number of factors or circumstances that may facilitate the decision to convert or the process of converting to OA itself.

First, important stakeholders may exert pressure on the journal owners or managers to flip. In particular, such pressure may come externally from governments, ministries of education, or research funders, for whom the term influence is perhaps better because OA mandates are not targeted to individual journals. The term pressure is better for describing the influence from the authors, readers, reviewers, and editorial board of the journal, groups that are usually specific to the journal.

In addition, there may be monetary subsidies available to facilitate the conversion process. Such subsidies can be in the form of specific funds available to aid the conversion during a limited time, as is the case in Austria (Reckling and Scherag 2013). Or, subsidies can be embedded in the rules of the continuous grants given in many countries, often to journals in the social sciences and humanities.

Also, journals can reduce operating costs using open source software (Edgar and Willinsky 2010) or national OA portals (Packer et al 2014). Such solutions have significantly lowered the barriers to convert to OA and facilitated the conversion of thousands of journals, in particular in certain regions of the world, with the prime example being Latin America. [Library publishing offices](#) are growing in importance as a means of providing portals and other publishing resources for facilitating conversions.

### **6.1 Pressure from Stakeholders**

The first scenario focuses on the top-down influence that government and foundation policies can have in supporting and promoting OA. The second scenario focuses on the bottom-up influence that authors, society members, and editorial boards can have in insisting that the journals they support, through volunteer effort and submission of their manuscripts, are OA.

#### **6.1.1 Government and Funder Incentives**

##### **Description**

This scenario focuses on the influence that government and foundation funding programs and mandates can place on publishers. The intent of such policies has been to encourage or require researchers to make their research available OA, either as self-archived manuscripts (green OA) or published OA in the journal itself (gold OA). Sometimes such mandates are implemented along with financial resources earmarked to fund OA publication. Another factor is national funding schemes, which are dealt with as a separate scenario in this report and address directly targeted monetary support for OA journals. This can change the market dynamics to be more favorable for OA journals. It should be noted these policies usually include a green OA option.

Naturally, the stronger and broader the mandate or incentive, the more effective the policy can be in supporting OA journals

**Jean-Claude Guédon**

The existence of a link between mandating Gold OA and the financial viability of OA journals is not obvious. Furthermore, it appears to rely on the presence of APCs without stating it clearly. Journals supported by some institution, programme, etc. (e.g. SciELO or Redalyc journals) do not see their financial viability increase with the appearance of OA mandates. On the other hand, APC-based journals, including Hybrid journals, will tend to treat financial resources earmarked to fund OA publications as new revenue streams.<sup>3</sup>

The only example I know that links mandates with the support of non-APC-Gold is the attempt by the European Commission to offset costs of publications in no-APC-OA journals within the framework of the pilot that was initiated within OpenAire2020 last year. This programme is still being discussed, so far as I know, and putting it in place has proved complex. However, the presence of the EC in the scheme also shows that the funding of journals does not necessarily fall under the umbrella of “national funding schemes”.

3: In fact, as commercial publishers began to embrace OA publishing, they also began to seek the multiplication and diversification of their revenue streams. I still remember Derk Haank, from Springer, laughing (Frankfurt book fair, ca. 2005 or 6), presumably all the way to the bank, at the thought that he would have never imagined he could develop a new revenue stream with research funders...

**Relevant publisher types:** All

**Relevant pre-requisites:** Currently most relevant to publishers and journals within scientific disciplines that make OA publishing funds available for authors

**Most relevant disciplines:** STM disciplines though specific policies also support social sciences and humanities journal

**Relevant goals for flipping:** Leveraging changes in market conditions or directly funding journals that have flipped to OA

**Strengths:** Although their effect is often indirect, by not funding journals directly, gold OA mandates and funding schemes for OA publishing provide a broader and more predictable market for APC-funded OA journals to succeed. In the social sciences and humanities, funding has often been in the form of direct subsidies to the journals.

**Weaknesses:** Despite additional funding for OA, successful subscription-based journals still might not find flipping to OA financially beneficial. Instead, they may offer hybrid OA to cater to gold OA mandates and generate additional income in the form of APCs.

**Opportunities:** Top-down pressure in the form of incentives and gold mandates by research funders or countries can accelerate the transition to OA.

**Threats:** Policies, if not carefully crafted, can result in price increases for APCs as well as encourage hybrid OA publishing as a permanent funding model rather than as a transition strategy. This increases the cost of publishing and publisher profits.

**Virginia Barbour**

The risk of the hybrid move is substantial and could well risk the acceptability of OA generally. Hybrid should not be considered even as a transition model because of its high unacceptability for universities and other funders. The threat noted in price increases of APCs is a very real one also, and suggests that at the current time market forces are not leading to a real “market” in APCs, but instead are causing a replication of the situation we find with the subscription oligopoly - ie that publishers of prestigious journals can essentially charge what they wish, regardless of actual price.

**Jean-Claude Guédon**

In the section on relevant pre-requisites, funders “that make OA publishing funds available for authors” tend indeed to be dealing with STM disciplines. However, this is not true of libraries financing the APCs of a particular university or research centre? I could not see a library offering APCs only to, e.g. chemists, biologists, etc. within a particular university. The appearance that this trend is the reality may also be connected to the fact that APC-Gold journals are not as commonly found in SSH as they are in STM disciplines.

I do not understand the section “relevant goals for flipping”. My impression is that research funders want to flip articles, not journals. Their financing is structured that way.

*Strengths:* the strength seems to be presented in market terms. However, are markets the most important factors to consider when examining the use of public funds or charitable funds? If I paraphrase the statement of strength, it roughly means that governments and funders provide funds to researchers, and these can then decide where to direct these funds. On the face of it, this would seem to create a competitive market for APCs. However, authors seek to reach certain journals because of their prestige (and the impact factor is the deciding metric right now, despite its glaring flaws) and they will pay anything to get in those journals, especially if funds are provided with no clear limits. Cameron Neylon, for one, [expressed his puzzlement at not seeing any APC market emerge](#) when he was working for PloS.

*Weaknesses:* The critique is spot on. Subscription journals retain all their options open with the hybrid solution, and, on top of this, it often allows for double dipping, while letting “liberated” articles in dubious states of visibility.

*Opportunities:* On the other hand, the argument for opportunities is not convincing at all. Increasing incentives (but in what form, if not APCs) will simply increase the revenue stream of publishers, and this is particularly true in the case of hybrid publications. Mandates or OA policies generally target articles, not journals.

*Threats:* Uncapped policies are indeed foolish as the sky will quickly become the limit. Capped support for APCs is not much better as publishers will tend to move their fees at or near the capped level. Hybrid publishing, even if it was originally imagined as a possible way to transition journals into OA, has quickly revealed itself as the preferred, semi-stable, business plan of companies intent on maximizing profits. It is interesting that, in the case of the FWF, the 2014 policy capped the hybrid APCs at 1,500 Euros, as against 2,500 Euros for full OA journals.

### **Cara Kaufman**

*Strengths:* Of the direct forces, government and funder incentives—and the surrounding public relations initiatives—are probably the major reasons that societies are moving toward OA. Some think of 100% OA for STM research as inevitable because of these mandates and start new OA journals now, as experiments thinking that the new OA journals may overtake their flagship journals one day. These “sister” journals have had the mostly unintended consequences of hurting smaller journals and societies down the line and underscoring the media trend of “big is big.”

*Weaknesses:* Generally, the journals more successful journals in terms of quality submissions tend to have been around longer and grew their subscription base when institutional subscriptions were much easier to attain and retain. Thus, one could argue that less successful subscription journals in terms of reach and revenues would be more likely to consider converting to OA. Also, since Impact Factor is still a major factor in number and quality of submissions and typically a smaller well-established journal fares better in terms of impact than a larger well-established journal and since OA based on APCs favors larger journals, it makes sense that lower tier journals are more likely to trend toward OA. Of course, there are exceptions, like mBio from the American Society for Microbiology, which was developed to be a more selective journal.

*Opportunities:* An obstacle in converting a clinical medical journal to an OA journal is that many remain in print and there are compelling user preferences for print (and advertising revenues tied to print) that make it more challenging to convert to OA as the APC would have to be too high to cover the cost. These journals often have a mix of original research and reviews, editorials, commentaries, instructive videos and many other content types for which authors generally cannot or do not wish to pay a publication fee. Given that we do believe that all original research at least in the basic, translational, and clinical sciences will transition to OA and because different users and usage patterns are associated different types of content, we may recommend to our society clients that they move their non-original research content into a separate publication that may remain in print (longer), be more likely to be read or at least scanned, continue to attract advertising revenues, and be subsidized by member dues going forward.

*Threats:* Assuming that more OA publications with revenues from APCs will mean even lower library budgets for journal subscriptions, an unintended consequence might be less government and funder support for clinical content of value to clinicians. Creating filtering software or filtering content is expensive (staff time and editor stipends, plus production costs), but having the mounds of articles filtered is critical for clinicians. Clinicians spend their day with patients, not reading (solely) original research. While many of course are interested in analyzing the literature, most are happier to get a just enough, just in time information on how to best treat the patient in front them or that they’ll likely see next week—or even a more unusual case that presents. Although NIH, for example is focusing great energies on translational research and the ACA is hoping to reduce health care costs in part by focusing on evidence-based medicine, moving away from government funding of subscriptions means that such clinical education will

fall more squarely on the shoulders of other groups with various motives--like societies but also pharmaceutical and insurance companies.

## **Background**

The number of OA mandates and policies has been growing substantially for the last decade. [The Registry of Open Access Repository Mandates and Policies \(ROARMAP\)](#) reveals hundreds of research funder mandates and over five hundred research organization mandates, most of which support green OA, but also include some mandates that incorporate funding for gold OA. The most important policies for promoting publishers to expand OA offerings are mandates from research funders with earmarked OA publication funding, such as the European Union's Horizon 2020 framework program, Research Councils UK, Wellcome Trust, and the FWF.

[Some universities](#) have set up [publication funds](#) to directly pay APCs for affiliated authors (Open Access Directory 2015). Many funding agencies make APCs an allowable cost on their grants, often coupled with a mandate for at least green OA. This practice is common in the United States. While not as strong an incentive as direct funding, making publication costs an allowable expense on grants does encourage authors to publish in APC-funded OA journals, particularly when coupled with a requirement to make a green copy of an article available. Unfortunately, without a policy crafted to discourage it, publishers can create a hybrid option for their subscription journals as a permanent source of income in addition to subscription fees rather than treating the hybrid option as a transition strategy (Björk and Solomon 2014).

### **MacKenzie Smith**

In the U.S., government funding agency policies related to OA for published research articles has been focused on "green" OA, as the report states. While many of these agencies allow researchers to charge publishing costs to a grant (whether traditional page charges or newer APCs), in practice many authors resist using scarce research grants in this way. The report says "While not as strong an incentive as direct funding, making publication costs an allowable expense on grants does encourage authors to publish in APC-funded OA journals, particularly when coupled with a requirement to make a green copy of an article available." I don't think that is quite the case. If the author is required to make a final manuscript of their article available via a repository (green), then their motive to publish in an OA journal is discouraged, not encouraged. To achieve global OA to research, funders will need to be aligned on the general strategy (e.g., green or gold), and structure grants so that authors really are encouraged to use their funds to pay for publications.

## **Examples**

**The Wellcome Trust** - The Wellcome Trust is a large foundation, based in London, focused on improving health with an endowment of around 18 billion GBP. [The Wellcome Trust policy](#) supports OA journals and funds thousands of articles each year. Unfortunately, it also encourages authors to publish in hybrid journals by covering these costs. Authors can fund their



publication costs from a dedicated fund for publication charges, and thereby avoid a financial disincentive to publish in an OA journal. There is no cap on what can be spent for publication charges, which places no incentive on authors to seek less expensive options for publishing their research. The policy does require that the articles using the Wellcome Trust's funds to pay APCs be published with a Creative Commons CC-BY license and be made available through PMC and Europe PMC. A thorough audit of the policy found that 39 percent of the articles funded through the program failed to meet at least some of these criteria (Kiley 2015a).

#### **Pippa Smart**

Kiley 2015a: There has been a recent (March 2016) [update](#) of this.

About half the roughly 5,000 articles published in 2013 with Wellcome Trust research funding were in either full OA journals (about one out of six) or hybrid journals (about one third). Interestingly, if you applied the average APC paid for these articles to all 5,000 articles published based on Wellcome Trust-funded research in 2013, the total APC charges for the articles would amount to just over 1 percent of what was spent on Wellcome Trust grants that funded conducting the research (Kiley 2015b).

#### **Jean-Claude Guédon**

The remark about the cost of APCs as a fraction of the Wellcome research budget (1%) is most interesting because it confirms that the cost of publishing constitutes a very small fraction of the cost of research. If we add the notion that the research cycle is incomplete without the publishing phase, we may then ask: why this dissemination phase should be treated separately from the rest of the research cycle. And if we add the fact that a very large majority of research (as distinguished from development) is funded by public money, then the issue transforms itself as follows: the cost of scientific publishing is an integral part of the cost of research.

**Austrian Science Fund (FWF)** - The FWF is the largest Austrian funding organization for basic research. Like the Wellcome Trust, the FWF has been a strong advocate of OA publication and has a mandatory OA policy for research reports funded by the organization. The policy allows publishing in full OA journals, OA articles in hybrid journals, or making a green version available in a suitable repository within one year of publication. Also like the Wellcome Trust, the FWF maintains a separate fund for covering APC payments, and the FWF previously covered the full cost of APC for both full OA and hybrid journals. In 2015, they instituted a new policy that is part of a [broader OA transition strategy](#) with a goal of phasing out of hybrid payments by 2017 that are not part of comprehensive agreements with publishers that control “double dipping.” The 2015 policy capped APC payments from their fund at 2,500 EUR for full OA and 1,500 EUR for hybrid journals unless the hybrid publisher had reached an agreement with the foundation for cost reductions. Researchers can supplement these capped payments with other funds. The FWF makes their APC payment data available, as does the Wellcome Trust. Unfortunately, at the time of this writing, the 2015 data reflecting the policy change was not available, so it was not possible to tell the impact of the policy shift. The data from 2014 is, however, instructive. It

should be noted that the FWF also covers costs authors incur to publish in subscription journals, such as page rates or special charges for color figures.

#### **Raym Crow**

“In 2015, they instituted a new policy that capped APC payments from their fund at 2,500 EUR for full OA and 1,500 EUR for hybrid journals unless the hybrid publisher had reached an agreement with the foundation for cost reductions.”

It might be interesting to note the implications of such APC cap policies. As with national caps on pharmaceutical prices, funder caps on APCs will put upward pressure on APC prices that affect authors not affected by caps. That is, the costs won't be reduced, just redistributed.

And to be fair, the third-party payer issue--insulating authors from the effects on APC prices, thus inhibiting price competition--applies to institutional OA funds, as well as to research funder policies.

#### **Falk Reckling (FWF)**

The payment for Hybrid OA is part of broader strategy which is not properly reflected in this paragraph:

- 1) The costs for Hybrid OA for IoP, T&F, RSC, Springer and Sage are invested for OA offsetting deals together with Austrian Library Consortium (KEMÖ). That means it not cost neutral for the FWF but for Austria because our Hybrid OA costs are reduced from the library subscriptions. A similar agreement with Wiley is under negotiation.
- 2) From 2017 onward, the FWF will most probably stop to fund Hybrid OA for publishers where no offsetting or similar OA agreement is in place.
- 3) For project funded after 11/2014, the FWF is not funding “traditional publications” (e.g. page charges) anymore.

In a nutshell, since 2010 the FWF follows a 3-step strategy: (1) Funding full Hybrid OA and negotiating together with the Austrian Library Consortium with publishers for OA deals. (2) Introducing price caps, done 11/2014. (3) Stop funding Hybrid OA for publishers without OA deals, most probably in 2017.

A broader and more comprehensive approach for entire publication system is formulated in the November 2015 [Recommendations for the Transition to Open Access in Austria](#).

#### **Alma Swan**

The [FWF data for 2015](#) are now published )and they do indeed show that the average price per Gold Open Access article (APC) increased from 2014, from EUR 1288 to EUR 1682 (a 21% increase). The FWF concludes that even if a fully APC-based publishing system is achieved, we will still see price rises as in the traditional subscription-based system. This does seem inevitable, given that OA policies are not being designed to help prevent this.

#### **Jan Velterop**

On the face of it, this seems one of the more promising scenarios, if implemented widely. Especially their new 2015 policy does address the need to limit costs, and it also provides an incentive for publishers of hybrid journals to go fully OA, given the differential caps on allowable APCs. For publishers, moving from hybrid to full-OA is particularly attractive for their “lesser”

journals, among which there are likely to be quite a few loss-making ones (obviously depending on cost allocation procedures and income allocation from Big Deal arrangements), which may well benefit from higher allowable APCs for full-OA journals relative to hybrid ones. From a publisher's point of view, it would help them to make the decision of going full-OA if some guarantee of the stability of the policy would be in place. The FWF, or any other funder, could decide to lower the APC caps at any time, of course, or runaway inflation due to increasing political instability could significantly reduce the real value of the amounts mentioned in the policy. This could be ameliorated if FWF and other funders willing to use a similar policy to fix such policy for, say, five years and allow a weighted inflation correction of the amounts.

**Table 3. APC payments by cost type<sup>3</sup>**

<b>2014 FWF APC Payments in Euros for Journal Articles</b>			
<b>Cost type</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>S.D.</b>
Gold Open Access	1,293.42	243	477.41
Hybrid Open Access	2,311.69	657	694.59
Other publication costs	1,176.05	159	819.43
Hybrid and other publication costs	3,341.86	120	1,365.45
Total	2,053.52	1179	1,011.56

Like the Wellcome Trust, when allowed to freely choose either hybrid or full OA journals for publishing their research, FWF researchers appear far more likely to choose hybrid journals and at much higher APC costs. In a significant number of cases, not only did the fund pay hybrid charges but also other publication costs for the same subscription journal article. Although the actual data are not as yet available, it seems that a 2,500 EUR cap will have little impact on authors choosing to publish in full OA journals. Authors choosing to publish in hybrid journals will likely need to find funds in addition to the 1,500 EUR cap in 2015.

### **Summary**

The Wellcome Trust and FWF are examples of research funding programs that promote the growth of OA by funding OA publication. Clearly, if very prestigious funding organizations such as these agree to cover the full cost of APCs in both full OA and hybrid journals, there will be the unintended consequence of reducing price competition in the APC market, which supports hybrid OA as a business model rather than as a transition path to full OA. Unfortunately, there is not yet data available on the effectiveness of the policy change FWF implemented, although

3 The data used in Table 3 was obtained from:

[https://figshare.com/articles/Austrian\\_Science\\_Fund\\_FWF\\_Publication\\_Cost\\_Data\\_2014/1378610](https://figshare.com/articles/Austrian_Science_Fund_FWF_Publication_Cost_Data_2014/1378610)

we expect the FWF will release this data in spring 2016. Given that APC costs are such a small part of the Wellcome Trust's budget, it is not surprising that it has not implemented policies to cap what it will pay for APC charges or to discourage publishing in hybrid journals. Unfortunately, the consequence of paying the high asking price is likely a slower transition to publishing in reasonably priced full OA publications among grantees and beyond.

#### **Martin Eve**

Government and funder mandates for gold OA are very welcome, especially where they can provide financial incentives to make this work. However, funding hybrid journals seems a strategy that will escalate costs and simply lead to further entrenchment of existing economic problems. I recommend this strategy so long as it does not fund hybrid.

#### **Eve Gray**

Many of the motivations that are at play in journal flipping in the North, such as top-down pressure from government and funders do not necessarily result in journal flipping in an African context, but rather tend to drive authors to select OA options with international journals, paying APCs that are exorbitant by African standards, in order to preserve prestige and personal promotion prospects. This is beginning to raise serious questions about cost and sustainability.

When it comes to government support for journal flipping in South Africa, this has not been by way of mandates, but rather by provision of government backing for the creation of a national journal platform (aiming to become a regional platform). Funding from the Department of Science and Technology and backing by the Department of Higher Education and Training supports a collaboration with Latin America, the [SciELO South Africa programme](#), run by the [Academy of Science of South Africa](#) in its scholarly publishing programme. Journal flipping is encouraged by the provision of infrastructure support, such as the OJS platform and the hosting of journals on the SciELO SA site, offering high levels of downloads and substantially increased citation impact. The programme also runs a Journal Editors' Forum as part of its overall mission. As ASSAf puts it: "The strategic goal of the SPP is to enhance the national capacity to produce and publish research, on the one hand, and to increase the quality and visibility of South African research publications, on the other."

This role of support and encouragement is accompanied by a system of peer review of scholarly journals before they are placed on the SciELO SA platform - in line with the quality control exercised by SciELO Brazil, but more formal in its processes.

What this offers, in contrast to the Latin American model, is government support that promises long-term financial commitment to underpinning the initiative, taking the risk from the venture and making it a national effort.

It is hoped that this initiative will be extended to NASAC, the African Network for Science Academies, with recent support being brokered by UNESCO and INASP. A UNESCO report, arising out of its consultative forum, offers a programme for open access for Africa through NASAC: [Report on the Consultative Forum in Open Access: Towards High Level Interventions for Research and Development in Africa](#).

In general mandates and enforced patterns of behaviour tend to be received badly in societies with histories of colonial or repressive authoritarian government.

### **Jean-Claude Guédon**

If this proposition is accepted, the only problem that remains to be solved is: How should the publishing phase be organized so as to optimize the “great Conversation” of science and scholarship?

In the present situation, authors seem to favour hybrid journals despite their very pricey APCs. The reason for this situation is probably that authors look for the journals with the highest prestige, and the only reason that might deter them from going to a particular, high-prestige, journals may well be that this journals does not even offer the hybrid option. From the publisher's perspective, once the hybrid option is in place, why move to full OA? In fact, subscription revenues allow publishing articles submitted by authors that cannot afford the APC.

It would have been interesting to note that the OpenAIRE2020 FP7 APC pilot has finally excluded hybrid journals. The [Norwegian Research council agrees](#).

### **Rebecca Kennison**

Generally this has been an effective scenario in enacting large-scale change — nothing is more compelling to a researcher (and a researcher's institution) than the stick wielded by funders who threaten to withhold funding if researchers do not comply with their OA mandates. In addition to all the problems addressed already, the lack of either unified policies or implementation requirements across funding bodies (whether governments or foundations) and often clunky mechanisms for tracking compliance mean such mandates often fail to have the desired effect. Publishers have very little incentive to follow the rules and asking researchers to police their publishers (or to go around them) is simply untenable.

A further concern is that because funding goes to the researcher, institutions that must take on the increased compliance requirements (whether ensuring deposit into a repository or processing APC) are asked to do this extra work with no extra revenue or additional staff. Funders could help ensure OA compliance by earmarking a certain percentage of the award to fund compliance of their own requirements, but that would require a very different approach to grant distribution. Such a more centralized approach would also address the problem researchers frequently encounter when they have numerous simultaneous grants that go to fund their projects (e.g., “This work funded in part by grant PO1 CA44704 from the National Cancer Institute and grant CCG #252E from the American Cancer Society”). Which grant should cover their publication costs? What if both organizations have different OA polices? Most researchers remain unaware of their funders' policies and thus are unable to assist in compliance, but funders cannot continue to demand more from institutions without enabling them in very material ways to assist.

And of course it is probably worth noting the obvious: not all research is funded. Publications in science and medicine (but not always technology) are almost always the result of funded research, but there are entire disciplines whose scholars publish — and sometimes prolifically —

without one cent of external funding. Of course, that's where other governmental policies, such as the Research Excellence Framework, can influence OA uptake even for those who are not funded beyond their employment. The REF has the potential of creating even more problems than it solves, however, as administrators will tend to favor only those few journals that are known to have resonance with review boards; those journals will probably have good reason to be flipped to OA to fulfill the REF requirements. Other journals will likely suffer in any number of very material ways, including potentially going out of business (no matter what the business model). This bleak scenario is not mine, by the way. It came from a vice-chancellor at a UK institution who can't see any other way for her to do her job than to provide a list of "acceptable" journals within which her faculty can publish that will be a slam-dunk for the evaluation boards to reward. She's actually a big fan of OA. Less so of the REF's application of the idea.

The authors also address the serious problem of the publisher double-dipping that has arisen because of hybrids. They properly note that encouragement of "hybrids" to fulfill funder requirements has resulted mostly in publishers making even more money and not having the least incentive to flip their journals. Elsevier has been very clear on this point. They "de-couple" APCs and subscription pricing for all their journals so that no matter how many articles might be made OA via the payment of hybrid APCs, the subscription price can (and often does) remain the same or can even increase because (in fact) the value of the journal increases as content can be more readily accessed and subscription rates are based on value, not on cost. The only real method for both controlling costs and encouraging flipping is the one that FWF has begun to employ, that of capping amount of hybrid APCs that they will cover and giving more to full OA journals. As a single funder policy, though, that is not likely to make a substantive difference to a publisher. If every funder were to follow the same practice, that would start to have an effect.

#### **Iryna Kuchma**

This scenario works in developing and transition countries, and I endorse it.

#### **Alice Meadows**

The authors have hit on one of the key challenges here, which is tracking and tackling compliance with mandates. Ironically, perhaps, the publisher-founded CHORUS organization is one way of doing this, but although several US federal agencies are working with CHORUS, support from funders (and universities) is not as high as you might expect it to be given the importance of compliance in making mandates work.

I'm not surprised by the report's authors finding that researchers are more likely to choose to publish in hybrid journals, since these offer a much wider choice of publication opportunities. But I'm not sure that FWF's approach of capping hybrid journal fees at a lower rate than full OA journals makes sense to authors or publishers. However, the idea of a (reasonable - from a publisher and funder perspective) cap at the same level for both types of OA is a good way of avoiding both excessively high APCs or - just as bad - a race to the bottom.

I'd recommend this approach for disciplines that are highly funded and where funders are willing to include money for publication costs as part of a grant. I think it is reasonable of those funders to then consider setting a cap on the APCs they are willing to pay, as long as the cap is

high enough to allow a good deal of author choice in terms of where they can submit a paper. One option would be for funders to negotiate a mutually agreeable maximum APC with publishers of key journals in the field. Increased transparency around the real cost of publishing (which, as noted above, will vary) - and what services are included in the APC price - would be very helpful in establishing an appropriate range of acceptable APCs.

#### **Lisa Norberg**

We can add the [recent announcement by the Council of the European Union](#) to the growing list of governmental and funder incentives. What makes the EU announcement unique is its agnostic approach to the scenario or path to OA. Many of the previous pronouncements or requirements have promoted a particular publishing approach — be it green, gold or hybrid — that can force a solution that is not appropriate for all fields. While I applaud such incentives and believe they are necessary, I worry they create a false sense of urgency and drive the community to solutions that are not scalable or sustainable.

#### **Abel L Packer**

In addition to Wellcome and Austrian cases, I would strongly recommend to cite FAPESP as a reference on the funding of OA as it cover both journal support mainly through SciELO that is a established Program and also finding APC for São Paulo State researchers publishing in any indexed journal. Another option and more fair in the SciELO case would be cite in general FAPESP as leading organization, but also the Latin American National Research Councils, South Africa as systematic funders of OA national journals. They are generally cited in the document but as it highlights Wellcome Trust and the Austrian Science Fund organizations, citing FAPESP alone or FAPESP and others would provide a more global view.

#### **Bonnie Tijerina**

Government and funder mandates are very important for growing OA. Researchers and PIs listen to their funders. It's important for funders to keep evaluating their mandates' requirements and the impact of their mandates on researchers and the research record.

### **6.1.2 Pressure from Authors, Society Members and Editorial Boards**

#### **Description**

This scenario focuses on grassroots pressure that authors, society members, and editorial boards can put on publishers to transition to OA. These groups, as both the creators and the consumers of the scholarship published in a journal, have a tremendous amount of influence that can potentially pressure a publisher to transition a journal to OA. Publishers can be vulnerable to losing a large share of the editorial expertise and long-term community support that the journal has accumulated. When the constituents of a journal are united in the demand to make journals OA, the pressure on the publisher to flip can be significant.

#### **Jean-Claude Guédon**

The description is a little optimistic, and it ignores an important detail: the importance of who owns the journal title. The recent case of *Lingua* (now *Glossa*) demonstrates this point: the whole editorial board resigned from a journal whose title is owned by Elsevier. They had to start



a new journal and then hope that the spat was sufficiently heard (and remembered) to see authors submit more to the new journal than to *Lingua*. Meanwhile, *Lingua* has rebuilt an (interim) [editorial board](#) with apparently little or no difficulty. The new interim Board is made up of twelve members (as against six for the original *Lingua*).

The reason for this “success” on Elsevier’s part is quite simple: being invited to join an editorial board is a sign of recognition that counts in one’s career file.<sup>5</sup> It is a form of academic promotion which, alas, is often in the hands of publishers. The prospect of “losing a large share of the editorial expertise” is very speculative and probably not very realistic. As for the long-term community support, resignations of editorial boards in the past do not seem to have had a lasting negative impact (if any) on the titled journal.

5: A further point can be made, that goes beyond the boundary of the present exercise, but nevertheless deserves being mentioned. Obviously, some people within Elsevier have worked to reorganize this editorial board. This is a clear example of a potentially unfortunate overlap between the commercial objectives of Elsevier and the disciplinary and intellectual objectives of a sub-set of the linguistics discipline. This area where possible interference may occur between the intellectual and the commercial spheres is not well studied or understood at present; yet, it potentially raises troubling issues regarding the objectivity and autonomy of people in charge of selecting articles and peer reviewers within a journal owned by a commercial entity. How did Elsevier select the new twelve members of the editorial board? Is the process transparent? The point made here can be pushed further if editors are paid. Little hard data exists on this latter issue, but persistent rumours circulate about a number of editors being well rewarded for their work. The rewards can be in cash or in perks, such as editorial board meetings in “nice” places.

#### **Cara Kaufman**

Authors and society members have never been the major advocate for OA for any of the dozens and dozens of journals on which we work. But it is sometimes editors and editorial boards leading the charge, often influenced by their institutions. On the other hand there is still an amazing lack of understanding of how to publish an OA journal and many persistent misconceptions (OA = lowering the bar for acceptance and publishing low quality articles).

**Relevant publisher types:** Both commercial publishing houses and societies can be influenced by grassroots support for OA; however the nuances of the pressure are somewhat different.

**Relevant pre-requisites:** Strong support for flipping a journal to OA from some combination of authors, editorial boards, and in the case of societies, membership.

**Most relevant disciplines:** All

**Relevant goals for flipping:** Independence, access issues, and allowable use of the material.

**Strengths:** Even journals owned by commercial publishers are built upon the committed input of academic scholars, most of whom are not paid for their services to the journal. Editorial board members and a critical mass of other influential academics affiliated with the journal, who band together and threaten to leave if demands are not met, can exert significant pressure and even impact a journal’s ability to function.



**Weaknesses:** Not all researchers feel that OA is significant, and it may be difficult to create the support needed to pressure a journal to transition to OA. In the case of societies, flipping may negate the incentive of low or no cost access to the subscription journal. If the journal is profitable and helps support the society, the membership must be willing to make up the lost income in higher dues, other fees, or reduction of the society's membership services.

**Opportunities:** Scholars have a tremendous amount of power in determining how publishing is done in their discipline. However, sufficient will is needed to force a change.

**Threats:** Attempting to force a journal to flip to OA can be a significant risk for an editorial board, society membership, or other journal constituency, even if an agreement is eventually reached with the owner or publisher. These actions might create long-term tensions that do not nurture a long-term collaborative partnership. If a substantial part of the editorial board moves over to a new journal the possibility of severely damaging the original journal while failing to create a successful alternative becomes a potential risk. This is not to say it should never be attempted; however, such drastic actions can pose real risks. Attempting to work out an acceptable compromise with the publisher might be a more prudent approach. For society journals, it is important to fully understand the wishes of the membership. While many members may be supportive of OA, when it comes to making significant sacrifices, such as the loss of free or low-price subscriptions or higher membership dues and conference fees, there may be a backlash.

#### Jean-Claude Guédon

Regarding the “publisher types”, are “professional publishing houses” commercial publishing houses? The two sets are not equivalent.

Among the *pre-requisites*, how does flipping affect independence?

The “strengths”, as noted just above, are overstated.

More than “will” is needed to seize the “opportunities”.

#### Virginia Barbour

There are very substantial risks with this scenario. One of the earliest examples was [Open Medicine](#), formed when a group of editors broke away from the CMAJ. The journal had no funds to call on and all the editors were volunteers. It eventually folded. For the humanities there is now a publisher, OLH, that can support such journals. For sciences there are only for profit ones. A more successful example was the *Malaria* journal, which joined BMC and successfully transitioned to being a APC funded journal. It is very important that any such moves are well advised and fully supported – it's a very disappointing experience all round if such moves fail for business reasons.

**Example:** *Lingua* In 2015, a coordinated effort by scholars in the Netherlands, [LingOA](#), was initiated to provide a sustainable foundation for OA publishing in the leading journals within linguistics research. In the case of Elsevier-owned journal [Lingua](#), which was part of the negotiations, the entire six-person editorial board of the journal resigned on October 27th 2015

to form a new journal because the publisher did not agree to the editorial board's demands for "fair open access" publishing. The demands put forward included flipping the journal to OA with an APC set at a maximum of 400 EUR, setting copyright for back-catalogue and future articles to CC-BY, and transferring ownership of the journal from the publisher to the collective editors with the option to change publishers with six-months' notice. The [demand letter](#) dated July 10th, 2015 was published and can be accessed at the *Chronicle of Higher Education* website. The editors founded the OA journal *Glossa*, published by Ubiquity Press, although it will transition to the library consortium-funded [Open Library of the Humanities](#). It remains to be seen what the long-term result is for both *Lingua* and *Glossa*.

### **Caroline Sutton**

Regarding the example of LingOA, there are a few cautionary points that could be made.

It is certainly true that editorial teams and editorial boards can put pressure on publishers to move towards full open access. However, it should be pointed out that it is probably not advisable for an editorial team or editorial board to demand that a publisher to relinquish ownership of a title. This is unrealistic and may contribute to conflict rather than to moving towards a solution.

From what is available online about LingOA, it looks to be focused on achieving full open access as well as on reducing the price tag for APCs. For a number of groups these are related concerns. Nonetheless, one should be aware that they are two separate things, although they might go hand in hand. The approach and cost levels suggested by LingOA might work well for smaller journals in social science or humanities fields. These price levels are likely more challenging to meet for a journal that receives hundreds or thousands of submissions per year, requiring statistical advisors, checks on compliance with various reporting guidelines, the need to compensate editors for their work, etc.

In the context of this report, one could also ask whether the example given of an editorial team and editorial board leaving one publisher to start a new journal is a transition, or rather just a launch of a new journal. At Co-Action we have launched a new journal with a group that left their old publisher (the publisher had moved the editorial office and there was mutual agreement to part company). We have not considered this to be a transitioned journal. Rather, it was a new journal launch. Among other things, we have had to build up the name and brand of the new journal as we are not able to use the reputation or impact factor of the journal with which the editors parted company.

The LingOA project can be compared with SCOAP3 as both aimed at transitioning an entire field of scholarship. However, each project went about this via a very different process. SCOAP3 offered an open competition among publishers – new and legacy – based on clear specifications. You might like or dislike the aims of SCOAP3, but it was/is fair and everyone understood the rules in an open playing field. In contrast, LingOA took place in a quieter way, enlisting a single publisher initially and working behind the scenes with selected editorial groups before an announcement was made. Most publishers would likely prefer the SCOAP3 route as demonstrating a platform for fair competition. Funding for transitioning linguistics journals now

states that journals may receive 20 000 EUR if moving to a publisher that meets the requirements established by LingOA, which does open to broader participation by other publishers and is a welcome change in the approach of LingOA.

Similar events, dubbed “journal declarations of independence,” have transpired. A [chronological listing](#) can be found at the Open Access Directory.

### **Summary**

Grassroots support for transitioning journals to OA models can be extremely effective if the constituency of the journal, including readers, authors, editorial board members, and—in the case of societies—the society membership, strongly supports the transition. It is important, however, for advocates of OA to understand the level of support and willingness to sacrifice required of the various constituencies in order to achieve their goals for the journal.

A journal’s owner, whether a society or a professional publishing house, also has a great deal of power when it comes to the reputation of the journal, author loyalty, and ownership of the back issues.

#### **Martin Eve**

Author and society pressure is also a very good tool to gain leverage and one that I recommend. The challenge is that societies have, in many but not all cases, been a sticking point here.

#### **Eve Gray**

African journals in the AJOL survey in identifying motivations for moving to or initiating OA publication identified the personal beliefs of the Editor-in-Chief and Editorial Board and international awareness of OA at the global level as the two strongest influences. However, an interesting detail is that the shift to open access tracked in the AJOL report indicated that two thirds of the journals surveyed indicated that they started out as OA and one-third reported flipping to OA. The majority of those that flipped did so after 2010. In other words, starting a new journal was a much more usual path than flipping an existing journal.

It needs to be borne in mind that the majority of African journals are small and sustained by voluntary editorial teams. The benefits reported from flipping included “highly visible, easier to manage”; “citations and downloaded manuscripts increased dramatically”. There were also reports of increases in international submissions.

In small journal of this kind, the ability to dispense with the business of managing subscriptions was also noted as a positive benefit. Also, given the difficulties that small journals had with publishing on time, the ability to shift to an articles received publication model was a positive benefit.

### Jean-Claude Guédon

This section should have begun by carefully distinguishing various types of publishers. Pressuring Elsevier is not the same thing as pressuring a small commercial publishers, and it also differs significantly from pressuring a large society publisher, a small society publisher, a university press (and even there, it may even be important to separate OUP, Cambridge UP, and some of the larger US University presses from small university presses), etc. etc. Commercial consortia of scholarly journals (e.g. CAIRN) present yet another situation.

In summary, this approach to flipping a journal works well only if the journal in question corresponds to a relatively well-defined community, and only if this community is devoted to flipping the journal. This will include the issue of finding a different financial model for the journal.

### Rebecca Kennison

You'll begin to note this as a theme — no surprise, given my own passion for collective approaches that is the hallmark of the [Open Access Network](#) — but the problem with grassroots efforts is that they are not sustainable without community organization. Even when a society is supportive (as is the case of the American Anthropological Association for Cultural Anthropology), there need to be in place active fundraising mechanisms that can be leveraged to provide ongoing support. The editors of Cultural Anthropology went to their community hat-in-hand and did get some money from donations, but have been unable to obtain the promise of ongoing funding to cover their costs. This “NPR approach” only works if you're NPR and have the organizational mechanisms in place to fundraise — and even then engaging the community in ways that keep the money flowing can be a major challenge. Most societies have not made OA fundraising a core part of their member outreach. (I don't want to say none have done so, but to be honest I am not aware of any.)

The example of *Glossa* also shows a potential pitfall when it comes to community organizing on behalf of OA. Within the linguistics community there has been considerable support for the Lingua board's resignation and for their setting up *Glossa*. But when some members of the community suggested all linguists should boycott Lingua and instead support *Glossa* with effort (submitting only there, reviewing only there) and with money (urging libraries to transfer subscription money from Lingua to instead support *Glossa*), there was considerable blowback from some others within the community. OA is fine, they said, but don't tell us where to publish and don't put *Lingua* in jeopardy.

All to say — grassroots efforts are fine, but they are not really sustainable without ongoing advocacy within a society or discipline, by leveraging the infrastructure and organizational mechanisms already in place.

### Iryna Kuchma

This scenario works in developing and transition countries, and I endorse it.

### Alice Meadows

Although the idea of the community “taking back” a journal from a publisher whose approach they dislike may be appealing at one level, there's pretty much no evidence that it works in

practice. It's nearly always simply too hard - and expensive - to launch a new, similarly high-quality journal from scratch. The report's lengthy list of threats in this scenario is a good indication of why this is rarely, if ever, going to be a good approach. However, I can envisage scenarios where support from the community for flipping a journal, combined with support from the society/publisher could work well. I assume the authors couldn't find any examples of this though?

A better approach therefore might be to encourage a true community collaboration between authors, society members, editorial boards, publishers, and universities/research institutions to identify possible journals for flipping and to collectively agree how and when to do so in a way that ensures the sustainability of the journal(s) in the long term. (See 7.4.1)

#### **Lisa Norberg**

Like government and foundation incentives, "grassroots" pressure to flip a journal can initiate an important dialogue among scholars, but as the authors point out there are risks and potential unintended consequences that come with this approach. One of my principal concerns with this scenario is the potential for an unnecessary proliferation of journals. As the *Lingua/Glossa* example illustrates, a scholarly society may feel it has no choice but to start a new OA journal rather than working with the publisher to change their business model. It is difficult to know if the initial enthusiasm can sustain the new journal long enough for the editors to reclaim the prestige of the former journal.

#### **Bonnie Tijerina**

While the threats listed are real, buy-in by stakeholders is so critical for the success of an OA journal. If stakeholders have a realistic understanding of what will be involved in moving to OA and are in agreement of expectations, I would strongly encourage this route.

#### **Jan Velterop**

The important remark here is "if the constituency strongly supports the transition." Unfortunately, there is little evidence—at least to my knowledge—that this is the case on a large enough scale in most discipline areas. For many, the most important incentive to publish is to do with career advancement rather than sharing results as widely as possible. Submission choices that increase the chances to obtain a prestigious "badge" (or "ribbon", as I have often called it) prevail over choices that increase dissemination, sharing and potential for re-use. This matters less if the authors post an open "preprint" version on an appropriate platform at the same time they submit their manuscript to a journal, as there is emerging evidence that the difference between preprints and the final officially published version is most often merely cosmetic and rarely substantial. In my view, this leads to a train of thought that points in the direction of funder policies that make the provision of an open preprint at the same time as submitting to a journal compulsory, particularly if the journal in question is not a full-OA one. The upside is twofold: speedier availability, and guaranteed openness, of research results. The downside of this is also twofold: openness, but no prepublication peer review (PrePPR) of the available preprints, and obviously no incentive for publishers to "flip" their journals to full-OA. As for the lack of PrePPR, that might actually remove the illusory sense of validity of peer reviewed literature and promote—even restore—the professional skepticism that science needs. The lack of incentive for publishers to change to OA does of course make systemic cost

reduction more difficult (and it may even discourage the “gold” route to OA, even for authors). But it may be the easiest and fastest way to ensure openness of research results, as both publishing models and the academic need to obtain “ribbons” don’t need to change. If Open Access is primarily about universally sharing research results, this approach should be considered; if it is primarily about cost reduction, it is not suitable for that.

However, openness is guaranteed, and those who feel the need for approbation, badges, ribbons, would just have to pay for them.

It has a fair amount in common with the “green” route to OA, with the for publishers crucial difference that it doesn’t concern the final “official” publication (which is their main motivation for imposing embargoes on “green” articles). Because of this difference, it has a much greater chance of success than “green” has had until now, in my view.

## 6.2 Other Funding (than APCs)

### Cara Kaufman

APCs—not by journal conversion—but by launching new journals has been the way the societies we work with have much more readily embraced OA.

Other conversion facilitators / hypotheses:

Hastening and increasingly deep declines in subscription (and advertising revenues esp after switch to online only) making OA with APCs more appealing.

More members getting content through other channels (institutional networks and even what’s readily available via Google search), and physical journal no longer being in their hands once online only, will likely mean that the value of the journal as a member benefit will start to fall in the estimation of members. Societies will respond over time by reallocating dues from journals to other programs—we are already seeing societies concentrating more than ever on building more sustainable (they hope) new non-journal information resources.

### Iryna Kuchma

Non-APC scenarios work in developing and transition countries, and I endorse them.

### 6.2.1 National Journal Subsidies

#### Description

This section discusses journal subsidies provided by a national program established to enable or force journals to transition to OA.

**Relevant publisher types:** Society, university department, research group; available in countries with public funding for subsidizing scholarly publishing and associations

**Relevant pre-requisites:** Small society, university and/or scholar lead journals needing support

**Most relevant disciplines:** Social sciences and humanities

**Relevant goals for flipping:** Increasing access, readership, and citations; securing the sustainability of small journals struggling for survival

**Strengths:** Journal subsidies reduces the financial risks of transitioning a subscription journal to OA and avoids the problems and limitations associated with APCs or other sources of funding.

**Weaknesses:** There is a risk that subsidies will not remain available over the long term.

**Opportunities:** Journal subsidies may offer a way to continue publication of journals having difficulty retaining subscribers and adequate income from subscriptions. It can provide the funding necessary to implement a transition to obtain the benefits of publishing OA.

**Threats:** Journal subsidies have a high dependence on external funding schemes, which might change or even be cancelled in the future.

#### Jean-Claude Guédon

In the relevant publisher types, significant national (i.e. publicly owned) publishers should be added. They are not limited to SSH journals. In Canada, for example, the National Research Council Research Press publishes 20 scientific (as distinguished from SSH journals) journals. (See a [quick history](#) of this public, scientific press.) It is now part of a nonprofit entity called Canadian Science Publishing. (More below.) CNRS also publishes journals in a wide variety of fields, including mathematics and biology (including publications for the general public). Such examples can probably be extended to quite a few countries, particularly in Europe. In any case, the idea that such journals are small, struggling for survival, etc. is somewhat misleading. In the case of Latin America, national and even international funding support large international platforms such as SciELO, Redalyc and Latindex. In the case of SciELO, the majority of its thousand-plus titles are in the bio-medical sciences.

“Canadian Science Publishing, a not-for-profit company, took over NRC Research Press journals in September 2010 after a federal government review decided scientific publishing should not be a government function. However, it maintained free online access to new articles [until December](#).” Ironically, this organization offered gratis access to its publications to Canadians (exclusively) between 2002 and 2011. The governmental decision came under the former Conservative government. It may well be reviewed again under the present Liberal government.

With regard to the weaknesses associated with this scenario, I do not understand why “...there is a risk that long-term financing will decrease because these journals do not charge APCs”. Subsidies are a matter of policy, and they do not affect journals only; they affect the whole of scientific research. Applying the same reasoning to scientific research as a whole leads to a conclusion that four centuries of history (at least) refute. Moreover, subsidies may also come from a variety of public and charitable sources, thus mitigating the risk of not receiving a grant one year for one reason or another. In Canada, where subsidies are allocated on the basis of competitive applications, it sometimes happens that a journal must go without a specific kind of grant for two or three years. However, the presence of other grants allows the publication to continue. In fact, “other sources of subsidies” are considered in this section, but the fact that they constitute a more robust form of support is not considered.

Grants become even more robust if they are organized on an international basis: When journals form national (or even international) consortia and are published on a common, but distributed, platform, local political headwinds can be compensated internationally. Here again, the examples of SciELO and Redalyc in Latin America should be studied.

In the *Opportunities* section, subsidies appear to be limited to implementing a transition, but a transition to what kind of OA. I may be wrong, but, while reading this section, I had the impression that all these “small” SSH journals should be herded into an APC model. For one thing, these journals are not just SSH; neither are they necessarily “small”, and, as I shall try to show later, the APC model is fraught with big problems that, to my mind, makes this solution less appealing than subsidies.

#### **Alice Meadows**

Relying on government funding is always risky – it’s prone to reprioritization based on who’s in power, the economic situation, and other factors. So, while the report’s authors comment that it’s “disturbing” that the Finnish government requires 50% of funding for journal subsidies to come from other quarters, I think it’s a smart move on their part! It means that the journals - and their communities - have to be serious about the investment in change, and that there are fallback funds if government funding runs out for any reason.

#### **Caroline Sutton**

Under *Weaknesses*. I would agree that many of these titles (in my experience) are in social science and humanities fields. I would also agree that a weakness or threat is that this type of funding could come to an end for a variety of reasons. As such, it is important for publishers to be looking ahead to alternative funding models. Our approach at Co-Action Publishing has been to collect a fee where an author has funding that would cover it. In one sense this is not fair. However, it does let us work towards identifying a means of longer term sustainability. Also to bear in mind when planning is that if funding does not continue, these journals will likely need to have a higher level of waivers than say a medical title because a larger proportion of authors are outside of research institutes or without current grants.

### **Background**

In many countries, there are government funding programs for scholarly journals, especially those in the social sciences and humanities. These programs support journals publishing content relevant to the country, often in the national language. These journals are deemed important and these programs provide much-needed support to many journals that try to survive on very small budgets. Such subsidies are often more or less constant, although journals must reapply regularly. Traditionally, subsidies have been provided as percentage shares of a declared monetary budget. Unfortunately, this favors journals using the subscription model or APC model over OA journals with no APCs.

Finland is a good example of a journal-subsidizing country. Scientific societies can apply for grants, which typically award 5,000 to 10,000 USD per year. The downside is the requirement



that at least 50 percent of the funding come from sources other than the grant, which in most cases would have to come from subscriptions since “in kind” support does not count towards the 50 percent. Hence, OA journals without APCs have usually not been able to apply for this funding.

#### **Pippa Smart**

There are also problems with selection of journal recipients of national funding. For example much Chinese funding goes to already-successful journals, and does not support newer (often OA) titles See Lin 2016 *Learned Publishing*.

There are also some government funding support systems that help journals indirectly. For example SciELO in Brazil is financially supported by the government – and I understand that there are funds for the journals to provide the required XML files, however similar support is not provided by some other participating countries, for example Argentina. (Abel Packer at SciELO would be able to provide more information about this - it may have changed since I last looked into their models in depth.)

### **Examples**

#### [Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council](#) (Canada)

In Canada, the dilemma of favoring subscription journals has been recognized for some time. Changes have been made in their funding rules so that the grant program is more neutral toward the journal’s business model. The grants can be awarded to a maximum of 30,000 CAD per year and are calculated based on 850 CAD per peer-reviewed article (SSHRC 2014). Extra support can be given for distribution costs as well as for the costs of transitioning to an electronic format. The nice thing about this scheme is that the support goes toward the first copy costs—that is, the costs of managing the peer review process, copy editing, and so on—but does not to support distribution costs to subscribers.

#### [Austrian Science Fund](#) (FWF)

Another type of support comes in the form of direct, one-time grants supporting the creation of OA journals or the conversion of toll-access journals to OA. In 2013, after a competitive application process, the FWF provided grants for initial funding over a period of three years to eight journals in the social sciences and humanities. Four out of five conversion applications were successful compared to only four out of 14 for new journals. The major reason for this success was quality, both in the sense of having an existing successful journal and the ability to foresee the costs. Overall, the average estimated production cost per article was 1,100 EUR. For the journals that converted, the average estimated cost was 1,000 EUR.

The grant maximums were 50,000 or 100,000 EUR, depending on how innovative the plans were. The median number of articles these journals publish is around 20 per year, and it is estimated that they will be able to fund their operations at an average cost of 1,100 EUR per

article. None of the journals plan to use APCs in the long run and instead have plans for support in kind or via a society.

One example of a journal that received an FWF grant is [Austrian Journal of Political Science](#), which is in its 43rd year of publication and is published by a national society. The journal is now OA and is published using OJS as a publishing platform. Its website seems to be provided by the University of Vienna. [Transversal](#), journal for Jewish studies, is in its 13th year of publication. It was previously published by the University of Graz, but has now been taken over by de Gruyter. It still sells print subscriptions.

#### **Jean-Claude Guédon**

The figures provided for the FWF are somewhat surprising. 50,000 Euros (and, a fortiori, 100,000 Euros) is very large for journals producing around 20 articles/yr, and it does not agree with a production cost of about 1,000 to 1,100 Euros/article.

#### [Journal Transition Programme \(Science Europe\)](#)

Three years ago, a European task force initiated discussions about supporting the conversion to OA of approximately 60 high-quality journals with a distinct European flavor. The goal was to start a snowball effect resulting in more journals flipping. The proposal was made by the Open Access Working Group (OAWG) of Science Europe. The top journals of each discipline would have been selected, according to Scopus and Journal Citation Reports. The plan was ambitious and would have required 30 million EUR of funding, which amounts to half a million per journal. The discussions did not lead anywhere (Reckling 2015).

#### [Norwegian Ministry of Education](#)

Norway offers an extremely interesting case of public funding used as means of both encouraging and enabling national subscription journals to convert to OA. In Norway, there are around 40 such journals, mostly of which are published in Norwegian. While some are subscription journals, from now on, receiving funds will require that the journal becomes fully OA after a transition period which was previously not the case. This alone will force many of the journals to flip. Another recent feature of the Norwegian system is new national funding scheme for APCs. Fifty percent of the APC of full OA journals will be reimbursed from central national funds to the universities, provided that they set up university specific APC funds, which usually will cover the remaining costs. One nice aspect of this schema is that it, to some extent, makes universities and authors price-sensitive. Another aspect is that the workload of paying APCs becomes more streamlined, reducing the costs per payment. This APC funding is quite general, covering all full OA journals, but an interesting aspect is that the Norwegian journals that flip will be able to charge APCs in addition to the journal-specific subsidies mentioned above. Thus, from a financial viewpoint, flipping the journals to APC-funding should not be an insurmountable problem. Instead, according to Jan-Erik Frantsvåg, the major problem, currently, is that authors who publish in these journals simply are not used to the idea of paying for the publishing services.

**Ivy Anderson**

Were these journals dependent on and accustomed to receiving financial support at the national level as subscription journals? It sounds as if that is the case, but it isn't clearly stated. If the journals are already dependent on this support, then the new requirement becomes an irresistible conversion mandate. That would seem to be a key discriminator compared with the Science Europe proposal, which had a carrot but not a stick.

The impact of these programs in Norway will be interesting to follow over the next few years. We will be able to assess whether manuscript flows are affected, how the economy of the journals develops, what level of APCs are charged, and how many journals flip to OA.

**Other Sources of Subsidies**

While national programs form the major source of subsidies for funding OA journals, there are many other organizations that subsidize journals and could be a potential source of funding for flipping existing subscription journals. These include, for example; government agencies, such as the Centers for Disease Control's [Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report \(MMWR\)](#); research institutes, such as Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution's [Oceanus](#); universities, such as [The Journal of Sports Science and Medicine \(JSSM\)](#), published by the Department of Sports Medicine medical faculty of Uludag University; and hospitals, such as the Institute of Geriatric Cardiology, Chinese PLA General Hospital, which publishes the [Journal of Geriatric Cardiology](#).

**Pippa Smart**

Other funding models. Cross-subsidy happens in several journals: for example [Medwave](#) (Chile) is supported by income from CME training provided by the publisher. [ecancermedicalscience](#) journal is supported through other activities of its parent organisation (see the [Learned Publishing article](#)). Then there are advertising revenues - usually for advertising in the print version - that support the online (only common in some disciplines). For example [BMJ](#) and the [South African Medical journal](#).

**Summary**

The use of public subsidies to enable or even force journals to convert to OA is a very strong mechanism, but is only available in the limited number of countries that have this sort of infrastructure. In many cases, these funds are used to support journals that promote the national language or culture. The United States and United Kingdom have taken different paths. The US government has largely supported green OA and the United Kingdom has largely supported APC-funded OA, with neither country having a program to support journals directly.

**Raym Crow**

As national subsidy models typically circumvent market feedback, it should be noted that such models need some mechanism to assess demand and value.

Subscriptions aren't the only proxy for value, but in their absence, another device is needed. Otherwise, resources may be expended disproportionately on low quality or irrelevant content.

#### **Martin Eve**

This type of funding is extremely helpful but is probably not suited for a long-term transition strategy. Funding infrastructure (journals) off yearly grants does not give a huge degree of stability to publishers who want to be able to pay their bills. That said, OLH has benefited from this type of funding and as we grow it is incredibly useful.

#### **Eve Gray**

Another manifestation of government intervention in scholarly publication in the South African context is a subsidy system for scholarly publication operated by the Department of Higher Education and Training. There is an oddity in the way that this subsidy operates: It is a subsidy to the university concerned for every peer reviewed journal article and scholarly chapter or book published by its faculty members in accredited publishers. This acts as a considerable incentive to publication, although there is no obligation by the university concerned to spend the money on publishing activities. Nor does it support OA over subscription publishing, What it does do is incentivize the maintenance of high standards in local journals, which are accredited by government and provide a source of funding, should the university concerned so wish, to pay author processing charges for publication in local or international journals.

Very large sums of money are involved - apparently the biggest unsecured source of funding in the university research system, that institutions can spend as they like. Thus this subsidy works more as a "publish-or-perish" incentive exerted through the universities, than an incentive for open access. Nevertheless, in conjunction with government support for the SciELO SA publishing platform, and given the availability of funds in the universities that could support APCs, it does potentially offer some support for OA and it certainly does push for increased volumes of publication.

#### **Jean-Claude Guédon**

The summary is correct. In fact, it seems to me that journals that accept any kind of subsidy from any public or charitable source are most amenable to flipping. Moreover, government ministries or agencies tend to care more about flipping journals than flipping articles. Charities, if we allow ourselves to be guided by recent history, can go either way.

#### **Rebecca Kennison**

The problem with most of these subsidies is that they do not provide ongoing support and that they only work for very small numbers of articles. The Journal Transition Programme was properly audacious in scale and in price point — any high-end journal that is making money for its publishing operation undoubtedly needs at least €500,000 in seed funding to even begin to mitigate the risk of flipping, and it's probably much higher, depending on the journals — but even that would have only covered one year of funding. What makes journals much more complicated than books or platforms in making them OA is the ongoing sustainability. Once a journal has gone fully OA, it cannot easily go back to becoming a subscription journal. None of these national subsidies provide ongoing support, even for high-end journals of national importance. Recasting this sort of approach to provide for ongoing funding of journals within

this category — however the selection might be made — would seem the only way this approach could succeed, and even then it would undoubtedly be at very small scale (<50 journals, as the JTP proposed).

**Iryna Kuchma**

This scenario works in developing and transition countries, and I endorse it.

**Lisa Norberg**

Like government incentives, these subsidies could provide critical seed funding for flipping journals OA, but it is difficult to say just how reliable or sustainable a source of income they are. As the examples given illustrate public subsidies typically and understandably go toward publications that serve a specific national interest. This may serve small niche publications or major scientific publications depending on the national priorities at any given point in time, but I don't believe this approach scales. I would much rather see governments provide subsidies for the international infrastructure needed to support evolving modes of research and scholarship dissemination and preservation. Ultimately, ongoing support for infrastructure should be in the hands of the scholarly community, but a national subsidy would go a long way in helping to make that happen.

**MacKenzie Smith**

The notion of national journal subsidies in the U.S., as opposed to funding agencies allowing publication expenses such as APCs to be charged to research grants, is far-fetched. Centralized infrastructure such as PubMed Central (National Library of Medicine) is tolerated, but legislation such as the Public-Private Fair Competition Act prevents government agencies from interfering with commercial enterprises. U.S.-based private foundations, such as the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation or the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation, are another matter, and could create such a subsidy or underwrite new publishing ventures.

**Caroline Sutton**

Co-Action has been able to work with transitioning or launching several titles thanks to support from research councils in the Scandinavian countries. When the Norwegian Research Council changed its rules for providing publishing support to national journals, we received a large number of inquiries.

**Alma Swan**

I believe that subsidy by universities is a fairly common model in Eastern European countries and that thinking there is now developing along the lines of insisting that subsidised journals *must* flip to OA. I'm afraid I don't have data on this but I have had reports that this is the way thinking is going.

## 6.2.2 Time-limited Funding for the Conversion

### Description

Flipping from subscription to OA is done through the use of “bridge funding,” which is, in other words, funding to be used specifically for supporting the extra costs and potential temporary loss of funding during the transition period. In some countries, this type of funding can be included in a national funding scheme. In other cases, the funding might come from other sources such as a university, foundation, or library. This type of funding can be beneficial because there are often significant costs involved in transitioning to OA while there is often a drop in revenue during the transition.

**Relevant publisher types:** All, but probably least relevant for commercial publishers  
**Relevant pre-requisites:** Clear project plan for flipping, including financial estimates for funding during, and after, the transition to OA  
**Most relevant disciplines:** All  
**Relevant goals for flipping:** Reduce the financial challenges of flipping; retain the academic community around the journal.

**Strengths:** The transition costs for flipping the journal to OA are covered, at least partially, by some external funding source. With proper funding, the transition may be faster and, in some cases, bridging funds may make the difference in the transition being successful.  
**Weaknesses:** The main limitation is that the access to bridge funding is not always available but additional resources are almost always necessary during the transition process.  
**Opportunities:** Bridge funding makes flipping feasible for some journals and facilitates the process in others.  
**Threats:** The bridge funding is helpful but not sufficient for the journal to be successful. There still must be a viable long-term business plan for obtaining the resources necessary to publish the journal.

### Examples

#### [Anthropology and Aging](#)

*Anthropology and Aging* first converted to an online version in 2012 with support from the University Library System and the University of Pittsburgh. *Anthropology and Aging* was able to host the journal online and eventually convert to OA. The journal runs on volunteer effort and help from the University Library System and is an example of a society journal that flipped with help from a university scholarly publishing office. It is noteworthy that it only accepts manuscripts from society members but the society only costs 28 USD to join (Danelly 2014).

[Scandinavian Journal of Trauma, Resuscitation and Emergency Medicine](#)

The process of flipping the journal through BMC appeared to be a success two years out with submissions and citations rising and the journal accepted into PubMed, Medline, Scopus, and, provisionally, the WoS. The conversion was funded by a couple of government agencies that picked up the APC costs during the first two years. In 2011 they transitioned to a regular APC model. Looking at the journal in 2015, it seems to have been a successful conversion. The journal has an influence factor of 2.03 and published 58 articles in the first 8 months of 2015 (Lossius and Søreide 2011).

### **Summary**

There are considerable one-time costs associated with transitioning a journal from subscription to OA. Depending on the eventual business model, the nature of these costs varies. Common expenses include marketing the change; informing and negotiating a smooth transition with subscribers and authors with manuscripts in process; and implementing changes in workflow, software, and procedures necessary to implement the new business model. If there is a change in publisher in conjunction with flipping, there may be substantial additional costs of transferring previously published articles and additional changes in software and workflow. A society or other organization considering flipping its journal(s) should carefully consider and budget for the one-time costs and activities.

#### **Virginia Barbour**

It is important to emphasise the financial costs associated with transitioning to OA. However, it is equally, if not more important to emphasise the need for logistical support. This logistical support such as access to a good submission system, or access to other editorial support can be what makes working with a large publisher appealing. As OLH is doing for the humanities it would seem essential to build a network who can assist with transition of journals either on a specialty or geographical basis, that does not rely on the infrastructure of one of the large publishers.

#### **Martin Eve**

This type of funding is useful but not in isolation. The challenge is to have a long-term model that can support the publishing operations in perpetuity. Also, some funders with whom I have spoken are wary of this model, saying they have been stung by funding societies through such a route, only to have them backtrack when the cash ran out.

#### **Jean-Claude Guédon**

This scenario differs from the others because it singles out the precise moment of the transition phase. As such, it can (and in fact, it should) complement other scenarios. Actually, *there should always be some bridge funding for the flipping of a journal*. Reorganizing the workflow alone would justify this temporary need for extra financial support.

**Rebecca Kennison**

This scenario calls out explicitly the problem I have with any of these grant (or grant-like) mechanisms of funding, which is that all of them (including governmental and foundation funding) are time-limited. The grant will end. What happens then? Any bridge funding must be part of a clear path to sustainability; otherwise, it will be just another bridge to nowhere.

**Iryna Kuchma**

This scenario works in developing and transition countries, and I endorse it.

**Alice Meadows**

I prefer this approach to the national journal subsidy approach - or perhaps better still, it could work as a version of that. Grants specifically to encourage and support transitioning to OA seem sensible to me, and part of the grant application requirement could be to include a viable business model with a timeframe for switching to it. I believe this model could potentially work in pretty much any discipline.

**Lisa Norberg**

I do believe that some kind of bridge or transitional funding will be needed for conversion. Regardless of where the funding comes from — governments, foundations, institutions — I believe the all of the key stakeholders — scholars, institutions, libraries, publishers, and scholarly societies — should be the ones to determine what the model on the other side of the conversion looks like.

**John Willinsky**

I think that there is great promise in some combination of this approach, time-limited funding [Section 6.2.2], with a later approach, joining a consortium [Section 8.4]. This is an area that a group of us have been recently exploring with the libraries providing a transition period of guaranteed funding during which time the libraries and journals involved in the flip work on developing a cooperative arrangement for continuing to sustain open access publishing. We think that an initial demonstration of commitment and financial stability is essential in moving these concepts forward.

More specifically, we're proposing a three-year "subscription-equivalent transition" (SET) to initiate the open access publishing cooperative. With the SET, the libraries subscribing to a set of journals form a cooperative with those journals by agreeing to pay a subscription-equivalent fee to the co-op for three years. During that time, journals and libraries will work out the principles, governance, finances, and other details of a sustainable open access publishing cooperative that offers the resources, responsiveness, and shared expertise needed to enhance scholarly publishing on an open access basis.

We are in the process of conducting a survey with libraries on this concept of a SET Co-op Scenario, which has resulted in over 250 responses to date, with preliminary results demonstrating that 84% of the librarians expressed an interest in exploring the SET concept further and 89% expressing an interest in exploring a co-op approach. The support for a cooperative involving both libraries and journals to open access was also much stronger than support for a one-sided libraries only co-op or an APCs model. We are about to launch a



publisher version of this survey, now that we have established a degree of interest among a group of libraries.

We feel that the co-op concept is a natural extension of the collaborative spirit behind libraries hosting open access journals, joining together to underwrite open access for particle physics through SCOAP3, sponsoring Open Library of the Humanities, Knowledge Unlatched and other open access initiatives, as well as developing open source for LOCKSS, DSpace, and Open Journal Systems.

In the U.S., the Library Publishing Coalition represents 115 libraries hosting 400 journals, many of them born digital and open. In Canada, 36 libraries are hosting 270 journals, a number of those Canadian scholarly society journals. Of those 270 journals hosted by Canadian libraries, 43 have flipped to open access from a subscription model, including the Canadian Journal of Sociology, which is cited in the report under 7.4.2, Switching to Different Publisher. More than switching publishers, CJS opted for a collaborative approach with libraries initiatives for hosting the journal, providing technical support, and an online journal management and publishing system. This model of cooperation between journals and libraries represents a very promising entry point for a more systematic approach to the flip.

As a further point on 8.4, while the reference to the American Anthropology Association (AAA) is warranted -- as we are initiated such discussions with the executive -- the focus needs to be on Libraria, a collective of journals and societies whose scope and purpose is laid out on its website, and that has approached the AAA in thinking about whether its collection AnthroSource could be operated within the scope of such a collective or cooperative. Relating to 7.4.1, on retaining publishers, we feel that this cooperative model can involve publishers entering as members without loss of journal ownership or publisher identity, or it can offer an alternative to associations looking for publishing partners.

### 6.2.3 Income from a Paper Version Subsidizing an OA Version

#### Description

This facilitator describes the act of continuing to sell subscriptions to a print version of the journal despite having flipped to OA.

**Relevant publisher types:** All

**Relevant pre-requisites:** Having a print version of the journal prior to the flip, preferably with a large subscriber base.

**Most relevant disciplines:** All

**Relevant goals for flipping:** Obtain the benefits of OA while continuing to receive the income necessary to publish the journal from paper subscription fees; lessen the need to rely on other funding mechanisms; expand readership.

**Strengths:** Maintaining a paper version caters to both the print-valuing audience as well as offering the benefits of OA.

**Weaknesses:** This method requires a healthy subscriber-base that is willing to pay for access to the paper version of the journal although an OA version exists. The journal remains restricted by the limitations of publishing a paper version, which include length limitations and the need to publish in issues.

**Opportunities:** There is potential for a stable income to fund publication while providing an OA version.

**Threats:** Subscribers may abandon the print version of the journal in numbers that affect the viability of maintaining a print version.

#### Jean-Claude Guédon

My impression is that this scenario would apply preferentially to SSH journals, especially when individual subscribers remain a significant source of income, and these subscribers exhibit a certain degree of paper fetishism. This is the case for a number of Érudit SSH journals in Canada. I refer to paper fetishism because, in actuality, we all have the opportunity to print a very nice, clean, copy of an article if it is available in pdf format (which, after all, is a print format, since it was derived from Postscript). Journal consortia could respond to this desire for paper by organizing a common, print-on-demand, structure and thus optimize revenues by decreasing printing costs. But we must expect that this paper fetishism will gradually fade away.

The weaknesses of this approach are very well described. The major one is indeed the format and functional limitations related to publishing electronically as if it were just an extension of print. This is exactly what Gregory Crane refers to as “digital incunabula”.

The *threat* is also perfectly real.

For these reasons, I do not believe this is “an elegant means of funding an OA journal”. At best, it could be a transitional, and somewhat paradoxical, measure.

#### Rebecca Kennison

The biggest threat of relying on paper to subsidize OA is that increasingly libraries that have to date subscribed to print could drop the subscription once they realize the content is freely available online. This scenario works right now because often libraries have not been rigorous in comparing their print subscriptions to the journal’s availability online, but should they become more vigilant — researching online access every time a print subscription is up for renewal — this approach would be less “elegant” than the authors find it now.

### Examples

#### [Journal of the Medical Library Association \(JMLA\)](#)

*JMLA* is a well-established society journal that is in its 103rd volume. In 1999, the Journal began making a digital version of its manuscripts available via PMC while continuing to publish a paper subscription version of the journal. While PMC no longer allows this practice, *JMLA* was grandfathered in and continues to use PMC as a platform for making the electronic version of the journal OA.

### [Acta Orthopaedica](#)

*Acta Orthopaedica*, founded in 1930 and flipped in 2005, is changing from pocket-sized print edition to a larger, standard print size for economic reasons. While the editor-in-chief conveys that he values the fact that the journal is free for both authors and readers online, he warns that the trend in declining subscriptions might mean that the journal has to introduce a page charge within a few years. Abandoning the paper version is also discussed, but there is still such a strong demand for it that dropping it would be a large change. The journal uses Taylor and Francis's platform (Rydholm and Svensson 2009).

### [Journal of the American Water Works Association](#)

*Journal of the American Water Works Association* began to flip in 2015 and also made its 25 years' worth of back issues OA. The association society will cover the conversion cost and is making the journal freely available. The journal appears to be self-published. A print edition is still produced and sent out to the nearly 50,000 members. The number of publications and citation rate suggest the journal continues to thrive.

#### **Jean-Claude Guédon**

The case of the Journal of the American Waterworks Association is probably not relevant to this study: as a professional journal, it does not deal with research. Its audience may be such that paper remains important if only to provide a sense of belonging to the association.

#### **Peter Potter**

AWWA tells me that this journal is indeed self-published (though its printing is farmed out).

## **Summary**

Publishing a paper subscription version and making the digital version freely available is one way to transition into OA publishing. Journals that choose this model tend to be society-based with fairly low subscription fees, which libraries appear, in many cases, to be willing to pay. *Acta Orthopaedica* currently uses Taylor and Francis, and there appears to be demand for its paper version. The *Journal of the American Water Works Association* appears to be in a somewhat different situation. The association is quite large, with 50,000 members who all, it seems, receive a paper copy of the journal, the cost of which is covered by the society.

#### **Virginia Barbour**

There are a couple of other possible scenarios here. First is the possibility of a paper short, web long version. The British Medical journal has a version of this (though they also charge APCs). For some specialities, where paper versions are valued highly this may be acceptable. An alternative is selling subscriptions to commentary and news as are seen in general medical and science journals. I'm not aware of this being done systematically

**Raym Crow**

This section might mention the use of “versioning” to maintain the value of the print edition. That is, in as much as OA specifically targets research output, that content can be made available OA while gating non-research content (editorial front matter, letters, book reviews, etc.) online and/or limiting non-research content to the print edition. (I know it’s not an ideal approach, but it would be an improvement over gating of the research output.)

**Martin Eve**

This seems less desirable/long-term sustainable to me. It relies on the rivalrous good being desired by libraries in the long term. In an era of increasing pressure on library budgets, I can imagine this framing leading to many free riders.

**Eve Gray**

There are interesting variations in motivations for African journal publishers in maintaining parallel print and open access online products when flipping journals.

In the AJOL survey 200 out of 333 respondents answered that they offered print versions for a fee; another 50 offered print for free; and only 26 did not offer print versions. 147 of the same sample offered online versions free. The arguments for offering print are, among others, that hard copies are needed where Internet access is inadequate, and to meet library preferences. Answers also indicated print availability as a matter of culture. From Nigeria, for example:

Hard copy is the model of publishing of all publications of the Nigerian [institute name]. These are printed for sale and the online versions are offered for free.

This suggests an informal approach to journal flipping - this is presumably the effect of a smaller market and more informal publishing structure, in a country with digital infrastructure problems. Most of all, however, are the needs of an environment where internet access can be uneven and inadequate.

More formally, Feminist Africa (<http://agi.ac.za/journals>), published out of the African Gender Institute in Cape Town, publishes a high quality journal in print sold through bookshops and provided on subscription. Copyright is vested in the authors, but an overarching copyright in the published version resides with the journal. An equally high quality digital version is available on the website, or in PDF to download. The copyright notice requires that permission is required for reproduction and that this will only be granted after a one-year embargo. The extent to which this copyright notice would be noticed or observed in the face of a freely accessible digital version is an interesting question ([http://agi.ac.za/sites/agi.ac.za/files/0\\_fa20\\_prelims.pdf](http://agi.ac.za/sites/agi.ac.za/files/0_fa20_prelims.pdf))

In these examples, and in a number of others, print appears to be retained less as a source of income (if fact some respondents saw it as a necessary expense) as the response to a market need.

**Jean-Claude Guédon**

A version of this model is quite common in Latin America, where the electronic version of a journal is often freely distributed via national or international portal, such as SciELO. The other journal production costs are commonly paid by universities and societies.

**Cara Kaufman**

Paper funding OA conversion would seem to us to be a very short-sighted strategy at least in STM where the trend is definitely toward online only.

**Rebecca Kennison**

One possible approach that could be seen as a twist on this scenario is that employed by the Modern Language Association when they made their journal *Professions* OA. *Professions* was always bundled into the price of PMLA, so what MLA did was make *Professions* online only and open to everyone, while not reducing the price of the PMLA/*Professions* bundle. Institutions still subscribe to PMLA, and members get that journal as a member benefit, but *Professions* is now made available to everyone for free.

**Iryna Kuchma**

This scenario works in developing and transition countries, and I endorse it.

**Alice Meadows**

This is a good short to medium term option in some disciplines (eg, clinical medicine, humanities), but it's hard to imagine that most/all journals won't go fully online in the not-too-distant future. So any organization that continues to depend on print subscriptions for income to support (free to publish) OA would need to consider introducing APCs or finding some other form of revenue generation as part of their transition plan.

**Lisa Norberg**

There is nothing inherently wrong with using the income from print journal subscriptions to subsidize an OA version, however there are costs involved in maintaining the capacity to produce a print version so as the authors point out, a substantial print subscription base is required to make this a reliable source of income. Unfortunately, that base — traditionally made up of academic and research libraries — continues to shrink. Demands for space and the costs associated with offsite storage make it difficult for all but the largest research libraries to justify maintaining significant print journal collections, onsite or offsite. Nevertheless, greater visibility online coupled with effective promotion could stimulate interest in new markets. Rather than giving the print version away as a perk of membership, large societies could charge members who prefer to receive a print copy, but this approach would have to be measured against a potential member backlash.

**Mackenzie Smith**

As a librarian, it seems unlikely that OA journals could be funded by subscriptions to print version (presumably by libraries). Library infrastructure to support print journals is rapidly being replaced with different infrastructure for e-journals, and it would not be sensible or sustainable to maintain both indefinitely. Only print journals with large non-library subscriber bases might rely on this model for OA conversion.

**Caroline Sutton**

There are also examples where this model has failed or not achieved the financial goals that were set. An example from Co-Action Publishing was Research in Learning Technology. The paper edition continued for a few years after the transition to OA (managed by the society). However, there were few subscribers and the society eventually decided to drop the print edition. It did not cost them very much, but neither did they make any money from it.

It is possible that this was a transition scenario that made sense and was possible in the early years of open access, but now that most journals are electronic anyway, selling a paper edition is probably a harder sell.

**Alma Swan**

I believe that subsidy by universities is a fairly common model in Eastern European countries and that thinking there is now developing along the lines of insisting that subsidised journals *must* flip to OA. I'm afraid I don't have data on this but I have had reports that this is the way thinking is going.

**Bonnie Tijerina**

There is good success in finding a business model that supports an OA journal with income from another means, whether that is a print subscription or income from a conference. From a business perspective, I like this model of diversifying sources of income.

## 7 APC-FUNDED SCENARIOS

### Björn Brembs

I would like to point the authors to an APC-based gold OA scenario that, as I see it, ought to be avoided at all costs, as it would lead to a situation that I would consider even worse than the status quo. I have summarized the arguments in an April 2016 [blog post](#).

### Lisa Norberg

I am not a fan of gold OA or APC-funded scenarios, regardless of the flavor (I should also note that neither am I a fan of green OA). While I agree with many of the points Martin Eve has articulated on the subject — foremost among those being that a significant amount of the research and scholarship conducted in the arts, humanities, and social sciences is done without the benefit of either internal (i.e. institutional) or external (i.e. governmental or foundation) funding — my concern focuses on the simple logistics of implementing an APC model at scale. For studies with multiple authors, who pays? Is the fee split? What if the authors are from different countries? If the fee is divided, who tracks those payments, especially if they involve different institutions, agencies, and countries? And in a hybrid APC model, how are those funds tracked to ensure that each of the libraries receives the appropriate discount on their subscription charges from the publishers involved (i.e. double-dipping)? The mechanisms and workflows needed to process and track APCs is complicated and costly.

Moreover, it is not hard to imagine that this cost-per-item approach will quickly become financially unsustainable as publishers increase charges to support expanding elements of the scholarly record (e.g. article associated datasets, video, audio, visualizations, etc.), not to mention demands from stockholders of for-profit publishers to increase profits. I am also not convinced that taking the “purchasing power” out of the library and putting it in the hands of author(s) will increase competition and lead to lower prices. It is in the author(s)’ economic interest (for tenure and promotion) to continue to publish in high impact and high prestige journals regardless of cost. While funders and/or educational institutions could cap the amount they are willing to pay for APCs, this simply forces authors to find ways to cover the difference or further exacerbates the potential for academic “haves and have-nots.” Regardless, I recognize that for those STEM fields that receive significant or at least sufficient grant funding an APC-funded scenario is the most likely path to open access so my comments in Section 7 reflect that perspective.

### Pippa Smart

One other general comment is that the APC model has three main disadvantages.

1. First that it changes the balance of payments, making a relatively small number of individuals/organisations fund a journal that was previously funded by a much larger pool of readers/institutions.
2. Second that it changes the balance of payments, penalising research-intensive countries and institutions
3. Third that it penalises the poorer nations (“in the subscription environment only the rich can access research, but in the APC environment only the rich can publish their research

findings” a paraphrased comment from a Kenyan researcher during one of my workshops).

### Mike Taylor

I can't really see the right place to make these points, so I will leave them here. What would the world look like if, [as proposed by the Max Planck Institute](#), the scholarly world flipped from being dominated by subscriptions to [Gold open access](#)? I think there are three things to say.

*First, incentives.* A concern is sometimes expressed that when publishers are paid per paper published, they will have an incentive to want more papers to be published. Would this exacerbate the existing publish-or-perish culture where we are flooded by quantity of publications, sometimes at the expense of quality?

It's certainly true that in a Gold OA world, the publishers would like to see more papers (and monographs) published. But whether we the academic community respond to that desire by publishing more is not a decision that the publishers get to make. This — like so many issues — comes back to the problem of [what incentives apply in academia](#). While scholars gain rewards like promotion and tenure by publishing many papers (for example because committees evaluate people based on their H-index), it is inevitable that those scholars will seek to publish many papers — and this would be true whether in a subscription-based or Gold OA-based system. Thus I think the problem of publishing quantity rather than quality is quite independent from the problem of how we pay for publications.

*Second, costs.* I sometimes hear a concern is that a flip to Gold OA would create an environment where funds are tied up, and resources are not sufficient to fund new and innovative journals. I'm sure these numbers are not new to regular readers, but it seems pretty clear that a flipped world would have much *lower* total costs than the present system. Here are the numbers: [The STM Report for 2015](#), page 6, reports total publisher income in the STM field as \$10 billion for 2013, and says that about 2.5 million papers were published that year. That gives an average income per paper of \$4000. (We can probably assume a broadly similar figure for non-STM papers, too.) By contrast, [the Wellcome Trust's recent report on its APC spending](#) in 2013-14 shows an average APC of £1837, currently about \$2634. This is slightly less than 2/3 what the world at large is paying per paper.

In other words, *even using the relatively high APCs paid by the Wellcome Trust*, the world's 2.5 million papers per year could be published for \$6.6 billion — saving \$3.4 billion to spent elsewhere.

*Third, markets.* This one is a question, and I think it's crucial for the prospects of a Gold-OA ecosystem: will we get [an efficient market](#) in APCs? If we do, then prices will be forced down until they are very close to costs — which publishers like Hindawi, Ubiquity Press and PeerJ have shown can be in the \$400-500 range, almost literally an order of magnitude less than the world presently pays for publication. But if no true market emerges, prices will not fall — indeed publishers may have the leverage to raise APCs at rates greater than inflation, as they have been doing for subscriptions.



That is why I believe that, *however tempting “APC Big Deals” are to individual libraries or consortia, they should be strenuously resisted.* As with subscription Big Deals, the short-term savings (while real) would be absolutely dwarfed by the long-term losses.

If I’m right about this, then we face a tragedy of the commons during this phase of transition from subscriptions to Gold OA: it will be in the short-term interests of each library to accept a Big Deal on APCs; but again the interests of the community. We will need to communicate well, and function as a global community, to avoid falling into this trap.

## 7.1 Submission Fees in Addition to or Instead of APCs

### Description

Submission fees, which require author-side payment for all manuscripts submitted to the journal, can be used by journals either alone or in conjunction with APC payment for manuscripts accepted for publication. Most journals that charge article processing fees only charge for manuscripts that are accepted for publication. A small number of journals charge submission fees of all authors to cover the costs of peer review. Payments are usually non-refundable. Submission fees typically range from 50 USD to 200 USD (although, some extreme cases have fees in the 400 to 500 USD range) (Ware 2010). Similar to providing subsidies for APCs, societies and associations might also provide members with a discount or waive the submission fee.

There are a few journals that charge submission fees but not article processing fees.

**Relevant publisher types:** All, but most relevant for publishers that charge APCs because they have the mechanisms to collect author-side fees in place. Also avoids shifting peer-reviewing costs from authors that are rejected to authors that are accepted.

**Relevant pre-requisites:** Having a challenge in finding time and resources to deal with large volumes of non-serious submissions; a level of submissions high enough to protect against the risk that a submission fee would deter submissions; potentially, a desire to reduce the size of the APC.

**Most relevant disciplines:** All, but most relevant for highly selective journals

**Relevant goals for flipping:** Adopting a model supported by author-side fees

**Strengths:** Even a low submission fee can be a potential deterrent for non-serious submissions, which take a lot of time to process.

**Weaknesses:** Transaction costs for publishers who charge article processing charges are quite high. Because submission fees are relatively modest and transaction fees are generally fixed, the net income from submission fees is very low and quite likely not worth implementing (Sutton 2015). Further, even a small submission fee may discourage authors with high quality manuscripts from submitting to a journal.

**Opportunities:** Submission fees can act as a complement to APC funding that scales well in relation to the number of submissions.

**Threats:** The submission fee may cause the loss of high-quality manuscripts. Overhead is likely to be high for relatively low fees.

**Virginia Barbour**

The very high risk with submission fees is the likelihood of specifically discriminating against authors from low and middle income countries - \$25 or so may be trivial in the US but is not in sub-Saharan Africa. It is also administratively complex.

**Jean-Claude Guédon**

The purpose of these fees is to control the number of submissions rather than generate real revenue. Bringing transaction costs into the picture is not central to the issue.

On the other hand, losing good authors because of submission fees is a real possibility and, therefore, constitutes a real weakness. The threat repeats this argument.

**Caroline Sutton**

A relevant pre-requisite to add would be the necessity of having a system that can manage – micro-micro payments (though covered in a way in weaknesses), but also the labor costs associated with this. It might be a system that could be used on either very small or very large titles or very small or very large publishers. For publishers in the middle, it would be rather costly to operate two types of systems (APCs and submission fees).

**Bonnie Tijerina**

I would discourage this scenario. I agree with the weaknesses and threats here.

## **Examples**

### [Cultural Anthropology](#)

Members of the American Anthropology Association (AAA) can submit manuscripts to *Cultural Anthropology* without a submission fee. Others are asked to pay 21 USD, a fee implemented mostly to decrease the number of low-quality or non-serious submissions, which take a lot of time to process. *Cultural Anthropology* has no APC (Elfenbein 2014). *Cultural Anthropology* is the first of the AAA's more than 20 journals to flip to OA.

### [Journal of Medical Internet Research \(JMIR\)](#)

*JMIR* is an OA journal that was launched in 1999 as OA and was one of the founding members of the Open Access Publishers Association (OASPA). *JMIR* began charging a submission fee of 90 USD in 2006. The current APC is 2,500 USD. The journal is quite successful; it publishes a large volume of articles and has a very high citation rate.

## **Summary**

Submission fees are not a widely used means of funding journals. They are most appropriate for journals with high rejection rates, where the costs associated with reviewing manuscripts that are eventually rejected is quite high. For such journals, particularly when they use an APC funding model, submission fees can more equitably distribute the cost of operating the journals among those authors whose manuscripts are accepted and those whose manuscripts are not (Ware 2010). Given that these fees can discourage submissions and are fairly low while the transaction costs for collecting these fees are often quite high<sup>4</sup>, they are of questionable value in funding journals transitioning from subscription to OA.

### **Martin Eve**

This seems extremely undesirable. Academics will fear for “academic freedom” if there is an up-front charge, and the system will be distrusted as a pay-to-say mechanism.

### **Jean-Claude Guédon**

The *summary* is right in questioning the value of submission fees.

### **Cara Kaufman**

So far, the societies with which we’ve worked often have considered submission fees but generally decided against them as they wish to encourage submissions. I can see this changing over time as the new OA journals become more established as I completely agree that this is a good way to have revenues keep pace with submissions, and to reduce inappropriate submissions.

### **Rebecca Kennison**

Of course everyone wants to cover the costs of high rejections that don’t convert to APCs, but the authors identify clearly all the pitfalls of that approach unless the journal is considered the top in its field and has the mechanisms in place to process the submission fee with minimal effort.

### **Iryna Kuchma**

I’d like to discourage this confusing scenario.

### **Alice Meadows**

I can’t help thinking that from an author’s perspective being charged a submission fee and an APC is a pretty tough sell - unless journals deduct the submission fee from the APC when an article is published, but I don’t believe that’s typically the case. In addition, most disciplines don’t have a history of charging submission fees, so would find it hard to start doing so. I can see that for journals with a high rejection rate it might be an appealing idea but, given that APCs can

4 If authors are required to pay a credit card transaction fees can be low but when paid via a purchase order as is often done transaction fees can be high limiting their value.

already be a barrier for authors, adding another barrier isn't ideal. It seems more likely that those journals that currently charge submission fees will come under pressure to stop doing so.

### Thomas Munro

Economics journals have charged submission fees for more than 40 years (Moyer & Crockett, 1976). Their prevalence has steadily increased, so that most of the top 20 journals in that field now charge them (McCabe & Snyder, 2014). Dozens of other respected economics and finance journals also levy submission fees, outcompeting hundreds of lower-ranked journals that do not (Zheng & Kaiser, 2016).

A number of TA biomedical journals also levy submission fees. The *Journal of Neuroscience* introduced a submission fee in 2004, and has continued to grow despite several increases (currently \$140), remaining by far the largest journal in the discipline. The ASPET journals (\$75) are among the leaders in their fields (*Drug Metabolism and Disposition*, *Journal of Pharmacology and Experimental Therapeutics*, *Molecular Pharmacology*). The argument that small transactions are "quite likely not worth implementing" because of transaction costs is surreal, as if cafes, convenience stores, book stores, cinemas and countless other businesses were not successfully implementing them every day. Journals that cannot make money on small transactions need to change their business practices. The OA hosting platform Scholastica is supported entirely by a \$10 submission fee. A journal that added a low fee of their own (\$40) would receive ~\$37 of that, with no administrative work of their own (Scholastica, 2016).

Furthermore, for prestigious journals, submission fees need not be low. Some finance journals charge over \$200. The highest, the *Journal of Financial Economics*, is currently \$750, higher than many APCs; JFE nonetheless receives among the highest number of submissions in the discipline (Zheng & Kaiser, 2016). Fast-track submission fees can be even higher. The *Review of Corporate Finance Studies* charges a \$1,000 fast-track fee. Evidence for other disciplines is limited, but the *Journal of Medical Internet Research* charges a \$450 fast-track fee, with ~15% take-up (Eysenbach, 2011; JMIR, 2016). The rapid review services Axios (\$250) and Rubriq (\$650) are both also attracting submissions. The controversial fast-track experiment by *Scientific Reports* (\$750) attracted 25 submissions in one month (Jackson, 2015).

Re: "even a small submission fee may discourage authors with high quality manuscripts from submitting to a journal."

The overwhelming consensus of the economics literature, both theoretical and empirical, is that submission fees increase the quality of submissions, and thus of the journal. This is because the deterrent effect is strongest for authors with a low chance of acceptance. The higher quality of submitted articles ultimately improves the quality of the journal, leading to greater prestige and more submissions, in a virtuous circle (Chressanthis & Chressanthis, 1994; Lusk & Hudson, 2009; Rosenbluth, 1979; Zheng & Kaiser, 2016). The decades-long rise in the prevalence and size of submission fees in top economics journals supports this argument. While there is less evidence in other fields, the same is likely to be true. Thus, the TA *Journal of Bone and Joint Surgery* recently introduced a high (\$250) submission fee, which was followed by a fall in submissions (~30%). However, the proportion of submissions of the highest quality increased markedly, and the proportion of low-quality submissions fell, reducing the costs of "desk rejections" (Nelson &

Dymek, 2015). All else being equal, a submission fee can be expected to initially reduce submissions (Zheng & Kaiser, 2016). However, for a given level of author-side revenue, all else is not equal: submission fees allow cuts in publishing fees, which also deter submissions. The net effect of raising submission fees and cutting publishing fees is likely to be an increase in submissions, especially those of high quality (Lusk & Hudson, 2009).

Take the *Journal of Clinical Investigation*. One of the first journals to flip to OA (in 1996), JCI had introduced a submission fee in the mid-1970s; submissions nonetheless grew over that decade, and continue to grow (Savla, 2004; see Figs. 2 & 3). The fee is currently \$75, and the acceptance rate 8% (Rockman, 2014). The APC is \$4,500 for full articles. Thus, JCI has author-side revenues of ~\$5,400 per accepted article, higher than even the most expensive APC-only journal (*Nature Communications*, \$5,200), despite being markedly cheaper. JCI is one of the most prestigious journals in its field, with the highest citation rates of any OA journal in the Scimago Journal Rankings. Submissions now exceed 4,500 per year (Rockman, 2014). This point is illustrated even more strikingly by the *Journal of Financial Economics* (\$750, \$700 for members). Approximately 18% of submissions are desk-rejected, with all but \$100 refunded (Schwert, G. William, 2007). Approximately 8% are accepted, with a full refund of the submission fee (JFE, 2016). Thus, despite being free to accepted authors, JFE generates total author-side revenues of \$6,700-\$7,100 per accepted article, far higher revenue than even the ruinously expensive *Nature Communications*. Nonetheless, JFE continues to attract more submissions than all but a handful of economics journals. Finally, and most importantly, there is no risk in testing submission fees. As Ware suggested, journals could simply offer them as an option with a discounted APC, and observe the take-up (Ware, 2010). If authors reject the idea, nothing is lost. But the potential gain is great, as seen above. It is interesting to note that Jan Velterop, who introduced and named the APC, now favours submission fees, and says “I do hope that one of the more visionary publishers dares to make the plunge” (Velterop, 2011).

Chressanthis, G. A., & Chressanthis, J. D. (1994). The Relationship Between Manuscript Submission Fees and Journal Quality. *The Serials Librarian*, 24(1), 7186.

[http://doi.org/10.1300/J123v24n01\\_05](http://doi.org/10.1300/J123v24n01_05)

Eysenbach, G. (2011, July 12). JMIR's Fast-Track Experiment (Innovations in Scholarly Publishing: Part 1). Retrieved from <http://gunther-eyenbach.blogspot.com/2011/07/jmirs-fast-track-experiment-innovations.html>

Jackson, A. (2015, April 21). Fast-track peer review experiment: First findings. Retrieved from <http://blogs.nature.com/ofschemesandmemes/2015/04/21/fast-track-peer-review-experiment-first-findings>

JFE. (2016). Turnaround Times: Journal of Financial Economics. Retrieved April 30, 2016, from <http://jfe.rochester.edu/turn.htm>

JMIR. (2016). JMIR-Fast Track Peer Review Stats. Retrieved April 5, 2016, from <http://www.jmir.org/reviewer/fastTrackStats/>

- Lusk, J. L., & Hudson, M. D. (2009). Submission Patterns, Submission Policies, and Revealed Preferences for Agricultural Economics Journals. *Applied Economic Perspectives and Policy*, 31(4), 695711. <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9353.2009.01462.x>
- McCabe, M. J., & Snyder, C. M. (2014). The Economics of Open-Access Journals. SSRN Working Paper. <http://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.914525>
- Moyer, R. C., & Crockett, J. H. (1976). Academic Journals: Policies, Trends and Issues. *Academy of Management Journal*, 19(3), 489495. <http://doi.org/10.2307/255615>
- Nelson, C., & Dymek, C. (2015). Quantity vs. Quality: Introducing Submission Fees to Reduce Editorial Workload Without Compromising Manuscript Quality [poster]. Presented at the ISMTE 2015 North American Conference, Baltimore, MD. Retrieved from [http://c.ymcdn.com/sites/www.ismte.org/resource/resmgr/2015\\_Posters/Quantity\\_vs.\\_Quality\\_-\\_Intro.pdf](http://c.ymcdn.com/sites/www.ismte.org/resource/resmgr/2015_Posters/Quantity_vs._Quality_-_Intro.pdf)
- Rockman, H. A. (2014). Happy Birthday JCI. *Journal of Clinical Investigation*, 124(10), 41354136. <http://doi.org/10.1172/JCI78708>
- Rosenbluth, G. (1979). Publishing Economics. *Canadian Journal of Economics*, 12(4), 551574. <http://doi.org/10.2307/134865>
- Savla, U. (2004). Reflecting on 80 years of excellence. *Journal of Clinical Investigation*, 114(8), 10061016. <http://doi.org/10.1172/JCI23290>
- Scholastica. (2016). Can I charge authors an additional submission fee? Retrieved from <http://help.scholasticahq.com/customer/portal/articles/1424146>
- Schwert, G. William. (2007). Report of the Editorial Office for the Year 2007: *Journal of Financial Economics*. *Journal of Financial Economics*. Retrieved from <http://jfe.rochester.edu/jfe07.pdf>
- Velterop, J. (2011, December 13). Science Publishing: All About Submission. Retrieved from <http://theparachute.blogspot.com/2011/12/science-publishing-all-about-submission.html>
- Ware, M. (2010). Submission Fees: A Tool in the Transition to Open Access? Retrieved from <http://www.knowledge-exchange.info/Default.aspx?ID=413>
- Zheng, Y., & Kaiser, H. M. (2016). Submission Demand in Core Economics Journals: A Panel Study. *Economic Inquiry*, 54(2), 13191338. <http://doi.org/10.1111/ecin.12277>

### **Lisa Norberg**

Submission fees in lieu of or in addition to APCs strike me as a barrier that provides little value to editors for the relative high transactional cost. Paradoxically, such a fee could be seen as a mark of exclusivity making the journals that do charge submission fees suddenly more attractive to prospective authors. Still, I imagine the negatives to far outweigh the potential positives in this approach.

**Pippa Smart**

Submission fees are common in some LDCs, for example in West Africa, where they are usually in the region of \$50 and are to cover admin costs of peer review (and to reduce time wasters).

**7.2 Gradual Conversion Scenarios****Cara Kaufman**

Many publishers already balance allowing a great deal of back and current content to publish without barrier; but they are generally careful to keep enough content behind access controls to not lose their core subscribers.

**Iryna Kuchma**

I'd like to discourage these confusing scenarios.

**7.2.1 Via Hybrid OA****Description**

This scenario describes a journal using the hybrid option as a transition phase in flipping to fully OA.

**Relevant publisher types:** Commercial and societal

**Relevant pre-requisites:** High submission volume (helpful); well-established citation metrics (helpful); availability of funding for APCs; growing hybrid uptake

**Most relevant disciplines:** Scientific technical and medical (STM) journals

**Relevant goals for flipping:** Increasing access, readership and potentially citations; in some cases, increasing revenue; increasing submissions, and publications; potential for increasing profits/income; salvaging a journal where the subscription market is no longer viable. Capturing quality research from funders with OA mandates.

**Strengths:** The financial risks of transitioning a successful subscription journal to OA are reduced. OA is provided for at least a portion of the contents of the journal prior to full transition. An opportunity to evaluate author interest in APC-funded OA is created.

**Weaknesses:** "This method lengthens the time necessary to transition to OA. Provides a way for publishers to address mandates and other pressure to transition to OA while maintaining a subscription journal potentially indefinitely.

**Opportunities:** Publishers may consider transitioning journals that are operating successfully under the subscription model.

**Threats:** Unless controls are implemented, hybrid journal publication increases cost to the community due to "double dipping" during the transitional phase.

**Raym Crow**

Another *Weakness*:

Double-dipping aside, to the extent hybrid models are revenue neutral for publishers, such models will be no more scalable than subscription models as the volume of research increases. (And I'd expect commercial publishers to price APCs to *at least* match their current return.)

"Threats: Flipping the journal may fail and cripple the journal or force it to close down."

Seems this would only be a threat if the APC is underpriced and the adoption of the discretionary OA option very high. That should be controllable by rational business planning.

**Jean-Claude Guédon**

The identified *Weaknesses* are fundamental. In fact, one can go further and say that hybrid publishing, although initially imagined as a transition mechanism to OA (David Prosser, 2003) is really a very efficient way to create a static position from which publishers can claim to be moving (ever so slowly) toward OA while continuing to benefit from subscriptions, plus the revenues accruing from APCs. This is the reason why publi-oligarchs have readily adopted hybrid publishing: it allows them to speak as if they practised OA; it allows them to provide some offer in response to OA requirements from funders; meanwhile their revenues increase.

**Pippa Smart**

One additional weakness is that many hybrid journals find that only a relatively low percentage of articles pay the APC (many report a stagnation at around the 15% mark) making a flip uneconomic.

**rob tiessen**

Re *Weaknesses*: I fear that the hybrid open access journal has become a permanent scourge on our landscape. The ones that I am familiar with seem to use the hybrid status to either make additional money or as a sop to granting agencies. I don't think you should recommend this as a serious option.

**Bonnie Tijerina**

Another possible threat is that commercial publishers may not want to complete the conversion if Hybrid OA is making money. It could be hard for them to justify the revenue loss after "double dipping" for a year or two.

Hybrid OA can make it difficult for libraries to keep track of OA articles, thus possibly limiting access of these articles. As of today, libraries do not have the tracking tools that allow for finding the OA articles within a subscription journal to ensure their users, using library discovery tools, can find these free articles.

Also, libraries are not managing double dipping very well, so libraries or universities might end up paying more during the transition. This should be clearly stated if that is a possible scenario.



### **Background: (APC Model)**

Hybrid OA has, from the start, been marketed by many publishers as an “experiment.” Prosser (2003) outlined the strategy for this experiment in a seminal article. Though a number of publishers offered a hybrid option on a small scale starting around 1996, Springer was the first major publisher to offer the hybrid option on a large scale in 2004 at a uniform fee of 3,000 USD (Björk 2012). Other major publishers began adding a hybrid option on a smaller scale. Starting around 2009, the number of journals offering a hybrid option increased dramatically. Most followed Springer’s lead, pricing their hybrid APCs in the 3,000 USD range. Elsevier has been the one major exception, pricing their hybrid journals individually (Björk and Solomon 2014).

As noted by Björk (2012), the uptake of the hybrid option among authors has, in general, been quite low, at least through 2012. However, it may be increasing; a number of funders and universities implemented OA mandates coupled with funding for hybrid APCs.<sup>5</sup> In addition, a number of funders such as the FWF<sup>6</sup> and Jisc<sup>7</sup> have negotiated “total cost of publication” agreements with publishers, wherein the institution has access to the subscription content and their researchers can publish articles as OA in participating subscription journals without any additional payment. This practice has also become more established among university library subscriptions through so-called offsetting deals, which are dealt with in closer detail in section 8.2.2. This addresses the double dipping issue while encouraging uptake of the hybrid model. It is likely that the number of these programs will increase, and if authors begin using this option on a larger scale, it could potentially provide a gradual transition path for a significant number of subscription journals to full APC-funded OA. As uptake percentages grow, the financial risk of a full transition to OA diminishes, and the benefits of full OA publication, such as meeting funding mandates and financial stability in a changing funding environment, can be realized.

#### **Jean-Claude Guédon**

In the preceding paragraph, the claim is made that the number of programmes supporting the payment of APCs in hybrid journals is increasing. I am not sure this is really the case. As noted earlier, some funders are already refusing this approach. But, even if the statement were to be absolutely correct, it does not follow that this could bring about a transition to a full-OA, APC-financed solution. It is to the advantage of publishers to maintain the two solutions alive, for example by keeping some degree of opacity over which articles in a hybrid journal are OA. In some journals, I have observed that one does not know that the article is OA until one requests it specifically.

5 There is a lack of good data on hybrid uptake in recent years.

6 <https://www.fwf.ac.at/en/research-funding/open-access-policy/>

7 <https://www.jisc.ac.uk/blog/offsetting-agreements-for-open-access-publishing-13-apr-2015>

For the hybrid-to-full APC funding option to be a viable strategy, APCs must be set close to the level necessary to generate the income the journal needs to operate. For-profit publishers would also need to generate a reasonable profit. This goal should be feasible for many journals. Journals that currently have a high percentage of subscriptions from nonacademic institutions, such as some clinically oriented medical journals, might require an unrealistically high APC to generate similar income to what they currently receive from subscriptions (Sutton 2015). Although it may be possible to generate enough income to cover the cost of publication, it would be difficult to convince publishers to give up the profits these journals receive from subscriptions outside academia.

#### **Jean-Claude Guédon**

In the preceding paragraph, a reference is made to “the income the journal needs to operate”. For profit-based publishers, this includes a “reasonable profit”. What is a reasonable profit? We know that the publi-oligarchs generate profits in the 35-43% range. Is this reasonable?

If the cost of electronic publishing essentially amounts to the cost of the production of the first copy, I do not understand why journals such as clinical journals would require high APCs, unless we admit that these journals really make a lot of profit mainly because of strong professional subscriptions. Given their fundamental role in public health protocols, should clinical journals be for-profit organs?

Journals that offer some articles in an OA format do it probably conceive this move as part of publicity for the journal, and not as part of a flipping-to-OA strategy.

Transitioning to OA, particularly for highly successful subscription journals, poses risks. An editor at the [British Journal of General Practice](#), provides one example in an editorial. The following quote presents the journal’s evaluation for the maturity of going full OA, bringing in the context of the RCUK OA policy:

To enable us to examine some of the implications of open access for the BJGP [British Journal of General Practice] we have analysed the funding sources of 216 articles published in the Journal over the past 2 years. Approximately 49 percent appear to be funded by organisations that could be expected to financially support open access publication, with far more UK articles meeting this criterion than articles from outside the UK. We contacted the authors of a number of articles from European countries and it appears that the move towards open access publication is much slower outside the UK, with little evidence at present of the development of national policy on open access, although a few researchers commented that they thought that some funders (both institutional and pharmaceutical) may not be surprised to be asked to fund APCs. (Jones et al. 2013)

Monitoring the uptake of a hybrid option might provide some assurance that a transition to full OA will be financially successful, but it is unlikely to fully mitigate the financial risks. For this

reason, publishers are likely to be cautious about transitioning journals, even if they see steady increases in uptake of the hybrid option.

### **Background: (Non-APC Model)**

Although hybrid OA journals typically charge an APC to make a specific article OA in an otherwise subscription-based journal, many subscription-based journals provide OA for a portion of their content, for a variety of reasons, without charging anyone an APC. While we were unable to locate any journals that specifically used this type of hybrid access as a vehicle for transitioning to OA, it could potentially serve as a means of making this transition.

### **Examples**

#### [Nature Communications](#)

Launched in 2010, *Nature Communications* made the transition to full OA in October 2014, allowing a year-long transition period for articles submitted prior to transition to be published according to the subscription model, if authors preferred. The hybrid share of articles prior to the flip was around 30 percent. A study of the citations accumulated by non-OA and OA articles published in the journal between 2011 and 2013 revealed a clear citation advantage of around 50 percent for the OA. This is one of the reasons behind the conversion (Jump 2014). Journal site visits and monthly submissions have increased by around 25 percent since the transition. A seemingly high number of APC waivers have been offered already, [44 in total between October 2014 and April 2015](#) (Nature Communications 2015). The transition appears successful despite a relatively high APC of 5,200 USD. The journal has the third highest citation rate in multidisciplinary sciences (after *Nature* and *Science*), and both its impact factor and volume of articles (11.4 and 2,788, respectively) are comparable with the *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences (PNAS)* (11.5 and 3,579). *PNAS* provides OA, with a delay of half a year, and also has a high percentage of articles which are published immediately in paid hybrid OA.

#### **Jean-Claude Guédon**

Why mention APC-waivers in the case of *Nature Communications*? Is this conceived as a way to help flipping to OA? If so, how? The details relative to *PNAS* should be treated separately, if important.

#### [Bioscience Reports](#)

*Bioscience Reports*, published by the Biochemical Society, transitioned to full OA after having a hybrid option for two years. The journal has been published for over 30 years and appears to have many of the characteristics of a mega-journal, seeking to accept all “sound science.” The central aspect of mega-journals is peer review, which only verifies that the research methods are scientifically trustworthy but does not evaluate the perceived scientific impact or contribution (Björk 2015). *Bioscience Reports* publishes around 200 articles annually, and the APC is 1,350 USD, the same as *PLOS ONE*’s original APC and that of many other mega-journals.

The publisher practices cascading reviews, funneling manuscripts from the more prestigious *Biochemical Journal* to *Bioscience Reports*. “The editors of the *Biochemical Journal* will, with the authors’ permission, refer good-quality, sound research papers, together with the reviewers’ comments, to *Bioscience Reports*. Authors will then receive a swift decision on the basis of those reports, speeding up considerably the time to publication” (STM Publishing News 2012).

**Jean-Claude Guédon**

Can a journal, such as *Bioscience Reports*, be considered a mega-journal with a production of only 200 articles a year? I agree that the peer reviewing criteria imitate those of *PLoS ONE*, but is this enough to transform a journal into a mega-journal?

The issue of “cascading review” is intriguing, but not entirely clear: who stands behind the implicit hierarchy of publications that it entails? And if it is the publisher, why is it credible?

[Internet Archaeology](#)

*Internet Archaeology* began transitioning to OA in 2004, three years after it began charging subscription fees. The journal itself was launched in 1996. Jisc asked if the journal would license its contents to the whole United Kingdom and provided some funding for transitioning the journal. By 2009, *Internet Archaeology* collected only enough to cover publication costs and began using a hybrid option as a transition phase. In 2012, they made back issues of the journal OA. Winters (2015) indicates that from the beginning, the editorial board envisioned the hybrid model as a transition phase and a way to test whether transitioning to full OA was financially feasible. The journal transitioned to full APC-funded OA in 2014 with an inexpensive institutional membership model. At this point, they are reluctant to say the transition has been a success, but the journal appears to be doing reasonably well. They feel they have come a long way, but ask their readers and authors to incorporate APC costs into their future project funding applications.

**Jean-Claude Guédon**

The case of *Internet Archaeology* is ambiguous: did the hybrid phase succeed only partially, and was there an added need for an institutional membership model (I assume this is something like SCOAP3)? Was the hybrid phase needed or even useful to reach this particular decision?

**Summary**

The journals described in this section demonstrate that the hybrid OA scenario can be successfully applied by a broad range of journals. *Nature Communication* represents a highly prestigious life science journal that successfully transitioned to OA despite charging an extremely high APC. *Bioscience Reports* represents one of the growing number of mega-journal-style OA journals and the increasingly common practice of cascading review. *Internet Archeology* provides a somewhat unusual example of a small not-for-profit university-based

journal that began charging subscription fees well after it was launched, but was able to transition to OA using the hybrid model.

#### **Virginia Barbour**

I appreciate that this report was written before the data from the Wellcome Trust among others, which showed again a high cost and high usage of hybrid OA. I think it would not be correct to say that publishers are using hybrid OA as an interim strategy; it seems to be becoming accepted normal practice. I would suggest that hybrid journals should be required to publish a time frame by which they will expect to be fully OA, especially given previous comment about general and rising intolerance of hybrid.

#### **Martin Eve**

Hybrid OA does, undoubtedly, make more material open access and reduces the risk of transition. But the financial constraints it imposes by putting additional overheads on libraries and universities outweigh the benefits, in my opinion.

#### **Rebecca Kennison**

The authors properly criticize this approach as being useful to get to full OA, in large part because there is no incentive for the publisher to lower subscription rates even if there is content in the journal that is paid for via APCs. In addition to the authors' observations, I would argue that such a move would only work for a journal under one of three scenarios: (1) it becomes a megajournal, (2) it introduces an APC at an extraordinary high rate, or (3) it is subsidized by other revenue. (The examples included in this section bear this out.) Merely shifting revenue from subscription to APC would not work for any journal with low volume, especially if it has good subscriber numbers. This would be true whether the journal flipped to OA en masse or moved to OA via the hybrid APCs route.

Here's what I mean. Let's say we have Hybrid Journal A, which publishes 100 articles/year. Before it was a hybrid journal, it used to have a subscription price of \$1000 and had 1000 subscribers, bringing in \$1 million per year. This year 25% of the articles in this newly "hybridized" journal were published via APCs to the tune of \$2500 each. Since for this particular journal subscription pricing is coupled with APC payments — as we commonly think (or at least often hope) is the case for hybrid journals — that \$62,500 in APC revenue now means for next year there will be a reduction to the subscription price of \$62.50 per subscriber, reducing the journal subscription to \$937.50. This sort of revenue balance via offsets only works for a while, though. To maintain that \$1 million in annual revenue, the journal eventually needs either to increase its volume (to 400 articles per year at \$2500/article) or increase the individual APC (to \$10,000) or something more evenly balanced between the two.

The likelihood is that that \$1MM revenue cannot be maintained, but the hope (and, for some, the fervent dream) many OA advocates have is that the reduced costs of an all-OA world would result in reduced need for revenues at their current level. (In my example those cost reductions would need to be rather severe for the journal to be able to maintain a \$2500 APC and stick with only publishing 100 articles per year. I'll leave it to others to debate what and where cost cutting could happen to make up that \$750,000 in lost revenue.) But the potential for APCs replacing subscriptions through an eventual "hybrid APC" transition becomes moot when pricing for

subscriptions is not based on costs but rather on journal reputation and other competitive considerations, as is the case with Elsevier's pricing model. (I'll admit that, given their argument, I do not think Elsevier double-dips — but that does not mean I agree with their approach.) Let me be clear in saying I'm not arguing for pricing journals like we do widgets, but merely observing that pricing based on value is considerably more difficult to evaluate than is pricing based on costs — and that is why APCs (which imply a one-to-one transaction of money for service) and subscriptions (which have always been based on the perceived value of the product) are hard to reconcile in terms of an OA transition strategy.

That is why the approach such as some (like John Willinsky) have suggested of obtaining long-term commitments from institutions to sustain subscriptions while simultaneously making the journals OA makes a certain amount of sense, more so than does paying hybrid APCs. This "subscription-as-OA-fund" approach becomes a type of bridge funding, but with an "out." If the journal can't figure out a way to become OA perpetually, it goes back to being a closed-access subscription journal. If it does sort out a way forward, it does so with full OA already its default.

In any case, my larger point is this: What is likely to be needed for most journals to flip is some sort of "hybrid" model, yes — but hybrid in a different sense. Some mix of revenue — perhaps a combination of low APC, institutional or organizational subsidy, and funds from an endowment to which donors can contribute, etc. — is most likely the best way forward for most journals that (to date) have generated revenue, even in small numbers (say, five figures instead of seven).

#### **Iryna Kuchma**

I'd like to discourage this confusing scenario.

#### **Alice Meadows**

If Wiley's experience is anything to go by, uptake of hybrid has started to take off in the last couple of years, especially following the RCUK mandate (though interestingly, at least when I was there, uptake was growing faster among non-UK authors than UK ones). Hybrid has a lot going for it - it offers authors a much wider range of journals to choose from while allowing publishers/societies to continue to benefit from ongoing subscription revenue. But the risk of double dipping and the sometimes higher cost of APCs for hybrid journals have made some funders and libraries less than enthusiastic about it, while the still relatively low uptake means that publishers aren't yet convinced that the time is right for a more wholesale flipping of subscription journals to OA. Realistically, the success of hybrid OA is going to vary substantially by discipline anyway, but one way to increase/accelerate uptake might be to offer improved/additional services to authors of OA articles in hybrid journals, e.g., in terms of speed of publication, submission of articles to repositories such as PubMed Central.

With further effort and engagement around hybrid and more of a commitment on the part of publishers to using it as a way of proactively moving to OA - at least for well-funded disciplines - hybrid could be a win/win for all stakeholders.

**Lisa Norberg**

I would strongly discourage the use of a hybrid OA to APC scenario. Contrary to the authors' earlier findings, a more recent study out of the UK finds that hybrid OA publishing is actually on the rise:

"We have learned from this monitoring process that the majority of APC payments arising from funder grants have been to hybrid journals (Jisc, 2014; Wellcome Trust, 2015a)." (Lawson, S, Gray, J and Mauri, M 2016 *Opening the Black Box of Scholarly Communication Funding: A Public Data Infrastructure for Financial Flows in Academic Publishing*. Open Library of Humanities, 2(1): e10, pp. 1–35, DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.16995/olh.72>).

The primary reason given is that, not surprisingly, the high prestige journals where authors want to publish are currently subscription journals and UK funders have not set a cap on the maximum amount that publishers can charge for an APC. The hybrid "experiment" meant to lower costs overall, has resulted in the precise opposite demonstrating what many in the US fear — the potential windfall for for-profit publishers will lead to significant costs increases and institutions as well as funders will find themselves in an all too familiar and unsustainable financial predicament.

While many for-profit publishers have insisted that they will work with institutions to reduce their subscription charges relative to the APCs received, as mentioned above, the amount of staff time required to ensure that publishers are not "double-dipping" becomes both a logistical nightmare and adds to an institution's overall cost. Rather than a gradual or transitional approach to an APC model, I would imagine publishers wanting to hold on to this practice for as long as possible.

I could, however, imagine a successful hybrid approach that takes us from subscriptions to a non-APC model, especially in non-STEM disciplines. There is no question that publishers and institutions need time to formulate a more scalable and sustainable plan and that any transition will cost money. I could envision institutions and their libraries continuing to support publishers, especially non-profit publishers, such as society publishers and university presses, by maintaining their subscriptions, but it would require a solid, transparent, and time-limited transition plan.

**Alma Swan**

As mentioned in the text, some publishers do make portions of journals available for free without charging an APC. Springer was doing this with whole journals, for a time period after publication (time-limited Open Access) but now appears to have withdrawn this service to the community. Although this probably was never intended to be a point on the progression of these journals to fully OA, the withdrawal of even this small gesture would seem to indicate backing away from OA rather than looking for a gradual way to achieve it. "Big OA Deals" are far more attractive to big publishers, of course.



## 7.2.2 Bundling APCs with Subscription Licenses

### Description

This scenario describes the emerging practice of including APC waivers or discount agreements as part of institutional subscriptions with large publishers. Rather than keeping subscriptions agreements and APC payments separate publishers can offer a single agreement to institutions that fully gets rid of, or at least reduces the need for affiliated authors to pay individual APCs to the publisher part of the agreement. This development took place at a time when institutions and authors were increasingly pressured to publish research OA, and publishers were increasing their hybrid OA and full OA journal offerings. This is mostly a publisher-level scenario, not something that individual journals can influence, but it has trickle-down effects on the quantity and quality of submissions that APC-based journals receive and how a publisher might decide which journals to flip.

**Relevant publisher types:** Publishers with subscription-based journals that also offer APC OA publishing options (either hybrid OA or full OA journals)

**Relevant pre-requisites:** The publisher must have mechanisms in place to incorporate information about articles published under this kind of agreement into future subscription costs. Details of subscription agreements are usually fixed for multiple years at a time, so rapid changes cannot be made.

**Most relevant disciplines:** All

**Relevant goals for flipping:** Maintain profitable business relationships with subscribers who demand improved circumstances for OA publishing; provide growth for hybrid OA uptake in journal portfolio; provide growth for converted journals based on author-side fees in journal portfolio

**Strengths:** Bundling provides a way for publishers to gradually transition over to OA publishing models while retaining relationships with subscribing institutions. As these agreements become more commonplace, there is an increased level of demand for OA publishing outlets in the publisher portfolio. Offset deals are an easy sell for publishers, benefits the subscriber if pricing remains the same as a subscription-only agreement.

**Weaknesses:** Offset agreements reduce price sensitivity regarding individual APC pricing for institutions and authors covered by the agreement.

**Opportunities:** This model does not require publishers to flip journals overnight; rather, they can take a gradual approach by seeing which journals fare well as hybrid OA journals before making decisions based on said metrics for a whole portfolio of journals.

**Threats:** As APC pricing is not really a central issue in offset agreements, there is plenty to offset from due to often multi-million-dollar subscription agreements. There might be a risk of increasing the list price to levels that are prohibitive for authors from institutions that do not have an offset agreement. Growth of large scale agreements such as these may place small and



medium-sized OA publishers and societies at a significant disadvantage in the competition for authors.

#### **Virginia Barbour**

The very high risk here is the risk that it replicates the current situation with institutions tied into big bundles that are secret and which do not allow full competition, nor are they associated with any lower costs for institutions. Furthermore, as has been seen with the recent Elsevier VSNU (Netherlands Universities) deal, the deal is highly selective and omits a large number of the journals that authors are most keen to submit too. These deals need to be publicly disclosed and negotiated ideally at a national level, to avoid the replicating the highly non-competitive market that currently exists. The call for disclosure is being made publicly by a number of groups and individuals.

### **Background**

The phenomenon of bundling APCs and subscription services has emerged, in part, so that publishers can avoid accusations of “double dipping” in the case of hybrid OA publishing. The method also spurs the growth of newly founded or converted full-OA journals while building up their citation metrics. Further, there was increased demand among authors to publish OA due to mandates. The idea is that these “offset deals” are negotiated between publishers and universities to provide universities with a full access and publication service package, rather than only including subscriptions. Doing so avoids the high overhead of charging APCs. There is not a wealth of publicly available information about the specific details outlined in deals that universities or libraries have made with journal publishers because the contracts usually contain requirements for non-disclosure.

It is possible that major publishers hope that subscription-hybrid OA deals, if they proliferate and trigger mass conversion of entire portfolios to full OA, will gradually evolve into purely APC big deals. In such deals, a university or bigger consortium will agree to pay a lump sum (on roughly the same level as the previous subscription big deal) to cover the APCs of all corresponding author articles from said university in all of that publisher’s journals. The development of big subscription e-licenses 15 to 20 years ago shows that publishers can manipulate APC pricing in such a way (that is, making individual APCs much more expensive than choosing the big deal) that universities will be steered toward signing such agreements. Because the agreements are likely to be non-disclosable, price discrimination becomes possible where it is not in the case of openly posted APCs. Price discrimination is already a fact for access provision; which is based on the customer’s ability to pay. Scholars in developing countries, for example, will never be able to pay the same APCs as scholars from the leading industrial countries. To some extent this limits the extent to which authors from developing countries can publish in APC funded journals. Many journals however offer waivers for authors how are unable to pay APCs. To the extent this occurs it shifts the cost of publication to authors, their institutions or funders who can afford to pay higher APCs.

Publishers could, in this way, keep their current revenue levels and universities would not need to pay more for access than they do currently. The losers in this scenario would be smaller, independent OA publishers such as Hindawi and De Gruyter, which currently may not have package deals (generally for subscriptions) with universities. Smaller publishers would be hurt because money for APCs in such journals would have to be paid in addition to what the university library budgets for the big publishers.

**Pippa Smart**

Why would Hindawi and De Gruyter lose out? The argument does not seem clear here. And what about other OA publishers, e.g. BioMed Central?

The APC management process within universities is still not fully standardized and can require a lot of administrative effort as APC-based publishing becomes more common (GW4 Libraries 2015). However, offsetting deals can save time for universities because individual invoicing is reduced, and the publisher also keeps a record of offset-eligible articles.

**MacKenzie Smith**

These so-called “offsetting” agreements are particularly attractive to libraries that are committed to significant journal subscription/licensing deals and want to facilitate the transition to OA. Libraries are used to negotiating with publishers over suites of content and services, and with complex terms and conditions (such as guaranteeing long-term archiving of e-journals for preservation). Adding APC discounts to these negotiations is easily imaginable. Whether publishers will maintain reasonable APC levels once the balance of revenue from these deals has shifted from mostly subscriptions to mostly APCs is an open question.

**Examples**

**Springer**

Despite the lack of firm data or specific details contained in publisher subscription agreements, what can be concluded based on publicly available information is that Springer has been one of the pioneering publishers in making offset deals. Springer (2016) has made offset deals with [Max Planck Society](#) and university consortiums from the [United Kingdom](#), [the Netherlands](#), and [Austria \(including the Austrian Science Fund\)](#). These agreements enable authors from affiliated institutions to publish their articles OA in all of Springer's hybrid OA journals.

**Wiley**

Wiley has also been active in providing offset deals as part of subscription negotiations. Based on the information about institutional and funder payments that Wiley provides, it is unclear how the use of OA publishing by authors influences subscription pricing across the institutions listed (Wiley 2016). Both universities and research funders provide free OA publishing for affiliated or funded authors. Jisc, who negotiates publisher agreements on behalf of UK universities and libraries, has disclosed some details about their deal with Wiley, which spans

from 2015 to 2017: Universities get credit usable for APCs based on what they spent on subscriptions in the previous year (Jisc 2014).

#### Elsevier

The most recent major development in offset deals is was the outcome of negotiations between Elsevier and the Association of Universities in the Netherlands (VSNU), who reached an initial offsetting agreement in December of 2015 —under a month from the previous subscription agreement running out (VSNU 2015). This was the first time (at least noted publically) that Elsevier has agreed to an offsetting scheme as part of a subscription agreement. Specific details remain undisclosed; however, it is certain that the offsetting is not as liberal in quantity and scope what is offered by publishers like Springer. A selection of Elsevier’s journals will be made available for VSNU-affiliated authors to publish in OA, with the offsetting gradually expanding to cover offsetting for 30 percent of all OA articles published in 2017.

#### **Summary**

This is a highly active area of development, particularly in Europe, when it comes both to publishers and subscribing institutions. Because the individual agreements often cover a large consortium of universities and libraries and span multiple years, the negotiations are often made a topic of science policy at various levels of administration. For publishers, there can be benefit in providing such agreements in order to secure agreements with similar pricing as in the past, the added bonus is spurred demand for OA publishing options making flip decisions more predictable to make.

#### **Raym Crow**

The comment I made on scaling above, on section 7.2.1 (via Hybrid OA), applies in this section as well.

#### **Martin Eve**

This is a scenario about which I have mixed views. It will lead to greater OA uptake, but also massively benefits incumbent publishers by essentially guaranteeing their income and removing any perceived author barriers through APCs.

#### **Jean-Claude Guédon**

This is really a kind of “Big Deal” for APCs. The report correctly points out that it allows publishers to respond to double-dipping concerns. Like “Big Deals”, they remain opaque because of nondisclosure clauses in the contracts.

I do not believe that major publishers hope that subscription-hybrid OA deals will eventually and gradually evolve into purely APC big deals. The hybrid situation just gets more complex and the grip on the institution is tightened. It is already very difficult to take apart a “Big Deal”; if one adds an APC “Big Deal”, this means that the authors of that institution will be naturally steered toward the journals of that publisher, at the expense of other publishers, and this will accelerate the mechanisms which, through revenue depletion, force smaller publishers to merge with the

big publi-oligarchs. In parallel, members of smaller, non-research, universities that cannot, or will not, enter into such deals, will find themselves cut out.

The point of this strategy, I believe, is not to flip, but to increase the control of the publi-oligarchs over scientific communication channels. Personally, I find this trend extremely worrisome.

### **Rebecca Kennison**

I agree with the authors that these “offset deals” are simply APC Big Deals, with all the efficiencies and all the problems inherent in Big Deals also true of these arrangements. There seems to be the hope that APC Big Deals would somehow cap price rises (“universities would not need to pay more for access than they do currently”), but that hasn’t been the case with subscriptions, which just keep going up and up, and I am doubtful that if institutions were paying APC Big Deals that pricing for those bundles would somehow not simply continue the trend of increases.

One role that wasn’t mentioned within any of these scenarios was that of the subscription agent. This scenario — in essence recasting subscriptions as APC payments — would find particular favor with those agents, who often represent the smaller, independent publishers and who could take on that role for OA publishers as well, if this approach (similar to the “open-content subscription” idea of Willinsky’s mentioned above) gained traction. If combined with Scenario 8.4 (Joining Consortium or Library Partnership Subsidy), so leveraging the power of current purchasing consortia to fund OA rather than subscriptions, whether that is by paying APCs or in funding the journal as a whole, this subscription-to-open-content approach could scale rapidly, but would require wholesale shifts of entire publisher portfolios to make the system workable — so would need at least one of the Big Five to lead the way.

### **Iryna Kuchma**

This scenario works in developing and transition countries and I endorse it.

### **Alice Meadows**

In combination with hybrid, this could prove a good way of speeding up the move to gold OA. It’s an ingenious way of helping libraries to control costs/price increases, ensure there’s no double dipping, and support their researchers in publishing OA, while at the same time continuing to guarantee the larger publishers a certain level of income from some of their big deals. Since the publishers who have negotiated these deals so far publish across a wide range of disciplines, and the institutions involved carry out research in a similarly wide range of disciplines, it would be interesting to know how much take up there is/will be of the APC quota from fields that have traditionally been less well served by OA models.

### **Lisa Norberg**

As tempting as this approach may be for institutions that want to minimize the internal costs associated with managing APCs, bundling APCs along with subscription licenses is guaranteed to put us in the exact same mess we are in with the subscription “big deals.” Such deals are likely to be limited to large research institutions as smaller institutions with fewer researchers are

more likely to cover individual APCs by dropping their subscriptions. This could force publishers to raise APCs and/or subscriptions quickly putting us in an unsustainable financial situation.

Despite my concerns and general opposition, I suspect this is the most viable scenario for flipping high impact and high prestige journals in STEM fields. It will be difficult to assess the short-term impact of this scenario on the budgets of research institutions because of the non-disclosure agreements institutions have signed with publishers so only time will tell.

I should also note that while the big deal has helped many smaller journals survive, especially in humanities and social sciences, I don't believe any path that leads toward an APC future is wise for those disciplines.

#### **Bonnie Tijerina**

This is an interesting model if deals are negotiated at a high level at the institution or across institutions. At the ground level within libraries, often APC and scholarly publishing budgets are separate from library collections budgets and library deals licensed with publishers. An added level of coordination would need to happen for this to be successful.

### **7.2.3 Flipping Journals via Delayed OA**

#### **Description**

A journal flipping via delayed OA transitions from subscription-based, to subscription with delayed OA, to immediate OA.

**Relevant publisher types:** Society, university, and potentially, but less likely, commercial publisher

**Relevant pre-requisites:** Publishers or owners wishing to transition to OA gradually

**Most relevant disciplines:** All, though the OA business models available for funding a journal will differ across disciplines

**Relevant goals for flipping:** Increasing readership; facilitating access; potentially, increasing citations

**Strengths:** Delayed OA provides a means of assessing some of the benefits and risks of a full OA transition before a decision is made to complete the transition. If the organization is planning to continue using the subscription model for a printed version of the journal, delayed OA can be a test of subscribers' willingness to continue subscribing when the digital version is OA. This method also provides some of the benefits of OA before the actual transition occurs.

**Weaknesses:** The eventual transition to OA still carries risks. Delayed OA will not necessarily help in assessing or avoiding all of the potential risks.

**Opportunities:** The content of the journal is more readily available prior to implementing full OA. This allows the publisher to assess some of the effects of transitioning to OA before fully implementing the new business model.

**Threats:** Delayed OA fails to mitigate many of the risks of transitioning to an OA business model.

### Virginia Barbour

The risk of this model is that by having articles not made fully OA - ie via Creative Commons licenses - the benefits of full OA, such as mining and reuse cannot be realised. It accomplishes only the goals of the paper being free to read, and that after a delay. Without appropriate licensing, the risk is that such papers can have their free status withdrawn.

## **Background**

Journals that provide delayed OA make the articles they publish freely available after a fixed period of time. The time varies from journal to journal, but is usually between six and 24 months. Laakso and Björk (2013) identified 492 delayed OA journals that published 111,312 articles in 2011. They also found that these journals have, on average, substantially higher citation rates than similar journals, both OA and subscription.

Delayed OA can serve as a stepping stone, allowing a society or other organization publishing a subscription journal to achieve some of the benefits and assess some of the risks of transitioning their journal or journals to a full OA business model. The two examples below highlight this strategy.

## **Examples**

### [Nucleic Acids Research \(NAR\)](#)

*NAR* is Oxford University Press's (OUP) largest journal, publishing about 1,200 articles a year (Bird 2008). OUP implemented a six-month delayed access policy for *NAR* in 2001 and began experimenting with other OA models in 2004. OUP introduced a hybrid option and published two special issues via APC-funded OA with a very modest APC. These were well-received. OUP surveyed authors and readers concerning a full transition to OA. Over half said they would support a full transition to APC-funded OA while 19 percent were against the transition; the rest supported a subscription model with an OA option (Bird 2008). The journal successfully transitioned to full OA in 2005, maintaining submissions and author satisfaction based on author surveys. Although fully OA, the business model has been mixed with income from APCs, institutional memberships, and continuing subscriptions. *NAR* has maintained its quality level and is ranked 20th among the 287 journals in its field with an impact factor of 9.1. *NAR* has also maintained a high publication volume, publishing 1,532 articles per in 2009. By 2009 *NAR* had raised its APC from 1,500 to 2,640 GBP, but, interestingly, 34 percent of revenue for *NAR* was still from subscriptions, with 62 percent coming from APCs and institutional memberships (Bird 2010). As of 2009, subscriptions dropped by about 20 percent since the journal flipped. *NAR*'s submissions and acceptance rates have fluctuated somewhat during the first few years of OA, but then were reported to be stabilizing at around the same levels as before the flip (Bird 2010).

In summary, *NAR* is a high-impact STM journal from a nonprofit publisher with strong author loyalty. OUP implemented a six-month delayed OA for several years prior to a successful transition to a full OA journal funded by APC sales of institutional memberships and substantial residual subscription income

**Jean-Claude Guédon**

The analysis of *NAR* offers a really puzzling result: if the journal is full OA since 2005, one wonders how subscriptions can remain; is it volunteer reader loyalty? If so, this will not be easily transposed to other journals. The same analysis demonstrates some of the moves that can help a successful flip, and it reinforces the point made in the context of temporary flipping financing: flipping is a complex process and it requires extra resources. The means to ensure a successful flip are distinct from the means needed to ensure the “sustainability” of the journal. Sometimes, they may be aligned, but that is not always the case.

[Investigative Ophthalmology and Visual Science](#) (IOVS)

The [Association for Research in Vision and Ophthalmology \(ARVO\)](#) has announced that it will transition IOVS to APC-funded OA beginning in 2016. This is another example of a journal that has implemented a short, six-month delayed access policy before transitioning to full APC-funded OA. Society members will receive a 350 USD discount on a base APC of 1,850 USD for the standard CC BY-NC-ND license. Authors selecting a CC BY license will pay an additional cost of 500 USD. The prices are the same for all three ARVO journals.

**Summary**

The two journals discussed in this section, one published by a nonprofit university press and one by a society, demonstrate how a short, six-month delayed access program can be a stepping stone in the transition to full OA.

*NAR* is an interesting and instructive example. Along with implementing delayed access for several years prior to transitioning to full OA, OUP published two special issues full OA and surveyed *NAR*'s authors and readers about their feelings toward the journal transitioning to full OA. There appeared to be strong support for the change, providing evidence that the transition would be successful. When considering whether to flip a journal to OA, the approach taken by OUP is a prudent one. The use of author and reader surveys can be an important tool in reducing the risks of flipping journals. Authors appear quite willing to pay an APC for this prestigious life-science journal, even after a substantial increase in the APC.

**Pippa Smart**

“The use of author and reader surveys can be ... Reducing risks of flipping” I disagree. Most readers want free access and most authors want to everyone to access and read their stuff. However because the current system has led to a disconnect between these desires and financial realities means that simply reporting the desires of a majority (many of whom do not see what most publishers do and don't understand the costs) is not necessarily helpful.

Another interesting point is that *NAR* was able to maintain a significant number of subscriptions, which appeared to decline slowly for several years after the transition, easing the financial risk of the transition. It is not clear whether this would be true for other journals. But in cases like this, the financial impact of flipping a journal can be blunted by slowing the decline in the subscription base over the course of the transition.

Because *IOVS* will be transitioning to OA in 2016, it is not possible to tell at this point how successful the transition will be. Free or reduced subscriptions for journals are often an important benefit of society membership. A reduced or waived APC can serve as an incentive for members when societies are considering flipping their journals to OA via an APC business model. This would likely be a useful incentive when a high percentage of a society's members publish regularly in its journal(s). For societies in which a large percentage of their members do not publish, such as often is the case in clinical medicine, this may not have as much value to the membership as a whole. Providing free or reduced subscriptions can be expensive for a society, and while transitioning their journals to an OA model results in a loss of this benefit, it also removes the cost. The savings can be used to help fund the transition or, as was done with *IOVS*, to reduce the publication fees for the journal.

#### **Martin Eve**

This seems to be a potentially good strategy to me but it has some flaws. The weakness is that if libraries try to game this – by cancelling subscriptions and using the delayed OA version – then publisher revenue will dry up and regress to a purely subscription mode. Also, some learned societies, like the Royal Historical Society in the UK, may attempt to insist on extremely long embargo periods based on questionable half-life usage data.

#### **Jean-Claude Guédon**

In principle, there is nothing wrong with this strategy, provided that it is really a process aiming at flipping. Delayed OA is more commonly practised as a way to ensure subscription revenues while offering a sort of compromise which, from my own observations, is conceived to stop or at least slow down the move toward OA. I have observed this attitude at close range in a number of publishing organizations, such as [Érudit](#) in Canada or [CAIRN](#) in France and Belgium. The spirit in which this delayed OA is proposed should be examined closely if one is not to be hoodwinked, so to speak, into a hall of mirrors.

Delayed OA, especially if it is handled as an exploration tool, can help identify the thresholds where the traditional business models no longer work. While it is a useful assessment tool, it is not a good tool to mitigate risks. The report makes this point clearly.

#### **Rebecca Kennison**

This scenario seems unlikely to succeed for the same reason 6.2.3. (Income from a Paper Version Subsidizing an OA Version) is not a long-term solution. Delayed OA (at least in some disciplines) does ensure subscriptions remain in place; that for *NAR* subscriptions only declined over time indicates nothing more than that libraries eventually caught onto the fact that the



content was now immediately available. Any scenario that relies on librarians not paying close attention might work — but it's not a scenario in which I would put too many of my eggs.

#### **Iryna Kuchma**

I'd like to discourage this confusing scenario.

#### **Alice Meadows**

In fast-moving, well-funded disciplines this approach makes a lot of sense. There's a decent amount of evidence, for example, that biomedical journals don't appear to have been harmed by the typical 6-12 month embargo period, and research in these fields also tends to be well-funded. So journals could potentially cut embargo periods while at the same time introducing APCs, perhaps in a staggered way - no APC for articles with a 12 month embargo, a reduced fee for a 6 month embargo, full fee for no embargo - giving publishers, funders, and others an opportunity for analysis and evaluation during the transition period.

#### **Lisa Norberg**

I don't find a great deal of difference between a delayed OA scenario and a hybrid approach — both essentially requiring libraries to maintain subscriptions for current access — only with an embargo thrown into the mix. It does provide a more gradual path for those society publishers and smaller university presses, but it also has the potential to frustrate researchers who don't have access to the current issues. This could impact citation rates, but again, unless it is a path to something other than an APC model, I wouldn't encourage it for the humanities or most social sciences. And in the sciences where currency is even more critical, such a scenario could lead to a greater reliance on alternative forms of access, such as repository pre-prints or unlawful repositories like Sci-Hub.

#### **Bonnie Tijerina**

This model seems sensible for a slow rollout, though could be confusing for “subscribers” since there is a temporary business that will exist in between the subscription and OA models. Like with Hybrid OA, libraries will have a hard time providing access to the OA content in this scenario, especially if they don't have a subscription to the original publication.

### **7.3 Changing Focus and Services During the Flip**

#### **7.3.1 Rebranding and modifying the scope of a Journal**

##### **Description**

This scenario concerns re-branding journals (to be more open in scope) in conjunction with flipping. The aim is to reposition the journal and thus facilitate a higher flow of submissions. While adjustments to journal scope and objectives can occur at any time, this scenario is concerned with major changes, which may extend to changing the journal's name and initiating an OA publishing model.

**Relevant publisher types:** Society, commercial

**Relevant pre-requisites:** Stakeholder support for changing the defining core characteristics of the journal

**Most relevant disciplines:** Most relevant in the life and natural sciences, where there is funding for paying APCs

**Relevant goals for flipping:** Increased authorship, readership, publication volume, and citations

**Strengths:** A wider scope has the potential to attract a wider breadth of manuscripts within a research discipline. This growth helps with funding an APC-based journal.

**Weaknesses:** There is a risk of alienating the existing academic community formed around the journal. A well-profiled regional journal might transform into a fairly generic international mega-journal.

**Opportunities:** If handled correctly, the goals of increasing submissions, publications access, and citations can be achieved by this scenario.

**Threats:** Switching to an APC model with a broader scope and focusing on an international audience could backfire, reducing submissions and losing a loyal local constituency.

#### Lisa Norberg

I agree with the authors that this may be effective for the life and natural sciences where there is sufficient support for APCs coupled with significant pressure to publish openly, but I don't see it working for other disciplines.

#### Caroline Sutton

Another threat is losing the impact factor, which can happen if changing journal name or dramatic change in scope.

### Examples

#### [De Gruyter](#)

In 2015, de Gruyter flipped, renamed, and rebranded eight STM subscription journals previously published by Springer (de Gruyter 2014a; de Gruyter 2014b). In 2013, these journals published over 1,000 articles and were doing well in terms of acceptance rates and impact metrics within their fields. According to a press release, the journals in question enjoyed strong community and editorial support for flipping the journals to OA (de Gruyter 2014a). In October 2014, five of the journals had a JCR impact factor and APCs ranging from 1,000 USD to 1,500 USD. The three journals without impact factors charged no APCs.

#### [The Journal of Korean Society of Ultrasound in Medicine](#)

This journal flipped in 2014 in a move towards broader international reach and impact. The journal was re-named to *Ultrasonography* and now only publishes English-language material. All costs of the publication process are underwritten by the Korean Society of Ultrasound Medicine. Ultrasonography (Yu 2014).

#### Jean-Claude Guédon

The case of *Ultrasonography* is a bit special; it appears similar to the Latin American strategies aiming at bolstering the visibility of journals that are ignored or neglected by the Web of Science

or Scopus, except that, here, the financing is footed by a society rather than public bodies: the Korean society decided to change their journal into an international journal; in order to achieve this goal, they decided to adopt a non-APC-Gold strategy. This makes one point of the summary – that regarding the ability to pay APCs – moot.

In a certain sense, De Gruyter is doing the same since its journals that do not have an impact factor (IF) are also without APCs, presumably to make them more appealing to potential authors. Presumably, they are cross-subsidized by journals with IFs.

### **Summary**

This scenario is being used fairly widely, allowing smaller, regional subscription journals to broaden their readership and authorship and potentially raise their citations and status. While this strategy can be successful, the journal runs the risk of losing its local base of support, and their current author pool may not be able or willing to pay the APC (Solomon and Björk 2012).

#### **Jean-Claude Guédon**

In a not totally explicit way, this section deals with scientific, commercial or society, journals that enjoy a well-established community of researchers and potential authors, and that play a relatively important role on a regional scene. The flip, then, is associated with the attempt to raise the international status and visibility of the journal.

#### **Rebecca Kennison**

It seems to me that the only reason to adopt this approach would be to bring in more APC dollars by being able to publish more content. But perhaps I'm missing something?

#### **Alice Meadows**

Rebranding/relaunching a journal is always a risky strategy - for successful journals, it may dilute their brand; for less successful journals rebranding may not be enough to attract more authors - especially not if they are being asked to pay an APC. I can't imagine this ever being adopted widely as an approach to transition.

#### **Caroline Sutton**

This is not my area of expertise, but some journals are spun off in this way in order to provide a cascading mechanism. If an article is rejected by the flagship/high impact journal, it can be forwarded to the open access title.

An alternative to the re-branding as such, has been that some societies have launched a second OA title alongside a subscription journal they have owned or supported.

## **7.3.2 Spinning-off a Well-defined Section of a Journal**

### **Description**

This scenario involves taking a well-defined section of an existing subscription-based journal and spinning it off as a new and separate OA journal. While this contains the central element of

founding a completely new journal, the whole process shares elements of transitioning an existing journal to OA. Depending on the circumstances, the spin-off scenario can also act as a stepping stone toward fully transitioning a journal to an OA publishing model.

**Relevant publisher types:** Applicable to all

**Relevant pre-requisites:** Journals with distinct article sections and sufficient submissions to fuel one of the sections becoming independently published without harming the original journal or jeopardizing the thriving section that is split out

**Most relevant disciplines:** The life and natural sciences, where there is funding for paying APCs

**Relevant goals for flipping:** Giving a popular sub-section of a journal room to grow; piloting an OA model while minimizing risks to the main journal; growing the publisher journal portfolio

**Strengths:** A spin-off is a fairly low-risk proposition for initiating OA publishing. Plus, the publisher and academic community get experience with the new circumstances of the publishing model.

**Weaknesses:** OA publishing only concerns the spun-off section of the original journal, while the rest still limited to subscription access.

**Opportunities:** If the spin-off journal is successful in OA, the rest of the original journal might follow.

**Threats:** There is a risk of failing to attract submissions to both the new and the original journal after creating two different outlets. There is also a risk of fragmenting the academic community around the original journal.

## Example

### [\*Applications in Plant Sciences \(APPS\)\*](#)

*APPS* is an OA journal “promoting the rapid dissemination of newly developed, innovative tools and protocols in all areas of the plant sciences, including genetics, structure, function, development, evolution, systematics, and ecology.” The journal is a publication of the Botanical Society of America, originating in 2009 as the *American Journal of Botany*’s online-only section, *AJB Primer Notes and Protocols in the Plant Sciences*. The first issue was published in January 2013 as part of BioOne’s OA collection; the journal has been expanded to address novel protocols, software reports, reviews, and applications of new technology in any area of the plant sciences (BSA 2016). The APC is 1,250 USD for non-BSA members and 350 USD for members. In 2014, the impact factor was 0.667.

#### **Virginia Barbour**

What is being described here includes probably the most common route now for large scale OA - that is developing a journal that essentially targeted at the rejected papers from a journal with a high rejection rate. BMJ Open is an example of a highly successful model. The risk as noted is that the original journal will not go OA, nor will all rejected author submit to that journal. It also has a risk of associating OA with lower quality in the minds of authors, even if that is not the

case. The advantage is that this model can help to build an ecosystem of sustainable OA with the more established journal supporting the newer one, and then potentially vice versa

#### **Stefan Busch**

The founding of spin-off titles, also known as companion or sister journals, is indeed a tried and tested approach by now, not least for societies thinking about their role in and preparing for an “OA world”. As the report’s authors point out, strictly speaking such spin-offs are outside of the report’s remit. However, spin-offs are a promising way to transition into a world in which subscription titles will face increasing head winds.

My comment on this section is mainly that the focus on “well-defined sections” of journals is too narrow, and unnecessarily so. Established journals with high submission and rejection rates are generally in a strong position to start new and related OA publications. They often reject sound or even good-quality papers because of reasons that have little to nothing to do with the quality of the papers, e.g. where editors of society journals are required, for internal “political reasons”, to balance the sub-disciplines represented in the journal. Spin-off journals offer an opportunity for modernization and growth, and their scope can be defined flexibly, whether to represent certain and perhaps newly emerging sections or broadly (and unfettered by traditions and “politics”), possibly to the extent of building “small mega journals” for the discipline.

#### **Martin Eve**

I find this scenario undesirable, since it depends on non-OA content in perpetuity for its revenue generation.

#### **Jean-Claude Guédon**

No comment on this section. However, I should add that this strategy may also feed into cascading peer-reviewing schemes. If so they fall into business models that may attempt to save money by playing on economies of scale worked inside some innovative dimension linking several journals together.

#### **Rebecca Kennison**

This scenario seems yet another variation of the other approaches that advocate maintaining subscriptions to cover the costs of the OA content, although this version is a bit cleaner in its implementation, since OA content is separate from (but still supported by) subscription content. Its attractiveness lies in making some known content free while subsidizing that content via stable funding and is not dissimilar to the PMLA/Professions approach that the MLA took to make Professions OA, which I already mentioned above.

#### **Alice Meadows**

Again not something I could see being widely adopted but could be a useful way of starting to move a community/niche discipline toward OA.

#### **Lisa Norberg**

See 7.3.1. I agree with the authors that this may be effective for the life and natural sciences where there is sufficient support for APCs coupled with significant pressure to publish openly, but I don’t see it working for other disciplines.

### Pippa Smart

Several publishers have launched OA journals to capture articles that don't meet the quality criteria of their other journals. For example, BioMed Central has a clear cascade system whereby articles rejected from the top tier journals are (with the authors' permission) submitted to the lower quality journals. (This is for articles which are technically accurate, but not sufficiently interesting, novel, etc., to warrant publication in the higher journals.) Part of the rationale for this is to avoid a waste of time (for reviewers, authors) if an article has to be submitted anew to another journal, and partly to retain the author APC. See for example the AIP journal *AIP Advances*.

## 7.4 Same or New Publisher After Conversion

### Eve Gray

There have been cases of painless and fairly rapid conversion of university-based journals to OA. A fairly typical case is the African Journal of Information and Communication, based at the Link Centre, a research centre at the University of the Witwatersrand in Johannesburg. In 2006 the journal switched to an open access model. The process as I recall it was relatively painless - a series of discussions about practical issues and implementation rather than the need for any slow transfer process. If one looks at the [journal site](#) now, all the issues are available online OA, although it is from 2006 that CC licences were applied.

In good part this ease of transfer draws on a background of South African radical anti apartheid action in the universities, In the 1970s and onwards, student movements and radical research units distributed their publications in underground mode, printed in secret and distributed through informal networks.

However, this was not only a South African tradition: Codesria, the West African science council based in Dakar, has, as Francis Nyamnjoh, a former publisher at Codesria, argues, published open access for 37 years. This is open access in a pre-technological phase. As Nyamnjoh argues, "Codesria was created as an intellectual space actively to promote, and sustain a specifically African dimension of that global quest for a third or alternative voice on world issues... To achieve this, Codesria, in line with its Pan-African mandate, adopted and has improved over the last 37 years, an open access functioning that privileges balance and representation along gender, generational, regional, disciplinary and linguistic lines, aimed at representing the realities and complexities of the African continent". Codesria publications, in line with this philosophy - its monographs, conference and seminar papers and non current issues of journal articles are available for PDF download, open access. Collaboration and rendering visible African perspectives are part of this mission.

Francis B Nyamnjoh, Institutional Review: Open Access and Open Knowledge Production: Lessons from Codesria. *African Journal of Information and Communication*, 10 2009/10, pp. 67-72.

AJIC thematic Issue on Scholarly Communication and Access to Knowledge 2009-10  
<https://www.wits.ac.za/linkcentre/ajic/ajic-issue-10-20092010/>

### 7.4.1 Staying with the Same Publisher

#### Description

The journal stays with the same publisher after the conversion.

**Relevant publisher types:** Societies that are either self-publishing their journal(s) or contracting with a commercial publisher for publishing services

**Relevant pre-requisites:** A highly ranked journal with a relatively large article volume or with a narrow field and limited subscriptions

**Most relevant disciplines:** STM

**Relevant goals for flipping:** Increasing the journal's revenue, impact, and readership

**Strengths:** The journal's entire infrastructure, including editors, remains in place. Often, the chosen journals are high-tier, or have strong society backing, which minimizes the risk of dwindling submissions.

**Weaknesses:** This method may discourage submissions from authors without funding for an APC.

**Opportunities:** If successful, this method may encourage publisher to more conversions. The impact of the journal may increase.

**Threats:** If the journal does not get enough submissions or APCs to cover its marginal costs the publisher may cease to publish earlier than a struggling subscription journal might otherwise as a subscription journal.

#### Background

There are two variations to this scenario. In the first, the journal is owned by the publisher (commercial, university, or large society press). In the second, a society contracts with an external publisher for the publishing services. In both cases, pressure from the academic community in question, in particular the editors and editorial board, can be a decisive factor influencing the conversion (Jaschik 2015).

For a large publisher, which owns the journal in question, the conversion cannot be viewed in isolation from the overall journal portfolio and the business strategy. These publishers have typically converted individual journals in order to start experimenting with OA and the APC model or sought a more lucrative business model for high quality journals with limited subscriptions (Meadows 2015). Similarly, these publishers often start new OA journals. The same publishers have also, in the last few years, started to offer a hybrid APC option for most of their journals (Björk 2012).

The motivations of small societies are somewhat different. Often, the journal in question is the only journal owned by the society. In the case of societies from regions that are not well-represented by English-language journals, there might be a strong ideological element of support from authors from the region, but these societies may feel they can gain international recognition and expand readership by converting their journal to OA.

#### **Jean-Claude Guédon**

The distinction between a journal owned by the publisher, and a journal owned by a society or some body of scholars/researchers independent from the publisher, is crucial. In the first case, the issue is almost moot as the editorial board then is forced to create a new journal – a case covered earlier with *Lingua*. If the publisher wants to flip the journal, it is indeed within the context of a more general business strategy which, in the last analysis, may not have much to do with the best interests of the affected research communities, but much more to do with revenue and profit. Alternatively, the publisher may be a public entity functioning within the confines of universities that must respond to new demands from research funders. However, in the latter case, direct ownership of the journals using the services of an academic platform or a consortium is not common.

#### **Pippa Smart**

Background - this is not related to the decision to stay with the same publisher  
I wonder what the point of this section is? What is being said here could be incorporated with 7.4.2

### **Examples**

#### [Nucleic Acids Research \(NAR\)](#)

*NAR* was one of the first converted journals from a major publisher, OUP (Bird 2008). The journal had a high publication volume at the time of its conversion in 2004 and currently has an exceptionally high publication volume for its field, with 1,532 articles annually. Similar journals like *Cell* and *Embo Journal*, which are both highly ranked and have a high hybrid share, publish 436 and 181 articles respectively. All in all, the output of *NAR* encompasses one third of all the articles published by the top 20 journals in its field, according to Journal Citation Reports.

*NAR* was one of OUP's first ventures OA, and they chose their flagship journals for this experiment. Subsequently, OUP opened up a number of journals for hybrid OA (Bird 2008).

#### [Stem Cell Research](#)

*Stem Cell Research* was launched by Elsevier in 2007, and the number of papers it published rapidly increased to around 200 per year between 2011 and 2013. In terms of scientific quality and prestige, the journal mid-tier in its field with an impact factor of 3.6. The journal converted to full OA in 2014 with an APC of 1,800 USD (Boersma 2013). At some point, the journal also de facto transformed into a mega-journal. Its website states that "*Stem Cell Research* collaborates with journals published by Cell Press. Our editorial board is happy to consider submissions



reviewed at *Cell Stem Cell* or other *Cell Press* journals, which are considered to be scientifically sound, but not impactful enough for the readership of *Cell Press* journals. Authors should include their *Cell Press* reviews (which will be confirmed by *Cell Press*) for fast-track consideration” (Elsevier 2015). In this case, it appears that rather than launching a new, broad scope OA journal, the publisher has chosen to convert an existing subscription journal for this purpose.

### [Conservation Letters](#)

In the case of *Conservation Letters*, the initiative to convert also came from the publisher (Wiley), which was planning to convert another journal and suggested that the Society for Conservation Biology convert this one as well (Wiley 2012). This recommendation well-received due to the low share of OA journals in the field. Also, *Conservation Letters* aims to reach policy makers in society, who often do not have subscription access. Other Wiley journals that flipped in 2014 include [Cancer Research](#), a journal published on behalf of the Japanese Cancer Association, and [Journal of Diabetes Investigation](#), published on behalf of the Asian Association for the Study of Diabetes (AASD). In the case of AASD, the APCs are waived for certain categories of society members in developing countries.

Recently, pressure from the editors and academic community to convert failed in the case Elsevier journal [Lingua](#). All of its editors and editorial board members resigned and started a new journal of their own because Elsevier refused to convert (Jaschik 2015).

### **Summary**

When major publishers have converted journals, either their own or journals they publish on behalf of societies, the conversions have to be seen in the context of the publisher’s overall OA strategy. Such strategies may also include introducing hybrid OA and launching new OA journals, which may include mega-journals existing symbiotically with more selective subscription journals from the same or even a group of publishers, and even green OA policies. Because there has not yet been a strong pressure to convert, the publishers have tried to pick low-risk journals with a strong business case to support the conversion.

#### **Rebecca Kennison**

The observation that “conversions have to be seen in the context of the publisher’s overall OA strategy” is salient. Each of the Big Five has been clear as to what their strategy is. Elsevier, for example, has explicitly stated that they can and will convert poor-performing or low-ranked journals, but that they will not convert their money-making, highly ranked journals — especially when they would lose serious revenue from journals that have low publishing volume but are highly subscribed, such as *Lingua*. Even if the demands of the editors had been less radical, *Lingua* could not be converted because Elsevier does not have a plan to flip that kind of journal — and it’s questionable whether anyone does, at least yet, although that’s one of the goals of the Open Access Network pilot, to think about collective funding support for high-end journals. Starting up an OA alternative from scratch is often much easier than flipping an existing journal

— but creating a parallel universe of content does not solve the problem exploding costs. PLOS Biology did not replace Nature, nor will *Glossa* replace *Lingua*; instead, now both venues exist and both cost money to run.

#### **Alice Meadows**

For journals/disciplines where a sound business case can be made for moving a journal OA, this is a good solution. It's true, as the report's authors say, that publishers tend to be cautious about moving to OA but that's not necessarily a bad thing, especially in the case of society journals outsourced to a publisher, where the publisher has a (sometimes large and/or guaranteed) commitment to a continuing/growing level of revenue for the society that they must be confident they can meet. Moving publishers can result in considerable disruption for a journal's staff, authors, readers, and customers so there's a lot to be said for "the devil you know".

#### **Caroline Sutton**

(This comment also applies to 7.4.2.) I am not sure that these are necessarily scenarios for converting. Rather they might be more of some of the parameters around converting, i.e. whether you can achieve your goals with your current partner or need to make a move to do so. These same dynamics were also behind subscription journals. When you wanted a new or better deal you could choose to work with your current publisher or move to a new team.

This differentiation was probably more pertinent earlier when most legacy publishers were shying away from OA. Today "everyone" has an OA portfolio whether or not it is alongside a subscription portfolio or within a full OA list of titles. This makes it possible to transition and stay with your current partner.

At Co-Action we certainly saw a shift after the legacy publishers jumped in the game in a serious way. Earlier we might be tendering to publish a society title and it was us (choosing OA) or one of the others (remaining as a subscription journal). Today a journal wanting to move to OA does not have to leave their current publisher and the bidding ends up being more about price and services rather than OA (move) or not OA (remain). The current marketplace offers a wide array of choices among publishers.

## **7.4.2 Switching to a Different Publisher**

### **Description**

It is quite common for journals to change publishers when they flip to an OA model. For example, a society may want to outsource publishing activities that have previously been done in-house or switch from one professional publisher to another. One common situation is transitioning from a traditionally subscription-based publisher to a publisher who uses an APC-funded OA model for most or all of its journals. It is also possible for a society to switch from a subscription-based publisher to a low-cost self-publishing model using society resources and volunteer effort. Flipping a journal to OA might also include some modifications to the journal, such as scope or level of publishing services.

**Relevant publisher types:** Societies that are either self-publishing their journal(s) or contracting with a commercial publisher for publishing services

**Relevant pre-requisites:** Support within the membership to transition to an OA model and its financial implications; a workable business model has been developed with the future publisher; contract with the current publisher (if relevant) must allow termination of the agreement and a change of publisher

**Most relevant disciplines:** All disciplines, although the funding may differ. An APC model is most appropriate for STM journals. Other funding models are more viable in the social sciences and humanities.

**Relevant goals for flipping:** Changing publishers to better align with the type of OA funding model most appropriate for the journal; achieving the benefits of OA using a publisher that is better aligned with the funding model used

**Strengths:** Re-evaluating and re-negotiating the publishing arrangement can facilitate a well-planned transition from a subscription to OA publishing. Changing to a publisher with more extensive experience in OA publishing is likely to be beneficial for future success of the journal (Busch 2014b). Changing publishers allows a society or other journal owner to revisit the conditions under which the journal is published. Issues such as digital rights and licensing can be renegotiated to be more consistent with OA.

**Weaknesses:** A transition from one publishing system to another often requires a significant change in workflow, which can be very disruptive, expensive and time consuming. Negotiating access to previously published content can be challenging and if the right to the content can be obtained, making it available can be expensive and labor intensive. An extensive marketing campaign will likely be needed to inform readers and authors about the changes in the journal and avoid confusion. This will likely include a change in the URL from which content is accessed which can result in confusion and the loss of traffic.

**Opportunities:** Changing to a well-established and reputable publisher with a professional marketing strategy can improve the reputation of a journal and increase submissions and citations (Busch 2014b; Goldman 2012). Some portion of the society membership is likely to support the change. A new publisher with a seasoned staff and journal management system geared toward an OA business model can streamline the production process and work with the editorial board to improve the operation of the journal.

**Threats:** Changing both the business model and the publisher used by a journal is a major shift with potentially serious financial consequences. There is likely to be some level of resistance to the change from the society membership. This is particularly true if the change results in a loss of income for the society. Changing both the business model and the publisher can be very confusing for authors and readers and has the potential to evoke a negative reaction, significantly reducing the number of submissions.

## **Examples**

### [Polar Research](#)

*Polar Research* was founded in 1982 by the Norwegian Polar Institute. “It was produced in-house until 2007 when it joined forces with Wiley Blackwell. In 2010 the partnership with Wiley ended, and Polar Research successfully became a fully OA journal, funded by the Institute” (Goldman 2012). The journal is now published by Co-Action Publishing and charges an APC of 180 USD per page for articles over five typeset pages. Polar Research is an example of a journal that transitioned from self-publishing by an institute, to a major professional subscription publisher, and finally transitioned to a mid-size OA publisher subsidized by the Institute but also charged APCs. The journal has made the transition to OA successfully; it publishes a large number of articles and is indexed widely, with a mid-range citation rate for journals in its field.

### [European Journal of Medical Research \(EJMR\)](#)

*EJMR* was originally a subscription-based print journal that flipped to a digital-only OA journal published by BioMed Central. The journal was founded in 1995 and published by Holzapfel Verlag until it transitioned to OA in 2011. Submissions dipped initially but are bouncing back, while citations have remained similar to when the journal was subscription-based (Busch and Häussinger 2012). *EJMR* is APC-funded OA and its new publisher, BMC, publishes digital-only OA journals funded mainly by APCs. BMC publishes well over 40 journals that were originally subscription journals. In some cases, the journals that follow this transition path receive subsidies for the transition from grants or other sources (Cooney-McQuat, Busch, and Kahn 2010).

### [Canadian Journal of Sociology](#)

The *Canadian Journal of Sociology* was originally an independent journal set up in 1975 as a not-for-profit organization. It has a broad scope as a general sociology journal. By the time its conversion to OA was initiated in 2007, the journal’s status as a charitable organization had lapsed, and the governance structure of the journal was unclear, with the journal largely run by the editor-in-chief. The journal was being published on a contract basis by the University of Toronto Press and had a fairly large and stable subscription base. There was also an electronic offshoot from the journal, started in 1995, that published a few articles and several books OA. An electronic version of the articles in the journal were available through aggregator services. The journal is now self-published using OJS and is funded through a grant from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada with additional support from the department of sociology at the University of Alberta. The transition to OA was largely the work of the current editor, Kevin D. Haggerty. Currently, the bilingual journal operates successfully, publishing a substantial number of articles in both French and English. A complete description of the transition of the *Canadian Journal of Sociology* is presented in the article “Case Studies in Open Access Publishing” (Haggerty 2008), from which this summary is largely taken.

[Paladyn: Journal of Behavioral Robotics](#)

*Paladyn* was subscription-based through Springer for its first four years of publication, but has changed publishers, moving to Versita (De Gruyter), as part of the flip to OA in 2014. There is no APC currently, so that metrics and reputation can be built up, but the plan is to start charging APCs in 2017 (Kieńć 2014).

### **Summary**

The journals discussed in this section demonstrate a variety of situations wherein a journal switched publishers while successfully flipping to an OA model. Both *Polar Research* and *EJMR* chose commercial publishers that focus on publishing OA journals. Both received some external support but rely on APCs. The *Canadian Journal of Sociology* took a very different path. The journal was published by a university press but transitioned to a low-cost, self-published OA journal relying on grant funding from the Canadian government. Each of the three journals has successfully transitioned to OA and demonstrates a variety of ways that changing publishers can be part of the transition to OA.

#### **Martin Eve**

Just as a comment, the risks here of moving publisher can be mitigated by pre-soliciting academic support and ensuring that disciplinary communities are aware of the move.

#### **Jean-Claude Guédon**

Generally speaking, this solution is not designed to achieve OA; rather, it corresponds to a reactive stance in the face of difficulties or forms of resistance expressed by the publisher. Changing publisher is always a difficult decision which often implies increased costs, at least on the short term. The change in the workflow is crucially important in this regard. However, as the report correctly notes, it also opens possibilities to negotiate better publishing terms. In the case of the *Canadian Journal of Sociology*, it should be noted that the University of Toronto Press has never been much in favour of Open Access. *CJS* reacted to this. University presses need to be carefully analyzed in this regard, as their behaviour can vary from total support to stark opposition. The support of the Social Science and Humanities Research Council of Canada, was always there in the case *CJS*; it simply became more “central” as the editor, Kevin Haggerty, puts it. The summary does not make this detail clear and leaves the impression that, now, the journal depends on public subsidies. It always did. In fact UTP would have demanded it.

#### **Alice Meadows**

If the decision is made to move to another publisher (or switch away from self-publishing) specifically in order to move to OA, all parties need to be very clear about the risks and opportunities of that transition. This can be more difficult than it sounds if, for example, the journal/society is conceptually committed to OA without understanding the potential impact on its income, and/or the publisher is over-confident about revenue projections in order to win the new business. This is generally a riskier strategy than 7.4.1 but can be successful in the right circumstances.

**Caroline Sutton**

See my comment on 7.4.1, which also applies here.

### 7.4.3 Partnering with a Low-Cost External Publisher or Publishing Service Provider

#### Description

There are several efficient low-cost publishers and service providers that can significantly reduce the cost of publishing services using economies of scale. Depending on the provider and the plan, they can provide most or all the services traditional publishers provide or a subset of technical services such as basic hosting and maintenance/support for a journal management system and archiving. They can be particularly useful for societies or other organizations whose publishing operations are too small to be very efficient. Low-cost professional-quality publishing services can help make it feasible to transition existing subscription journals to other funding models. These publishers and publishing service providers can be either commercial or nonprofit, though most of the exiting publishers are nonprofit.

**Relevant publisher types:** Societies, special interest groups, universities, libraries, and other groups of scholars with only a single or few journals

**Relevant pre-requisites:** Most useful for a society or other group with a single or a couple of journals publishing relatively few articles per year

**Most relevant disciplines:** Likely specialized, regional, or niche journals; appropriate for social sciences and humanities

**Relevant goals for flipping:** Increased readership, reduced costs, providing professional publishing services, avoiding the need for volunteer labor, facilitating a self-sustaining business model

**Strengths:** This method provides low-cost but professional-quality publishing services for organizations without the scale for efficient publishing. It reduces the challenge of funding, making it easier to develop a stable business model. It relieves the organization that owns the journal of the technical portion of the day-to-day publishing activities.

**Weaknesses:** This method generally provides only basic publishing services. The journal may need to forego services such as high quality copy-editing, which may be important for authors and readers.

**Opportunities:** There is the potential of implementing a sustainable business models in disciplines with little available funding.

**Threats:** Even with reduced publishing costs, the business model may not be sustainable. The possible lack of services such as high-quality copy-editing may damage the reputation of the journal, particularly in the arts and humanities.

**Jean-Claude Guédon**

The *Weaknesses* may not apply to all “low-cost” external publishers. EDP Science, for example, appears to provide most of the services a journal could desire while doing it at a relatively low

cost. This may be due to the fact that I suspect EDP Science to be financed by the French government, perhaps indirectly through subsidies to the societies that own EDP Science. One should also add that “high-quality copy editing” is not necessarily guaranteed by high costs. I have seen examples of little or no copy editing in high-cost publishers. I have even experienced mistakes added to one of my texts in a piece I wrote years ago for IOP. The two variables simply do not correlate well.

#### **Alice Meadows**

As the report’s authors say, this could be a useful option in social sciences and humanities, where there is usually a lower volume of papers published combined with lower revenue expectations/needs.

#### **Pippa Smart**

“High quality copy editing” is a very poor example of what publishers provide – this is one of the minor things that they offer (and many of them do not offer it). What they do offer, and which is not captured by this section includes: Assistance with editorial office management (software and staff); Editorial strategy (advice and mentoring); Copyediting; Typesetting/design; Administration of production; Online file creation; Online platform; Deposit of journal with indexing and archiving and repositories (e.g. PMC); Metrics (reports on user trends, hot topics, etc.); Printing and dispatch; Marketing; Market research (reader/author surveys, analysis, etc.); Strategy (advice on business, workflows, delivery mechanisms, etc.); Rights management (including helping challenge piracy and other illegal uses); Advice and involvement with initiatives (e.g. CrossMark, ORCID, etc.).

This is really not a service provided by publishers! (It is probably one of the least things they do - and as an editor myself, one of the things that even they do not pretend to provide): what they do provide is a basic technical edit, which is not provided by online hosting providers and some publishers.

### **Background**

Publishing requires resources and a variety of technical skills. The resources needed to publish a journal can be significantly reduced through economies of scale. The vast majority of societies and other nonprofits that publish journals publish on a very small scale. 90 percent of society publishers publish a single journal and 97 percent publish three or fewer journals (Crow 2006), often lacking the economy of scale to publish their journals efficiently. This puts them at a significant disadvantage in competing with larger organizations, whether they choose to publish via the subscription model or OA via another business model.

A number of relatively new OA publishers have focused on providing efficient and cost-effective publishing services, generally partnering with societies, universities, and other organizations to publish low cost OA journals. The cost and publishing services provided vary with each publisher.



The services vary, but generally include web hosting for the journal and providing web-based journal management support for peer review and other publishing tasks. They also generally provide permanent archiving and backup support. Some of these companies provide more complete services, such as formatting and XML generation, assigning DOIs, and providing managing editorial support. In some cases, when they do not provide a specific service a journal needs, they can serve as the “middle man” for obtaining services from another company.

## **Examples**

### [EDP Sciences/EDP Open EDP Sciences](#)

EDP is learned-society–owned publisher established in 1920 that launched EDP Open in 2014. EDP Open is a dedicated OA imprint and web platform to support society journals transitioning or creating new OA journals. The publisher provides heavily discounted APCs for all authors (in the 400 USD range ) in the OA journals they publish.

### [PKP Publishing Services](#)

PKP is part of the Public Knowledge Project and provides a range of journal hosting services using OJS, which was developed by the project. Along with hosting, services include regular backup, metadata for harvesting, and archiving via LOCKSS. The most basic plan, probably adequate for a small journal, is 850 USD per year. This includes basic support and a range of standard style templates for the journal website. The highest level of service for 2,700 USD per year places the journal on a commercial grade server and provides low-level access to the journal’s database, four hours of expert support, custom style templates for the journal website, and Crossref membership with up to 200 DOI’s.

### [Scholarly Exchange](#)

Scholarly Exchange is an OA publishing platform set up in 2002 as a 501(c)(3) not-for-profit corporation. They provide basic journal hosting services using OJS. The material is also archived in LOCKSS. The service is free for the first year to help journals become established; after this initial period, the charge is 750 USD per year. Its main focus is providing technical support for a journal management and hosting system. Rather than provide a great deal of additional support, they provide links to other resources for clients in need of additional publishing support. The Scholarly Exchange appears to be geared toward newly formed OA journals but could be used as a very low cost platform by a small society or other organization that is considering transitioning from subscription to OA.

### [Ubiquity Press](#)

Ubiquity Press is a very efficient OA publisher of both journals and books. It is a spin-off company founded by researchers at the University College London in 2012. Ubiquity Press seeks to publish society and university journals. It is funded by a relatively low APC of around 500 USD. For the charge, Ubiquity Press provides full-service publishing, including a peer review/journal management system based on OJS, managing editor support, and standard



article processing and production such as typesetting and file generation, assigning DOIs, and permanent archiving. Societies, if they so choose, can charge a higher APC and use the additional revenue to help fund their activities. Ubiquity Press will also negotiate license agreements with organizations.

**Falk Reckling (FWF)**

Interesting here is also the [partnership between Ubiquity Press and Stockholm UP](#).

**Summary**

Reducing costs can be just as effective as generating additional income. Cost reduction through the use of a low-cost professional publisher or provider of publishing services can greatly assist small societies and other organizations with a few journals and without the technical resources to publish their journals on their own. There appear to be a growing number of options for organizations seeking a low cost publisher providing a variety of options with different pricing and levels of service.

**Virginia Barbour**

This is a model that has the potential to introduce diversity into the scholarly publishing landscape, as well as sustainability.

**Eve Gray**

Given the small size and volunteer status of many African journals, there are problems of capacity and resourcing. As the motivations for flipping to OA grew, there were businesses that set up or expanded their business models, to offer services and hosting to these journals. These can be seen as outsourced publishing service companies - a feature of the publishing industry in Africa in other sectors as well.

One such an example, with a comprehensive range of services, is [AOSIS](#) in Cape Town and published a [growing list of journals](#)). It is committed to open access as its core business model, enabling effective knowledge access through the most appropriate technology. The company also offers professional development courses and the development of e-learning services.

For its journal publications, AOSIS offers a raft of services, including OJS online journal management and a range of publishing and production services. The aim is professionalize the production process and provide support for the editorial team. AOSIS is a member of OASPA.

Another company positioning itself in the scholarly publishing field, although currently dealing more with books than with journals, is [African Minds](#).

Both of these companies were early movers in open access scholarly publishing, setting up in the early days of OA publishing development in South Africa.

**Rebecca Kennison**

Regarding sections 7.4.2 and 7.4.3: I am putting commenting on these two scenarios together, since they seem somewhat related. Changing publishers or self-publishing might be the best route for low-cost operations that aren't making tons of money for the publisher. These types of publications seem a particularly good fit for library-based publishing partnerships.

For larger publishing operations with more risk factors, switching to a different publisher might prove more complicated, even if they're looking to switch to an OA-friendly operation. It's intriguing to speculate whether the American Anthropological Association, if they'd stayed with UC Press, might have been able to flip their journals to OA by now, but it's not likely that UC Press would want to take them on as clients again — although that's merely speculation on my part!

The good news is that technology barriers to publishing get lower and lower all the time, so either partnering with a low-cost provider or self-publishing can be done more easily by non-technical staff. New platforms are being developed all the time that can be leveraged by new groups providing publishing services — especially notable are the platforms under development right now by the [Collaborative Knowledge Foundation](#) and by various Mellon-funded projects, such as [Vega](#).

**Iryna Kuchma**

This scenario works in developing and transition countries, and I endorse it.

**Lisa Norberg**

Each of these scenarios (7.4.1, 7.4.2, 7.4.3) could have their unique advantages and disadvantages depending on the situation of the particular society or journal publisher. In general, I would encourage small societies to consider switching or partnering with a non-profit university press or low-cost publisher to at the very least begin to reduce their costs and position themselves for an OA future.

**Pippa Smart**

In this section (but also elsewhere) there is confusion between what publishers (e.g. Wiley) do versus what journal hosting sites (e.g. IngentaConnect and PKP) do. This becomes particularly important when new players enter the market, because there is an assumption that only the services of a hosting platform are required and that the journal owner can do everything else.

This difference is not helped because some publishers only offer a hosting service to some Associations. I found that in places your document seemed to confuse these two types of providers.

**7.4.4 Partnering with a Major Global Publisher****Description**

This scenario plays out when small, often society- or association-based journals establish a publishing partnership with a major commercial publisher as part of a plan to flip to an OA

business model. To date this has occurred mainly with Asian English-language journals indexed in the Web of Science and within the STM disciplines –although, in theory, the practice could be used in other areas of the world.

**Jean-Claude Guédon**

I do not understand why this scenario should primarily concern Asian journals. Springer has opened an office in São Paulo, staffed with a former SciELO employee, simply to attract the journals deemed to be most profitable and part of SciELO. *Computational and Applied Mathematics* became a Springer journal in 2013. The reality is that the publi-oligarchs know that the size of their journal collection matters. As a result, they constantly monitor journals produced everywhere, including in Western countries, to see which ones might be profitably added.

**Pippa Smart**

“Primarily concerns Asian journals” really? And again this conflates flipping to OA with publishing online.

**Relevant publisher types:** Society or association publisher flipping to a society/association co-published with a commercial publisher

**Relevant pre-requisites:** High-quality English-language journal

**Most scientific disciplines:** All

**Relevant goals for flipping:**

*For the acquiring publisher:* Increased coverage of high-quality non-western journals. APC funding model has the potential to become financially lucrative if the journal succeeds with maintaining its scientific quality as an OA journal with likely higher counts of published articles.

*For the journal (and society/association):* A way of increasing the visibility and prestige of a prospering regional journal. Increasing international submissions as well as readers particularly in Western Europe and North America. Gaining the expertise and infrastructure of a major professional publisher.

**Strengths:** Increased visibility is provided by partnering with a large global publisher. There is also the benefit of leveraging the technical infrastructure of a large publisher, providing support for the complete editorial process.

**Weaknesses:** Partnering with a large publisher often results in less autonomy. An APC is often introduced in conjunction with the transition to OA, an APC which may limit the ability of authors from the region to publish in the journal. This might alienate the loyal authors who have published in the journal, risking a backlash from loyal readers of the journal.

**Opportunities:** There is potential for growth and internationalization in both readership and authorship. This partnership offers a way for western commercial publishers to diversify their journal portfolio.

**Threats:** The regional and disciplinary identity, and strength of backing from regional authors, might be lessened when the journal is pushed for increased publication volume from a global audience.

#### Jean-Claude Guédon

The distinction between owning the title and simply selling services to a title is crucial here. If the former, the journal is going to be integrated in the existing “global” (as distinguished from “international”). With the added obstacle of APCs which the report correctly identifies, the journal is essentially uprooted from its original community and its particular concerns to become part of the “core science” that reflects more the interests and emphases of scientific research in rich countries. I am aware that this is a somewhat controversial thesis which is not yet fully developed and demonstrated, but, in the context of such a report, I wanted to bring this issue to light to signal that the way science has expanded and is expanding in the last couple of centuries is not without some important problems of its own. The threats mentioned in the report do actually allude to these questions.

(More on the distinction between globalization and internationalization: “Globalization” refers to an ever wider extension of North-Atlantic initiated science, including a continuing control over which questions are the more interesting ones for science in general. This has led to some very serious problems being neglected, particularly in health and agricultural fields. Internationalization, by contrast refers to a kind of scientific development where issues and questions could be raised and studied without immediately condemning this kind of work to regional marginalization. These issues vary greatly from field to field, of course, but a distinction should be maintained between the terms “globalization” and “internationalization”.)

#### Pippa Smart

Relevant goals - not all of these journals are APC funded (in fact in my experience few are, most are institutionally funded).

See also the Lin 2016 *Learned Publishing* article about goals for Chinese journals “quick success” mentioned above.

### **Examples**

#### [Annals of Occupational and Environmental Medicine](#) (AOEM)

AEOM is the official academic journal of the Korean Society of Occupational and Environmental Medicine (KSOEM). The journal flipped to OA in 2013 and is currently published by BMC. KSOEM is the first Korean society journal to transition to OA with a commercial OA publisher. Authors based in the Republic of Korea can apply for a discounted APC of 800 EUR; for others the APC is 1540 EUR. As of 2015, KSOEM had not received an impact factor.

#### [Petroleum Science](#)

Petroleum Science flipped to OA in 2015 through SpringerOpen. The journal is sponsored by China University of Petroleum and enjoys the assistance of the Science & Technology

Department of CNPC and three research institutes under the three major oil corporations, China National Petroleum Corporation (CNPC), Sinopec, and China National Offshore Oil Corporation (CNOOC). The journal's 2014 impact factor was 0.721.

The Springer Chinese Library of Science

[Chinese Science Bulletin](#), with a 2014 impact factor of 1.579; [Science China Life Sciences](#), with a 2014 impact factor of 1.688; and [Photonic Sensors](#), currently without an impact factor, were added to the SpringerOpen portfolio in 2011 as part of Springer's Chinese Library of Science (CLOs). Chinese Science Bulletin and Science China Life Sciences are co-published by Science China Press and Springer. Photonic Sensors is co-published with the University of Electronic Science and Technology of China.

[Earth, Planets and Space](#) (EPS)

Springer started OA publication of EPS in 2014 on behalf of five academic societies in Japan. EPS is the official journal of The Society of Geomagnetism and Earth, Planetary and Space Sciences; The Seismological Society of Japan; The Volcanological Society of Japan; The Geodetic Society of Japan; and The Japanese Society for Planetary Sciences. EPS was formerly published by Terrapub under a traditional subscription model. The impact factor for 2014 was 1.328.

## **Summary**

This scenario has been used successfully in countries that have been industrializing very quickly and are developing strong research infrastructures but whose journals, to date, have lacked the international stature. Partnering with a major global publisher offers one approach to gaining that stature.

### **Eve Gray**

There has been a trend towards large international publishers targeting African journals, particularly in the wake of criticisms of the neo-colonial nature of the criteria for what constitutes "impact" in as defined for "international" journal publishing. "International" was defined as being of relevance to the global North. The developing world and its interests were seen as "local". In the wake of a more expansive definition of "impact", Taylor and Francis in particular, made a concerted effort to garner African journals in the humanities and social sciences and now has a [long list of such journals](#).

In this context, two interesting co-publishing partnerships were created, with [UNISA Press](#) and [NISC](#). These allow for the retention of the South African publishing presence, with differential pricing for the print versions in Africa and the UK respectively, but have also created the possibility for OA hybrid publishing through the UK version of the journal. APCs are payable, at T&F rates to open up the article via the UK edition, which means that authors would need subsidy to be able to afford the comparatively high APCs. This is attractive to authors wanting the prestige offered by an international publisher yet retaining their local presence. It does appear, however, that this deal may disqualify the T&F journals from inclusion in the SciELO

platform, which is strictly for locally published South African journals, even though these journals have South African editorial teams.

Elsevier and Wiley are among other large global publishers are targeting African journals or creating new open access journals with African societies or research associations. In these cases, the benefits of internationalisation have to be offset by the risk of a loss of local control in circumstances in which there is sensitivity about the need to decolonise African universities. An expensive way, perhaps, of flipping journals, but one that does address capacity issues.

**Jean-Claude Guédon**

The summary should be extended to all regions of the world where rapid economic growth is observed. Latin America is an obvious example of this situation, but countries, including African countries such as South Africa, Nigeria, and probably others, are potential targets of the publi-oligarchs.

**Rebecca Kennison**

I actually find this scenario baffling, given what I just said above about low barriers to publishing. It seems these groups might better spend their money hiring a marketing firm rather than choosing to publish with one of the Big Five.

**Iryna Kuchma**

I'd like to discourage this confusing scenario. Partnering with a Major Global Publisher does indeed often result in less autonomy, and can be a very [dangerous move](#).

**Alice Meadows**

I don't see this as significantly different to 7.4.2.

**Pippa Smart**

Even though this section is about APC funded journals (including the goals) several of your examples are not APC funded.

## 8 NON-APC-FUNDED SCENARIOS

### Pippa Smart

Conflating rationale for selecting open access with choosing to publish online.

Many journals, especially those outside the UK/USA regions automatically made their journals free online when they started digital publishing. Therefore their journals did not ever “flip” as such. The rationale for publishing a journal in regions such as China, India, African countries, etc., is often tied in with institutional reputation, desire to publish their own research, etc., and the financial model was always envisaged as institutional funding (by the parent organization). This is particularly the case in Latin America for example. In many cases the printed journal never had a financial model beyond institutional funding (with some occasional sales (often selling individual issues rather than subscription), or recouping of direct print costs).

Therefore there is a confusion between the decision to make a journal “open access” and the decision to make it available online. This has been evidenced through surveys/research done by [INASP](#) and [AJOL](#) that sought to find out people's rationale for making journals OA - the rationale for OA is often conflated with the rationale for making it online - visibility, access, reach, technology, attractiveness to authors, etc.

### 8.1 Society Subsidy

#### Description

This section examines societies using income from other sources to subsidize flipping journal to OA without requiring article processing charges. A society can form a publication partnership with a professional publisher, or the society itself can publish the journal.

#### Jean-Claude Guédon

Societies have significantly, albeit silently, changed their business model in the time of the “Serial Pricing Crisis”. Originally, societies allowed individual scientists, particularly those standing on the margins of the scientific enterprise, to band together to form an association. This decreased the sense of isolation that “provincial” scientists might have felt, especially those that could not easily join academies or universities. Societies collected dues which they often translated into a journal. The journal was produced for the benefit of the members, both as writers of articles, and as readers. But the journal did more: the society could print more copies than it had members, and it could barter these extra copies with similar societies elsewhere, and even with other institutions publishing scientific journals. With one journal, one could thus build a library of journals serving a local community of researchers.

When the “serials pricing crisis” hit, i.e. somewhere in the ‘70s and after – we are still in this situation – societies began to understand that their journals were very cheap in comparison with the prices practised by the likes of Robert Maxwell and its Pergamon Press (now part of Elsevier). Societies then began to increase the subscription prices of their journals, so much so that their main source of revenue became the journal(s) subscriptions rather than the members’

dues. With this money, they financed conferences, prizes, scholarships, workshops, etc. They also strengthened their publishing capacity and, among the bigger societies, they began to multiply journals. The American Chemical Society is a good example of this trend.

When a society supports a journal financially to place it in OA, it actually tends to revert back to its original vocation (and financial stance). However, the impulse to do so will vary greatly from society to society. Those societies, particularly the big ones such as ACS, IEEE, etc., actually cling to the newer business model. ACS is famous for its long-lasting resistance to OA, and when it finally decided to have an OA journal, it began charging [very high APC rates](#). On the other hand, smaller society, especially societies with fragile journals, may well be tempted to flip their journal to improve their visibility. In some ways, this strategy attempts to correct a sense of increasing marginalization and invisibility. In many ways, it parallels what whole nations feel when analyzing the ways to promote their scientific output internationally.

We have already seen an example of this with the Korean example of *Ultrasonography*. It is indeed mentioned again in this section of the report, as is the Journal of the American Water Works Association. However, in the latter case, as pointed earlier, this is mainly a professional, not a research-oriented journal.

**Relevant publisher types:** Scholarly Societies

**Relevant pre-requisites:** Good finances via membership fees, conference overhead, etc.

**Most relevant disciplines:** All

**Relevant goals for flipping:** Service to members and the research field in question in increasing the impact of journal; improved image of the society

**Strengths:** The journals in question are often well established, and flipping to OA may further increase submissions.

**Weaknesses:** Some other society activity or resource must absorb cuts in funding to allow funds to be used for publishing. Loss of perceived society member benefits.

**Opportunities:** There will likely be increased visibility of the journal, which may enhance the image of the society. There is, therefore, the possibility to increase readership and further the aims of the society.

**Threats:** If the journal has been free to members (as part of the benefits of personal membership in the society), transitioning to OA could result in loss of memberships, which would further damage the society's finances in addition to the loss of subscription income.

## **Background**

This is a relatively frequent scenario because there is pressure from the members and authors for OA, and societies offer a good infrastructure (such as governance and recurrent conferences) for opportunities to discuss the issue of flipping. There are three factors that can be used to structure the scenario in more detail. First, whether the society publishes one or several journals. In the latter case, the income from the other journals might be used to



subsidize the flipped journal. Secondly, the discipline is important because researchers in some disciplines are much more likely to have access to adequate funding for covering APCs as compared with others. Also, if the journal has a lot of review articles, solicited articles, and non-peer reviewed content, this model may be more appropriate than an APC funding model since this content would not receive APC funding. Third, the audience and type of articles are important considerations. Journals that also have a strong appeal for readers outside active researchers are better candidates for flipping than highly academic ones.

The opinions of the membership are important for making the flipping decision. To what extent is the membership willing to pay higher dues and conference fees or give up services provided by the organization to make their journals open? Often there is a very committed and vocal minority pushing to transition the society's journals to OA, but it may not be as much of an issue for the majority of members, who will often resist sacrifices needed to transition journals. Societies and their members should consider the trade-offs that will have to be made and whether OA is a high enough priority for the majority of members. Surveys can be a very useful tool in gauging the membership's attitudes and expectations in making these important decisions.

### **Examples**

#### [New Zealand Journal of Forestry Science](#)

This journal flipped to OA through SpringerOpen, coinciding with its inclusion into ISI. The publication costs for the journal are covered by New Zealand Forest Research Institute Limited (Scion), so authors or their sponsors do not need to pay an APC.

#### [Chiropractic and Manual Therapies](#)

This society journal is supported by several societies so that even though the journal is published by BMC, there are no APCs. The journal went through name changes and mergers prior to becoming OA.

#### [Journal of Korean Society of Ultrasound in Medicine](#)

This journal flipped in 2014 in a move towards broader international reach and impact. The journal was re-named *Ultrasonography* and now publishes only English-language material. All costs of the publication process are underwritten by the Korean Society of Ultrasound Medicine.

#### [Brookings Papers on Economic Activity](#)

This publication flipped to OA in 2011. Most papers seem to be solicited papers presented at conferences arranged by Brookings, so it is not a conventional journal. The organization's funding seems to be donation-based. The general marketing and promotion of the Brookings institution might be a strong motivator both for the publication of the journal and its going OA.

### [Journal of the American Water Works Association](#)

This journal flipped beginning in 2015, also making its 25 years' worth of back issues OA. The association will cover the cost and is making the journal free to everyone. It has been self-published all along. A print edition is still produced and sent out to the around 50,000 members. Based on JCR data, the journal seems to be doing fine in terms of articles published and citation rate. The impact factor went up a bit since flipping, and it is publishing about the same number of articles.

### **Summary**

This is an important scenario since many societies have used this opportunity. At the same time the decision making preceding the flip may be more complex than in other cases, since there may be many stakeholders with divergent views involved. The impact a journal has for the society's finances also varies, complicating generalizations made between societies. If subscriptions are bringing in significant income the flip to a subsidized OA publishing model has a large influence on the funding structure of the journal—if not also the whole society.

#### **Martin Eve**

This would be a great scenario. The challenge, of course, is that most societies do not work this way and expect a revenue return from their journals.

#### **Rebecca Kennison**

Societies can be complicated — not least because there are often tensions between the publication staff, who wish to remain employed, and their own membership, who don't understand how complicated (and expensive) running a journal can be. While many societies are under pressure from some of their members to flip their journal(s) to OA, most have not actively explored with their members what would be required to make that flip. How much does the membership really value that journal as a benefit? Would they be willing to pay more to have that journal OA? If given the opportunity to donate extra money to an OA endowment, as they often can do for other mission-motivated society projects (e.g., grad student travel subsidies, early career fellowships), would the members give generously?

Societies' missions are in alignment with OA — but they are also often extremely risk adverse. Helping them overcome their fear by providing stable funding is the goal of the Open Access Network, which is limiting our support to publications produced by societies and university presses.

#### **Alice Meadows**

This will only work for societies that have large enough surplus to fund it and, given that many societies are so reliant on their journal subscription income, they'd need a clear time-frame and the confidence that there were other, more sustainable sources of revenue once they'd transitioned to OA. So it could be an option for societies serving well-funded disciplines, which could transition to gold OA.

**Lisa Norberg**

I would encourage the society subsidy scenario, especially for those disciplines in the arts, humanities, and social sciences, where the majority of the membership is supportive and the list of journals is not so extensive that the society is wholly dependent on subscription income. Scientific and scholarly societies exist to further the field they represent by facilitating communication between scientists, scholars and their publics and they are often associated with the highest impact and most prestigious journals in their disciplines. By flipping their journal lists, societies are not only fulfilling their mission but also setting an important example for others to follow.

There are, of course, challenging legal and financial hurdles — not least of which is the realization that many societies no longer “own” their journal titles. For those who have turned ownership over to a for-profit publisher, simply subsidizing the flip may be prohibitive. If another non-profit mission-driven organization, such as a university press owns the journal, a reasonable subsidy is more likely. The financial implications — not only of the loss of subscription income, but the increase in dues and/or conference fees — requires thoughtful business planning but is possible. Partnering with a not-for-profit publisher such as Ubiquity, a university press, or an established university library publishing operation could keep costs low while maintaining quality. Stable funding could come from raised dues and conference fees, offset or augmented through new entrepreneurial initiatives including new member-only services (e.g. print copy of the journal, advertising, etc.). The size and overall financial health of the society would ultimately determine if the society were able to support OA journals through subsidy alone. Most likely, the subsidy may need to be paired with other funding sources, such as a library or society-based collectives. I think the strategy for this scenario’s success is to approach the endeavor in a well-reasoned and collaborative manner.

**Bonnie Tijerina**

Using funds from another source to support OA appears to be a good idea for sustainability. If the community agrees that their journal should be OA and they know what that would mean for their society, the threats will be minimal.

**8.2 Low Cost Infrastructure and Volunteer Effort****Description**

This scenario is for journals with very little or no funding that seek to replace funding with some combination of volunteer effort, open source journal management software, and “in kind” support such as use of a web server for journal hosting. This scenario is very common for journals that were created OA, but there are examples of journals that have transitioned from subscription-based to a very low cost OA business model.

**Relevant publisher types:** University, scholar-lead, and small society journals. Though applicable for flipping journals, this scenario is probably more often used by journals that were born OA.

**Relevant pre-requisites:** Individuals who are willing to provide a substantial amount of volunteer labor, some of which requires specialized skills; organizations that are willing to provide “in kind” support for at least some of the resources needed to operate the journal.

**Most relevant disciplines:** Situations where sources of funding an OA journal are limited, which is often the case in the humanities

**Relevant goals for flipping:** Achieving the benefits of OA in disciplines or regions where there is little access to other means of funding journals

**Strengths:** This method provides a means of flipping journals from subscription to OA in disciplines or situations where it is very difficult to obtain support via APCs or other means. Volunteers can lower the overall cost of funding publication. It often uses student and graduate student labor for publishing which can benefit both the students and the journal.

**Weaknesses:** Maintaining the amount of volunteer effort to operate a journal can be difficult. Publishing requires specialized skills, and it can be difficult to find people with the desired skills who are willing to donate their time. Due to these limitations, this model is applicable mainly to low-volume journals.

**Opportunities:** A means of flipping journals that would otherwise have been impractical to flip is provided. Volunteer labor can avoid the need for APCs, even when significantly lowered, and reduce the problems they entail.

**Threats:** The large amount of volunteer work necessary to operate a journal may be difficult to maintain over the long term, increasing the likelihood that journals using the model will fail. This model is best suited for relatively low volume journals, and it can be hard to control the number of submissions that must be processed. The effort necessary to recruit, train, and sustain the volunteerism necessary to operate a journal is substantial and may overwhelm the organization and individuals publishing the journal, resulting in the journal shutting down.

#### **Bonnie Tijerina**

Under *Opportunities* for this scenario, there is a chance that collaborative, volunteer effort will create additional buy-in amongst the stakeholders who are volunteering or who are seeing their community’s effort is making the journal OA. This could help with long term support.

### **Background**

Transitioning a journal from subscription to OA results in the loss of a steady income stream for operating the journal. The major challenge in flipping a journal to OA is to find some other means of long-term funding for the journal. The APC model addresses this directly by replacing subscription income with author-side fees. Author-side fees are not always practical and create their own set of problems.

One option is to minimize the costs of publishing, which can significantly reduce the need to generate income. This can be done by eliminating nonessential services or gaining in-kind support, such as web hosting, use of sophisticated open source journal management software,

and volunteer labor. Solomon (2006) discusses some of the costs can be minimized and suggests options for funding a small OA journal that does not charge reader-side or author side-fees.

O'Donnell et al. (2015) discusses how the library, School of Graduate Studies, and faculty of arts and science at University of Lethbridge have worked together to align the educational and research mission of their university to create what they call the "Lethbridge Journal Incubator." They have redirected funding to create stipends for graduate assistantships in publishing academic journals. The graduate students gain experience and expertise in the specialized skills of publishing an academic journal while providing much of the labor required to operate a university-based OA academic publisher. This is a very interesting model that uses funds that would otherwise be spent outside the university to purchase publishing services and redirects them back into the university, fulfilling both the need for publishing services and professional education in an important field.

### **Examples**

#### [Anthropology and Aging](#)

*Anthropology and Aging* first converted to an online version in 2012 with support from the University of Pittsburg's University Library System (ULS). The Association for Anthropology and Gerontology (AAGE) was able to host the journal online and eventually convert to OA. The journal runs on volunteer effort and help from the ULS. It appears the editor was the main force in flipping the journal. The society's leadership surveyed the members before flipping the journal, and there was strong support for making it OA. The journal only accepts manuscripts from society members, but dues are only 28 USD annually, far less than most APCs. So far, it appears the journal is functioning well under a low-cost OA funding model.

#### [Ohio Journal of Science](#)

The *Ohio Journal of Science* flipped to OA in 2013 and hosts the journal on the university libraries' institutional repository, known as the [Knowledge Bank](#), rather than on a dedicated editorial management system. The journal has been published for over 100 years. Its articles have been available through the Knowledge Bank on a two-year delay since 2006, with a hybrid option implemented in 2012. In 2013, the journal announced it will make all content available through the Knowledge Bank upon publication. It appears that the journal is being supported by the library and still maintains a paper version available by subscription.

#### [Scripta Instituti Donneriani Aboensis](#)

This series is published by the Donner Institute for Research in Religious and Cultural History in Åbo, Finland. The aim of the institute, which is attached to the Foundation of Åbo Akademi University, is to conduct and promote scholarly research in the field of religion. "The publication series *Scripta Instituti Donneriani Aboensis* was inaugurated in 1967 with the aim to publish papers presented at conferences and symposia organised by the institute. The series

has previously been published in printed form but from 2014 onwards, *Scripta* is published as an open access e-publication” (Donner Institute 2016). *Scripta* provides another example of a journal that transitioned to digital OA and has been operated on a low-cost basis by an institute.

### [Open Medicine](#)

This journal provides a counterexample of the potential pitfalls of operating a journal based on volunteer labor and low- or no-cost publishing with in-kind support. *Open Medicine* was formed by the former editor and a number of former editorial board members from the *Canadian Medical Association Journal*. The editor was fired and a number of board members resigned en masse over a dispute with the publisher concerning editorial freedom. *Open Medicine* operated for seven years, largely via the editorial board’s volunteer labor, with considerable support from the Public Knowledge Project. In the words of the editor:

While inspiring, the process was also chronically frustrating. Despite everyone’s best intentions, it was challenging for a small team to keep stoking the interest and engagement of the general academic community, and it was difficult to recruit members to our editorial board and board of directors who could provide the kind of hands-on involvement that our small but ambitious operation required. (Canadian Press 2014)

Operating a journal is very time consuming, and this model works best for journals with fairly low submission and publication rates. Maintaining the effort necessary to publish a high-quality scientific journal on a volunteer basis is very challenging and, as seen in the case of *Open Medicine*, not always successful over the long term.

### **Summary**

Minimizing costs through volunteer effort, open source journal management software such as OJS, and in-kind support from universities or other organizations is a viable approach to publishing a low-volume journal. While probably better suited for journals launched OA, there are a number of examples of journals that have successfully flipped from the subscription model to a low-cost OA model that charges neither readers nor authors. In each case discussed here, a combination of volunteer effort and in-kind support were essential for this transition to be successful. *Anthropology and Aging* and *Ohio Journal of Science* were society journals that received overwhelming support for the transition from their membership. Such support is obviously a key issue in the success of flipping the journal.

*Open Medicine* provides an example of the dangers of this approach. With a dedicated board and substantial support from John Willinsky and the Public Knowledge Project, the journal operated successfully for seven years. The effort to maintain a high-quality medical journal with few little resources required considerable volunteer effort and eventually became too much. As a result, the journal had to be shut down.

**Virginia Barbour**

I'm pleased to see *Open Medicine* discussed here (also see my comments above). I think this is a very challenging route to take. One area where it might work is in time limited or one-off publishing initiatives, such as student projects. It is not a good long term route, despite the best intentions of those starting the journal

**Martin Eve**

I think too much volunteerism can be dangerous. The digital environment already hides much labour that should be classed as work and paid for. To insist that all publishing should be done on a volunteerist basis could be very damaging.

**Jean-Claude Guédon**

One important dimension that should be added to this section is that many new journals begin in the fashion described here. In fact, as a way to increase visibility and impact, many such journals begin with an OA option.

Journals that rely on volunteer work are inherently fragile. As a result, if they are not already OA, they will tend to be extremely cautious about going OA, if only because of legitimate fears regarding their survival. The notion of an incubator is excellent, and the Lethbridge University example deserves being studied further. One obvious extension of this model would be to create a consortium of universities sharing tools, best practises, etc., perhaps on the model of the RFCs in the Internet world. OJS provides a powerful starting point for this kind of development. The promise would be to see many journals working completely under the control of the research communities themselves, and doing so without sacrificing the editorial and publishing tasks associated with good scholarly publishing.

The case of Open Medicine should also be studied closely, if only to identify what made the experiment ultimately fail. But it should be remembered that many journals based on entirely different business models have also failed.

**Rebecca Kennison**

One of the huge challenges in converting small institutionally based journals from subscriptions to OA is that often they employ grad students or part-time staff to run their operation and, while the subscription revenue might be negligible, the income they receive from inclusion in full-text databases such as ProQuest and EBSCO can be considerable. They fear that going online themselves will be a breach of their contracts — that would be true of most ProQuest contracts, not of EBSCO's — and they cannot figure out how to find revenue from other sources to cover even the small amount of money they need to run their journals.

This is where institutional subsidies can help, whether that comes through in-kind contributions provided by their library (as is often the case for library-based publishing operations) or through direct institutional support such as that modeled by Lethbridge. One model discussed at Columbia in the case of one journal ("*Romantic Review*") published by the Romantic Languages Department, which needed \$15,000 to maintain its journal operation, was to get annual funding of one third from the library's OA fund, one third from the department as in-kind staff

contribution, and one third from the dean of humanities' subvention fund. I left Columbia before we finalized this arrangement, but that collective approach seemed attractive, viable, and sustainable to all parties.

Keeping volunteer staffing both robust and motivated is not just an OA problem. Many small subscription-based journals also rely on volunteers and, no matter what the business model, it can take considerable effort on the part of the editor(s) to maintain community passion — but some of the oldest OA journals (such as *Kairos*) have done so very successfully by building a committed community of practice.

I have one overarching comment about what seems to be a scenario that at times gets obliquely embedded within some other scenarios, but is not itself listed as a scenario: library-based publishing operations that have leveraged publishing expertise (or sometimes just passion) to enable journals to flip. Pittsburgh's University Library System gets mentioned a couple of times, but there are many such groups and there is now a formal organization, in the Library Publishing Coalition, that's come together to provide support for those who do this work. Many university presses have begun reporting to libraries; they are under some pressure by their library deans to convert more and more of their journals to open access, sometimes being subsidized to do so by their local library budgets. Some programs (like the one I ran at Columbia or like the huge operation run by California Digital Library) are receive funding from central administration to operate as a service organization for the university (or, in CDL's case, university system). From time to time in my comments below I'll highlight the way such an organization might be leveraged within a specific scenario, but I wanted to point out that this institutional-based scenario (local rather than regional or global) seems to be somewhat missing.

#### **Iryna Kuchma**

This scenario works in developing and transition countries, and I endorse it.

#### **Alice Meadows**

Only possible for small, mostly less well-established and/or less prestigious journals. Again, this doesn't seem like a viable long-term option as you can't rely on volunteer efforts and goodwill being permanently available.

#### **Lisa Norberg**

I would agree with the authors that this scenario is most appropriate for more niche journal titles in disciplines where alternative funding sources, like APCs, are not likely to be a viable option. That said, I would also point out that we are about to see a number of innovative publishing platforms emerge from Mellon-funded collaborative development grants that will enable research universities like the University of Michigan, University of California, University of West Virginia, and Johns Hopkins, and their associated libraries and presses to provide low cost support for OA publications while providing a high quality presentation of multimodal content to readers. As this new infrastructure becomes available, it may be an attractive alternative to for-profit publisher platforms. Again, these low cost options will probably need to be paired with "freemium options or other library or society-based collectives.



**Alma Swan**

While this comment from me adds no new wisdom, it seems clear from the examples cited here and perhaps others that we all know exist, that this business model is quite precarious and operational examples are often seriously weak on sustainability planning.

**Bonnie Tijerina**

This scenario does not seem sustainable in the long run. At some point, an infrastructure outside of a few dedicated individuals should exist to keep a journal going for a long time.

**8.3 Joining Regional Journal Platform****Peter Potter**

It seems to me that “regional” is not the right term here. What we’re talking about is a cooperative publishing partnership that can be formed based on region, nation, or any particular interest group.

**Description**

An existing subscription-based print journal creates a digital version of the journal that is made freely available through a regional publishing platform. Subscription print publishing continues in parallel.

**Relevant publisher types:** Society, university department, researcher group in countries where such platforms are available

**Relevant pre-requisites:** Sufficient income from subscriptions for the paper version or other means of funding the publication, because few of these journals charge APCs. Some regional portals are flooded with applications for journals; a sufficient publication track record and quality level can help with getting selected to join the platform

**Most relevant disciplines:** All disciplines

**Relevant goals for flipping:** Increasing access, readership, and citations. Due to the quality control provided by the platform, participating journals gain stature.

**Strengths:** Joining such platforms is free or has a very low cost, which lowers the overall costs of the conversion. Because platforms like SciELO and Redalyc provide fairly rigorous quality control, they can serve as a proxy to demonstrate the quality of the journal. The model has been used quite successfully in Latin America, Eastern Europe, and Asia.

**Weaknesses:** Despite the financial subsidy, there is a risk that long-term financing will decrease because most of these journals do not charge APCs. While these platforms defray part of the cost of publishing, significant additional costs exist and need to be covered by some other form of income or support.

**Opportunities:** There is the benefit of enjoying centralized web platform management with other journals, which should lessen the need for an individual journal’s staff to get involved in technical maintenance. Discoverability is potentially enhanced by having opportunities for

cross-journal marketing and readership on the platform versus on an independent journal website.

**Threats:** Finding other sources of funding to supplement the resources provided by a regional publishing platform can be challenging, particularly in developing countries.

#### **Abel L Packer**

Re *Weakness*: SciELO and similar solutions involve the issue of sustainability as it depends on public resources. However, when they cover a significant number of relevant journals its funding reflects a good public policy and as such it become difficult to be interrupted at least abruptly. We consider that SciELO is an integral part of a country research infrastructure and therefore it is entitled to public funds. In addition, a key factor of SciELO model is that it provides as publicly funding core functions only common services that applies to all journals and focused on enhancing visibility, innovations and preservation. It does not interfere in editorial policies and journals are free and in fact stimulated to run services that improves their operation. Considering the overall costs of journal publishing we estimate SciELO covers around 20 to 30%. Additional funding are mobilized by journals combining different sources including APC, which, by the way, is being increasingly adopted.

### **Background**

Since about 2000, there has been the development of regional and national publishing portals that provide the basic infrastructure for digital publishing. Probably the best known is the Latin America-based SciELO, but there are many others in Eastern Europe Asia and Africa. For more examples see table 4 in “Types of Open Access Publishers in Scopus Publications” (Solomon, 2013). Frequently, these portals use Open Journal System (OJS) rather than developing their own software. These portal often have some level of national public funding.

### **Examples**

#### **Pippa Smart**

The section of examples omits African Journals OnLine (AJOL) and the [other JOL programmes spearheaded by INASP](#) (disclosure: these were my projects 2001-2006), which perfectly exemplify the model.

AJOL was launched in 1998, originally without full text, but with a printed document delivery service (free to developing country researchers). Since 2005(?) it has been adding full text, OA. It now contains about 500 journals. It relies on donor funding, and the journals mostly still provide a print version, and receive institutional support or rely on smallscale volunteer labour, Susan Murray (Sue Murray [susan@ajol.info](mailto:susan@ajol.info)) can provide more up-to-date information.

#### **Caroline Sutton**

An example that could be added here is African Journals Online ([AJOL](#)).

AJOL as well as groups like SciELO and Redalyc not only provide a platform but are also important in terms of sharing norms and quality standards. I and Lars Björnshauge met the Redly team while in Mexico for the 2013 OJS conference. We were incredibly impressed with the over 300 editorial teams they met with online to work through the new DOAJ requirements, for example.

### [SciELO](#)

A significant factor in explaining the success of SciELO is the infrastructure for society- and university-published journals that existed in Latin America prior to the internet. Part of the demand for such journals has stemmed from the need to publish in Spanish and Portuguese, and part from the difficulty authors have getting their articles accepted in international English-language journals.

SciELO, once established, has been able to deliver a cost-effective service, which has reduced the need for journals to devise their own technical solutions. Currently, 1,249 journals from 14 countries are using the platform. SciELO has also become a brand in its own right and provides significant leverage for its journals' inclusion in the leading citation indexes. A recent deal with Thomson has led to the establishment of a new SciELO Citation Index, which has meant that 350 more Latin American journals (in addition the 300 that were there already) are now indexed in the Web of Science.

Latin America has an exceptionally high percentage of OA journals, compared to any other regions in the world, largely due to portals such as SciELO and Redalyc. The vast majority of these journals are converted (Solomon, Laakso, and Björk, 2013).

#### **Abel L Packer**

Regarding SciELO model combining functions of indexing, aggregation, publishing and interoperability following the state of art ( as much as possible) it is not necessarily a regional solution. In my view, it could be considered also as a solution for developed world. The French/Belgium Revues.org for example can be considered a variation or extension of SciELO model.

#### **Pippa Smart**

Note that support for journals on SciELO comes in various ways. The journals need to provide full XML files, which many do not have the funding so some are also receiving other funding to help them participate.

### [doiSerbia](#)

Launched in 2005, doiSerbia is a national portal for Serbian journals. The key motivation for its establishment was the difficulty attracting international readers to Serbian journals. It started as a pilot project with five journals and currently includes over 100 journals, some of which publish in Serbian and some in English. The name of the service stems from the aim of assigning proper metadata to the articles of the journals and use of the CrossRef system for linking.

One of the successes of the project has been that at least 20 indexed journals have been included in Web of Science, a factor that helps the journals to attract good quality submissions. The service has become so popular that journals have, at times, had to wait for inclusion because the national library handling the system has limited capacity.

### J-STAGE

J-STAGE, which stands for Japan Science and Technology Information Aggregator, currently lists 1,772 participating society journals. The portal has been developed and is maintained by the Japan Science and Technology Agency, a government branch. Not all included journals are OA, however, and many are published in Japanese. What distinguishes J-STAGE from many of the other portals is the large number of STM journals.

### Scientific Journals Online

In Finland getting enough uptake for a national platform, so far, can be problematic. The Federation of Finnish Scientific Societies plays a central role in the distribution of public subsidies, acting as a gateway between the Ministry of Education and societies. It started in 2006, experimenting with a platform for publishing and using its own servers and OJS. Twelve journals participated, but not all published papers are included. The pilot was funded with time-limited external national and Nordic funding, and after the initial stage, things developed rather slowly. Currently, 21 journals are listed on the website. Many more journals could potentially use the platform.

One example of a journal that has begun using the Finnish platform is [Informaatiotutkimus](#) (Information Research), which is in its 35th year and started publishing the free online version in 2008. It is typical of journals using such national portals. It is still published as an annual printed book for subscribers, containing additional materials of interest to the backing society's members as well as the peer-reviewed articles.

### **Summary**

On a global scale, using regional and national portals as enablers for conversion to OA without the need for APCs has been extremely popular, with the number of converted journals in the thousands. This phenomenon has mainly occurred outside of North America and Western Europe. Most of the journals are small and published by societies or universities.

In some countries and regions, such portals have been very successful. Their use has been the natural choice for print subscription journals when they consider creating a digital OA version. It's also interesting to note the very low number of predatory OA journals published in Latin America as well as the low numbers of authors from Latin America who choose to publish in predatory journals (Shen and Björk 2015).

**Eve Gray**

Many of the motivations that are at play in journal flipping in the North, such as top-down pressure from government and funders do not necessarily result in journal flipping in an African context, but rather tend to drive authors to select OA options with international journals, paying APCs that are exorbitant by African standards, in order to preserve prestige and personal promotion prospects. This is beginning to raise serious questions about cost and sustainability.

When it comes to government support for journal flipping in South Africa, this has not been by way of mandates, but rather by provision of government backing for the creation of a national journal platform (aiming to become a regional platform). Funding from the Department of Science and Technology and backing by the Department of Higher Education and Training supports a collaboration with Latin America, the [SciELO South Africa programme](#), (run by the [Academy of Science of South Africa](#) (in its scholarly publishing programme. Journal flipping is encouraged by the provision of infrastructure support, such as the OJS platform and the hosting of journals on the SciELO SA site, offering high levels of downloads and substantially increased citation impact. The programme also runs a Journal Editors' Forum as part of its overall mission. As ASSAf puts it: "The strategic goal of the SPP is to enhance the national capacity to produce and publish research, on the one hand, and to increase the quality and visibility of South African research publications, on the other."

This role of support and encouragement is accompanied by a system of peer review of scholarly journals before they are placed on the SciELO SA platform - in line with the quality control exercised by SciELO Brazil, but more formal in its processes.

What this offers, in contrast to the Latin American model, is government support that promises long-term financial commitment to underpinning the initiative, taking the risk from the venture and making it a national effort.

It is hoped that this initiative will be extended to NASAC, the African Network for Science Academies, with recent support being brokered by UNESCO and INASP. A UNESCO report, arising out of its consultative forum, offers a programme for open access for Africa through NASAC: [Report on the Consultative Forum in Open Access: Towards High Level Interventions for Research and Development in Africa](#).

In general mandates and enforced patterns of behaviour tend to be received badly in societies with histories of colonial or repressive authoritarian government.

**Jean-Claude Guédon**

The large number of OA journals in Latin America is not really due to SciELO and Redalyc. Rather, these two portals have tried to attract what they considered to be the more interesting journals from a much larger base. The extent to which Latin American scholarly publishing is OA is viewed more accurately through a list such as Latindex, particularly its "Catálogo" which covers over 8,000 titles, many of which are in open access.

A particularly interesting example is [Revues.org](#), a subset of the Open Edition setup, which includes an original [freemium business model](#): basic OA is available, but better and higher forms

of services are for a fee. The latter are aimed mainly at libraries. With over 400 titles and a number of monographs, this is an interesting platform to consider.

Ultimately, this scenario is all the more interesting that it is not inherently tied to “journals” even though, for the moment, the journal unit remains prominent. If we keep the article unit stable for a moment, we can also imagine platforms where these articles can be selected/adopted by several communities. This is not the place to develop this issue further, but it is important to note that the whole issue of “flipping journals” starts from the unexamined premise that journals are here to stay. In actuality, journals, as a way to bundle articles, are a print artifact. In the digital world, the granularity of scientific contribution may take on entirely different forms and it may also allow for much greater variations. The way free software communities organize their contributions to a project may provide some interesting images and metaphors in this regard (see my introductory remarks).

#### **Rebecca Kennison**

Joining a regional platform that is set up expressly for OA is an interesting solution for those journals not already online and wishing to go OA — but a connected issue in my mind is how to flip content in subscription databases, which may be the only place online some of this content appears. The Canadian regional gateway [Érudit](#) would love to make their content all immediately OA, but cannot find a sustainable funding source to do so and publishers won’t agree without such a guarantee. Neither JSTOR nor Project Muse seem to have any strategy for including open content on their platforms, although I am told that both platforms get requests from publishers about their doing so. These players — especially for HSS journals — must be included in discussions about flipping journals, as they often act as the sole hosting platform for that journal’s content, but that has not been the case to date.

#### **Iryna Kuchma**

This scenario works in developing and transition countries, and I endorse it.

#### **Alice Meadows**

This is an interesting idea but regional platforms’ reliance on government subsidies makes them a risky option in the medium to long term. Having said that, some of them have already survived longer than you might expect, given the political and economic turbulence in their regions over the past decade!

#### **MacKenzie Smith**

An interesting variation on this scenario is a journal platform managed by a community, e.g. a university consortium, rather than a geographical region.

#### **Michał Starczewski**

[Biblioteka Nauki](#) (The Library of Science) is a collection of more than 600 OA scholarly journals from Poland. The scope of the collection covers all of the research areas. Most of the journals are flipped to OA. They are financed by Polish Ministry of Science or universities. APC are extremely rare. Some of the journals are available on their own website (sometimes OJS) as well, but for some of them the Library of Science is the only place where they are open. First full texts in the LoS were added in 2013.

**Bonnie Tijerina**

I would encourage this scenario for smaller publications with little money though the threats are a concern and possible sources for small support should be considered early on. If this publication is through a university department or research group, perhaps a small budget can be carved out to make this scenario sustainable.

**8.4 Joining Consortium or Library Partnership Subsidy****Description**

Journal flipping can be funded through a broad cooperative consortium agreement among libraries. Commonly, multiple journals are flipped and supported as part of a single consortium agreement because the larger scale is beneficial to membership and publication outlets. Optimally, the funds directed to covering journal publication activities would be taken from funds that libraries previously allocated to pay for journal subscriptions, thus avoiding a substantial extra cost. SCOAP3 and OLH are the most prominent successful initiatives so far. Current successes suggest that the model can be successful. To date, the consortium approach has focused on a specific discipline and has been primarily driven by nonprofit or noncommercial organizations. Different approaches might also work, but so far, these have been the defining characteristics of the initiatives that have been successful.

**Relevant publisher types:** All

**Relevant pre-requisites:** A critical mass of organizations reaching an agreement on consortium membership fees and the type and volume of content to be funded with the collected funds.

**Most relevant disciplines:** All

**Relevant goals for flipping:** Large scale, sustainable, and scalable OA publishing model. New journals, as well as new member organizations, can be brought in.

**Strengths:** This method is potentially a very effective use of resources, wherein there are few intermediate steps between libraries and journals. Freeing journals from reliance upon individually paid APCs brings increased stability and predictability. There is no need for journals to pad the pricing of their services to allow for unexpected circumstances; the consortium agreement guarantees a minimum income.

**Weaknesses:** Governance structure can become complicated once the number of member organizations grows into the hundreds and beyond. Arranging for democratic decision-making on potential new journals to be included in the consortium and the pricing of membership for different types and sizes of organizations is less straightforward. Free-riding is a potential problem; that is, an organization can resign from the consortium, or decline to join, and still have full access to its OA journals. There need to be attractive benefits for members of the consortium. One benefit is being part of the decision-making process.

**Opportunities:** A scalable model that has the potential to flip multiple journals in entire sweeps as long as there is strong commitment from consortia members. The more members the less

has to be paid per member so attracting new members should be easier once critical mass has been achieved.

**Threats:** Journals might struggle to transition to alternative funding models if the consortium falls apart with short notice. Libraries might not be incentivized to become members if it does not cut overall spending, i.e. it does not affect what is paid for subscriptions and APCs but is an additional cost on top of everything else.

#### **Raym Crow**

Re *weaknesses*: “Free-riding is a potential problem; that is, an organization can resign from the consortium, or decline to join, and still have full access to its OA journals.”

The Collective Action problem isn’t just potential, it’s actual. Initiatives that have addressed it successfully (SEP, SCOAP3, arXiv) have provided sufficient private benefits to overcome free riding. But, as the authors note, the organizing costs, even of successful initiatives have been significant.

Some (indeed most) collective OA funding initiatives simply ignore the free rider problem. They may seem successful initially, but won’t scale beyond a few hundred institutions. (A few hundred institutions can be an adequate funding base for targeted resources (e.g., arXiv), but not for general SSH collections.)

#### **Alexander Kohls**

Re *Weaknesses: Regarding Governance*: While the establishment of an effective and lean governance is essential, it can be done as the existing examples such as SCOAP3 demonstrate. Future initiatives should use the lessons learned to avoid traps.

Re *Weaknesses: Regarding possible membership models*: One possible approach is to link contributions or membership fees to the number of publications. This methodology is used by SCOAP3 for the apportionment amongst participating countries and in many cases also within the country to define contributions of individual institutions.

Re *Weaknesses Regarding free-rider problem*: While this is indeed a potential problem in all OA models, the SCOAP3 experience to date shows a much lower number of free-riders than initially expected. A participative governance, in particular aiming for broad consensus about the strategic development of the initiative, can help to maintain a high level of participation.

Re *Threats*: The second statement might cover be the key aspect that should be addressed in the contracts with publishers when flipping is agreed.

## **Examples**

### **[Sponsoring Consortium for Open Access Publishing in Particle Physics \(SCOAP3\)](#)**

SCOAP3 is the largest and most innovative attempt to flip the journals in a particular scientific field. SCOAP3 is a rather unique partnership that includes thousands of libraries, research institutions and funding agencies in 47 different countries. The project is led by CERN, the



European Organization for Nuclear Research. The members of the consortium have pledged to provide funding roughly equal to the proportion of the published articles authored by researchers in each participating country.

**Alexander Kohls**

Clarification: CERN initiated the project and acts as the host organization providing some infrastructure. However, there is a strong governance in place that shifted a leadership role from CERN to the entire partnership represented by a Governing Council and an Executive Committee.

The consortium negotiated with publishers through a tendering process where particular journals were selected based on the publisher's bid for the cost per article published. Along with along with the cost, other factors, such as quality indicator, were used in an algorithm to select the bids that would be funded.

The institutional setting of the SCOAP3 conversion is unique. CERN is a huge multinational organization with a budget of approximately 1.25 billion USD. As one might expect, organizing such a large consortium was a huge undertaking, which took around seven years from its conception to implementation. It is not clear what the costs were to organize the consortium, but they were clearly substantial.

**Alexander Kohls**

*Regarding CERN financial strength:* The financial contribution of CERN to SCOAP3 is minimal so that the financial budget of CERN seems not relevant for the setting of SCOAP3. However, it is correct that the strong connectivity of CERN with research institutions across the world has supported the initiation of SCOAP3.

*Regarding the cost to organise the consortium:* The operating cost of the consortium are in fact very low. At the moment only 1.5 FTEs are running the entire project supported by volunteers of the consortium members. During the initiation, some support was provided by CERN infrastructure functions.

The competitive bidding process resulted in reasonable per article charge, which does not differ significantly from the average APCs paid for full-OA journals as reported by funders such as JISC, Wellcome Trust, and the FWF. Currently, 10 journals from nine publishers are included in the process (SCOAP 2013; SCOAP 2016). The project suffered a setback when the The American Physical Society (APS) —publisher of the largest journal, *Physical Review D*, which publishes around 3,000 articles per year—decided not to participate. That journal published 45 percent of the relevant content in 2011.

**Alexander Kohls**

In fact, the effective per-article charges SCOAP3 is paying are as low as one third of those of the Wellcome Trust or JISC and still significantly lower than many other OA initiatives. Details about the effective cost per article can be found in a regularly updated [working paper](#).

As some journals are co-published by a commercial partner and a society, SCOAP3 covers at the moment 10 journals from 11 publishers that contain together more than 50% of all High-Energy Physics publications.

The journals included very strong commercial and society journals, which typically have charged around 3,000 USD for hybrid publications. Due to the competitive tendering process in SCOAP3, the agreed-upon per article prices are clearly lower than would otherwise be expected and are probably closer to the marginal costs of producing the journals. These journals are well-established, with editorial and technical infrastructure in place, and some have quite high publishing volumes.

#### **Alexander Kohls**

Clarification: Some journals have been fully converted to Open Access via SCOAP3 while some others participate only with the relevant High-Energy Physics content (remaining content might be subscription or Open Access via different models).

Examples for fully converted journals include *Physics Letters B* (Elsevier) and *Journal of High Energy Physics* (Springer and SISSA).

Examples for partly funded journals are *Chinese Physics C* (IOP Publishing and Chinese Academy of Sciences) and *Progress in Theoretical and experimental Physics* (Oxford University Press and Physical Society of Japan).

To summarize, SCOAP3 is a rather unique and extremely important experiment that can be viewed as a “proof of concept” project. Viewed from this perspective, it has been largely successful. Its organizers were able to convince a large portion of the institutions across the globe contributing to the literature in the field to agree to participate in the consortium and fund the costs of publishing much of the literature in particle physics OA through the consortium. The tendering process was also successful in obtaining considerably lower per-article publishing costs than might be expected. While successful, the task of implementing such a project in other disciplines would be daunting. Also, maintaining such a consortium over the long-term in an era of flat or declining library budgets will likely be challenging given there are no direct consequences for a participating institution pulling out of the consortium. Although it may not be practical to implement the SCOAP3 tendering process in other scientific fields, lessons from this innovative experiment can prove valuable in developing other models that use competition to reduce the cost of transitioning subscription journals to OA.

#### **Alexander Kohls**

Comment concerning the remark “Also, maintaining such a consortium over the long-term...will likely be challenging...”:

The SCOAP3 partners have confirmed the continued support for another 3-year cycle 2017-2019 which is currently in preparation.

Examples of journals participating in SCOAP3 include [Physics Letters B](#) (Elsevier), [Nuclear Physics B](#) (Elsevier), [Journal of High Energy Physics](#) (Springer and SISSA) and [European Physical Journal C](#) (Springer and the Italian Physical Society)

#### **Ivy Anderson**

The examples suggest that only the large commercial publishers are supported by SCOAP3. It would be useful to list the other publishers (and their partnering societies) to correct this impression – e.g. Hindawi, OUP, Japan Physical Society, etc.

#### **Virginia Barbour**

SCOAP<sup>3</sup> is an interesting model but for a number of reasons probably is not widely applicable among areas of research, especially where the research is done by a very disparate group. Though as you note the infrastructure to run the consortium is complex, it is offset by lower complexity at an institutional level. The main drawback is that there may be a substantial free rider issue as not every organisation that could benefit from the publishing arrangement will choose to support it.

#### **Alexander Kohls**

Note that both the Springer journals are published on behalf of the two learned societies. Contrary to the impression SCOAP3 mainly cooperates with commercial publishers, in fact 7 out of 10 journals participating in SCOAP3 are society journals. The list of all SCOAP3 journals can be found [here](#).

#### **Salvatore Mele**

Some of my colleagues have already commented on a few factual inconsistencies (IOP vs APS) or irrelevance (CERN annual budget) in the public consultation. My contribution to augment the example would be the following

- Relevant pre-requisite is the existence of monies (in subscription) which can be re-used. A newer pre-requisite would be the existence of funding agencies committed to Open Access to address shortfalls.
- A strength is the transparency for authors!
- SCOAP3 has never perceived governance as a weakness! Possibly the opposite, it generates consensus and cohesion which in turns generates long-term sustainability. It might be CERN asset as an intergovernmental organization with a mission to facilitate cooperation, but we find that the SCOAP3 governance works extremely well, and we have 3'000 partners in 47 countries with representatives which confer regularly and bodies which oversee operations very efficiently. More to the point, shared vision (and a single-issue clearly spelled mission) and a fair pooling of resources work extremely well. If any, we like to see it as one of the great successes of SCOAP3.

- There is a strong factual inconsistency, in the SCOAP3 case, in that an opportunity for more members to join is that everyone pays less. That is not how SCOAP3 works. Every member has a target contribution, often a cash amount aggregate in a nation state, which is created from individual re-directions at a library level. CERN (and some national agencies) make up what is missing (overall or nationally).
- The free rider systemic weakness creates the reason for the pre-requisite of a financial reserve to stop these gaps as/when they arise.
- I would like to take exception to the substantial costs of SCOAP3. Actually, we like to say that it took less staff to set up (just myself for long and not full-time) than an average institutional repository! We did peruse the CERN legal and financial infrastructures (with peaks at 3FTE) and we operate now with about 2 FTE. All of this is courtesy CERN.
- There is a factual inconsistency in that SCOAP3 APC compare to JISC/Wellcome. The point is that (Romeau et al, in bibliography) SCOAP3 pays only a limited number of articles at the nominal APC. After a cap is reached, all the rest is published at no cost. This means that the average APC SCOAP3 pays is going south of 1000 Euros at the moment, and is *less than half* of JISC/Wellcome.
- I do not believe is relevant to speculate whether what SCOAP3 pays is or not close to the marginal costs, or, if any, is interesting to so speculate around the 1000 EUR price point.
- You will forgive me for making a few more points to put in context the daunting task and the long-term challenges for libraries to pull out. In particular: the SCOAP3 partnership grew from 13 countries to 47 from the time of launch to today (from about 1,000 to 3,000 contributing libraries) and all is agreed for three more years.
- Among the lessons which could be inspiring, apart from the daunting tender, is that one can actually build a global coordinated action. Then, this can be taking different shapes, like us, a pooling of resources, but also like in the OA2020 MPG spearheaded discussion a national re-allocation of funds towards a global flip. I note, *en passant*, that no mention of that initiative appears.

### [Open Library of the Humanities \(OLH\)](#)

OLH is a co-operative consortium based in the United Kingdom that was set up to facilitate OA journal publishing in the humanities. The initiative started in January 2013 with a call for researchers to get involved. However, the practical work started in May 2014, when a grant from the Mellon Foundation enabled three-year funding to get operations to a self-sustaining stage. At its launch in September 2015, OLH included a newly launched mega-journal, journals that have been OA from the start, and journals that flipped as part of joining OLH. There is also a print-on-demand feature for journals that want to maintain a paper version. Currently, member libraries and organizations are paying between 500 to 1000 USD annually (Eve 2015a).

The publication process is handled through Ubiquity Press, which uses an OJS-based technical back end with a custom-built front end. OLH is seeking more journals for its portfolio, including indie journals, society journals, too-expensive APC-driven journals, or any journals that want to flip from being subscription-based. The goal is to include 300 to 350 organizations by the third year of operation with pricing on banded rates. The more members there are, the less expensive it would be for each one. A potential upcoming challenge is that the governance structure can become complicated as the consortium grows and common decisions have to be made (such as whether or not to include a new journal which has cost-implications for all members) (Eve 2015a). The [Journal of British and Irish Innovative Poetry](#) and [Filozofski Vestnik International](#) are examples of journals participating in the OLH.

**Raym Crow**

Re OLH and “The more members there are, the less expensive it would be for each one.”

If it were simply a matter of math, then yes. But in reality, the larger the group, the less likely the success of a collective action. This has been discussed for over 50 years (at least since Olson (1965)) in economics, political science, etc., but it gets ignored in favor of simplistic appeals for large groups.

With the qualified exception of SCOAP3, which prudently uses a networked approach to increase contributions, most OA collective funding initiatives stall at about 250 - 300 participants (with a fair amount of overlap in the participant bases). That will work for some projects, but not for most. And it certainly won't support meaningful scale. (Although I recognize that scale isn't a sine qua non of a successful model.)

*Full Disclosure:* I'm working for SPARC on developing design principles for collective funding models for open resources. And the issues are also addressed in previous work on the collective funding of OA infrastructure services (for Knowledge Exchange).

Hopefully, applying collective action theory and practice to the design of collective funding models will lower organizing costs and increase the resources available to fund open resources, including flipped journals.

**[American Anthropological Association \(AAA\)](#)**

AAA is currently investigating the possibility of creating a library funded co-operative to flip their portfolio of journals (Jiménez et al. 2015).

**Raym Crow**

Would that they were. Probably more accurate to say that a group of anthropologists is investigating this and trying to convince AAA to consider it.

## **Summary**

Consortium or Library Partnerships that subsidize publishing cooperatives are a relatively new and potentially very powerful approach to flipping journals. In theory they can provide the necessary scale to publish very efficiently as well as spreading the costs of publishing over a large number of libraries allowing such a model to be economically feasible. As noted by Crow (2006) while very attractive there are very significant challenges implementing the consortia.

### **Martin Eve**

I obviously approve of this approach, but have myself noted some of the difficulties in the governance and implementation. The APC-free benefits here work well for disciplines with less recourse to funding for APCs.

### **Eve Gray**

A different version of library partnership has been created in South Africa through the Stellenbosch University Library, which set up an open access journal venture, offering technical support and hosting for open access versions of the journals. Providing OJS to host the journals, the library staff responsible for the institutional repository offered their services in providing the expertise to flip the journals, host them and promote them. The journals continue under the editorial management based in the departments or research units in which they are based, but with the opportunity to provide a digital and OA journal in partnership with the library.

This appears to have been a successful model, growing steadily. What it has done is to address the capacity dilemmas faced by volunteer-managed in-university journals. It does, however, require continued in-house capacity in the library.

### **Jean-Claude Guédon**

The argument has often been made that there is enough money in the system to make everything OA. Flipping journals in this fashion, as has been pointed out in the report, is dependent upon the possibility of a subset of buyers ready to subsidize the publication costs of a whole sector of journals in a coordinated fashion, and letting the whole world access what has been subsidized. As correctly pointed out in the report, free rider issues as well as governance problems have to be resolved, and not just on a one-off base, but rather on a continuing basis. Disciplinary size and characteristics are certainly of the essence here: it took seven years for SCOAP3 to achieve some degree of success. However, the characteristics of particle physics as a sub-discipline are somewhat unique and transposing the SCOAP3 agreements to other disciplines, as also correctly underscored, may be “daunting”.

At present, libraries are facing a kind of existential crisis because many of their traditional functions have been either eliminated or diminished: collection building in an era of “Big Deals” is quite difficult; preservation of digital documents is not easy to achieve when publishers insist on maintaining full control over their own archives, if only to prepare for the marketing of text-mining and data-mining services. Cataloguing has been taken over by external institutions such as OCLC. Etc. Libraries are left with the task of burying books in compact shelvings and with the

duty to offer good coffee to potential patrons who may wonder why they have to move somewhere to read something.

For their part, university presses are also facing a crisis because they have been asked to work within a cost-recovery framework and even potential profit-making, if possible). This situation developed against the whole initial concept of university presses, as initiated by Johns Hopkins in the nineteenth century: let us recall that university presses were supposed to allow for the publishing of scholarly important works that were not commercially viable. They were subsidized by the university which, in doing so, was fulfilling a public service. The cost recovery mandate has forced these presses to look for more popular titles that, ipso facto, enter a different and much more competitive market. In such markets, university presses face deep challenges when confronting huge press consortia (Bertelsmann, Hachette, etc.) that have global marketing tools and can benefit from all kinds of economies of scale. Meanwhile, and the report here shows it clearly, most societies are finding it increasingly difficult to maintain and promote a small collection of 1-3 journals.

This situation calls indeed for a coming together of the libraries, the university presses and (at least) the small societies. Together they can pool their resources to form platforms, and they can do it from the perspective of promoting either a field of knowledge, a set of problems covering several disciplines, or even the intellectual production of a country or a region.

The situation just sketched, therefore, lends itself to exploring further how to create new kinds of partnerships between entities that are all located within the research communities themselves, or their umbrella institutions. OLH, in this regard, offers a really important prototype of what could become an important segment of scholarly publishing in the future.

On the other hand, the recent deals between certain funders and presses described in the penultimate paragraph of the conclusions are to be resisted: they create chaotic forms of open access (especially in hybrid publications) without decreasing costs, and they generate new forms of distortions by steering national authors toward certain publishers, thus reinforcing the grip of the publi-oligarchs over scientific publishing.

### **Rebecca Kennison**

It will come as no surprise that I support collective funding as the scenario most likely to succeed, but I disagree with the authors that this model — at least as it has been outlined here — is scalable. The authors properly point to a major weakness being that of governance, where everyone who contributes wants some kind of “decision-making” say, beginning with determining decision-making for what.

Another challenge comes from there being no easy collection mechanism to support multiple projects; many libraries are beginning to complain about “OA fatigue” as they are asked — one SCOAP3 and OLH and Luminos and Knowledge Unlatched (etc.) at a time — to provide funding for this project and that project. Each of them are small asks, but collectively they do add up and to date no library has set aside anything remotely like enough money to begin to make a substantive difference in funding OA projects. I’ve regularly suggested libraries consider earmarking 1% of their materials budget for OA projects; I have yet to hear of any library that

has done so. Collective funding also requires collective action, but so far most OA projects are competing for increasingly smaller pools of funds — and are not in the process making any kind of transformational change.

Both the SCOAP3 and OLH projects are laudable, but they are, at the end of the day, very small scale indeed, flipping at most a handful of journals — dozens rather than hundreds. For example, OLH's stated goal of 350 institutions as members means gross revenue of only \$350,000. That does not go very far if you need to pay staff, editorial costs, Ubiquity, etc.

All of these challenges are why we're proposing something quite different, albeit still collective, with the Open Access Network. To start with, the OAN will not host any projects ourselves. Instead, the monies collected by the OAN will go to support the scholarly communication infrastructure itself, whatever its form, format, platform, product, or project. The money comes from annual or multi-year payment that is made by every institution of higher education. The payment — \$0.50 per student per year of study (ranging from \$2 per year per student at a community college up to \$5 per student per year at a doctoral-granting institution) and \$5 per full-time faculty — is modest relative to the overall budget of most institutions, but, when spread broadly across all institutions, results in a sum substantial enough to sustain a vibrant and open scholarly communication environment.

Securing funding from the OAN is comparatively easy. Academic institutions and scholarly societies or university presses come together in partnership to apply for funds through a lightweight screening process. Each project by each partnership will then appear listed on the OAN funding contribution and distribution site, which will look familiar to those who use crowdsourced funding sites already. Funding for the OAN (which will come from institutions, foundations, organizations, companies, and individuals) can be designated on a project-by-project basis, on a discipline-by-discipline basis, in support at the level of an area of study, or by contribution to the general fund. (That's the decision-making power all contributors gets.)

To acknowledge the investment many institutions are already making in OA publications, projects, and platforms, we have factored into the funding formula the option for an institution to reduce its annual payment by the (self-reported) amount that that institution already spends on other OA initiatives. (The numerous examples of such initiatives include APCs for articles in fully OA journals, the Open Library of the Humanities, Knowledge Unlatched, Luminos, Lever, campus-published journals, open educational resources, discipline-specific repositories, digital humanities projects, and so on.) Acknowledgement of these local OA priorities underscores the importance of institutional support for OA infrastructure whether regional, national, or global.

The remaining balance of the institutional annual fee that is spent directly on OAN-supported projects is dispensed to OAN partner projects across subject disciplines, geographic regions, or publishing formats, also in accordance with institutional, funder, or individual donor priorities. Funds are then distributed to cover the costs of the partners' publications, platforms, and projects, providing direct support for the infrastructure and resources needed for the creation, curation, distribution, and long-term archival preservation of scholarly content. Examples of OAN-supported projects include high-impact society- and university press-published journals,



university press– and society-published monographs and book series, open educational resources, discipline-specific repositories, and innovative digital projects and platforms.

Our model also provides a roadmap to address concerns about “free riders,” including a campaign in a stepwise but nevertheless assertive way to persuade all tertiary academic institutions to participate financially, to raise endowment funds from foundations, to accept donations from the public, and otherwise to engage all beneficiaries — all very much in keeping with the core mission of academic institutions, societies, and libraries: the advancement of knowledge and learning and the communication of the products of those efforts to the entire world.

This approach gets around many of the concerns legitimately raised by Raym Crow and others about collective funding models, but raises some other issues as well, of course, including the massive outreach necessary to educate thousands of institutions about the network! But no solution is without its challenges.

#### **Iryna Kuchma**

This scenario works in developing and transition countries, and I endorse it.

#### **Alice Meadows**

Another interesting idea but, from what I know of the SCOAP project at least, I believe it is quite resource-intensive and, therefore, difficult to scale. In addition, the physics community already has its own form of very successful (preprint) OA in arXiv. The Open Library of the Humanities seems like a simpler approach, and a valuable way of tackling the lack of funding for OA in the humanities - something that could potentially be replicated in other fields where this is the case.

#### **Lisa Norberg**

I would strongly encourage a consortium or library partnership subsidy for all disciplines, but especially those in the arts, humanities and social sciences. While collective action can be difficult to establish and maintain, once launched it is more scalable and sustainable than most other options. It mimics a subscription model so institutions/libraries can easily budget and renew their membership without having to add to or revise existing workflows. Enticing enough institutions/libraries to join requires: 1) a significant number of high prestige journals to ensure faculty/researcher support for the initiative; 2) enough journals to generate savings from subscription cancellations; and 3) a governance structure that is transparent and inclusive of all stakeholders or their representatives. An assurance contract may be needed to make sure sufficient numbers of institutions/libraries participate and stable funding is guaranteed for a duration that is acceptable to all parties. Given the level of transparency required, this scenario would probably work best with non-profit society publishers or university presses. While libraries are more inclined to support OA initiatives, like SCOAP3 and OLH, they are also becoming more critical of the projects they support. Because support for an open access journal is not a tangible exchange of goods, they need to trust that their funds can be accounted for and are being spent wisely. Annual increases can and should be expected, but funders will want to know that funds are going toward additional content or investments in infrastructure, rather than profit margins.

**MacKenzie Smith**

This is a particularly viable scenario for converting journals to OA, from a library perspective. This approach has been used successfully in the scholarly monograph world (e.g. Knowledge Unlatched) and libraries are comfortable with multi-institutional, multi-year agreements to pay for valuable content. The SCOAP3 initiative is an example of what can be achieved and translates reasonably well to other disciplines. This scenario is, however, subject to the same risk as with the offsetting big deals discussed earlier and similarly discourages market competition.

**Bonnie Tijerina**

This is a promising scenario but requires a lot of work and consensus amongst a lot of groups. The time, energy, and money put into setting up a scenario for a discipline or set of journals needs to be weighed.

**John Willinsky**

See also my comment on section 6.2.2 (Time-limited Funding for the Conversion).

**8.5 Other non-APC Sources of Funding**

The previous sections present various non-APC sources of funding and resources for operating an OA journal. There are many other less commonly used means of gaining resources for publishing an OA journal. The section on business models in the OAD discusses these in more detail (OAD 2016).

**Advertising:** Placing advertisements on the journal website is a convenient means of generating income to help cover the cost of publishing an OA journal. Using services like Google AdSense requires little effort beyond setting up the journal website for use of the service, though advertising space may also be sold directly to an advertiser. While convenient, advertising is unlikely to generate enough income to cover all or even a large portion of the cost of publishing the journal. Also, services like Google AdSense may insert ads that are embarrassing or are inappropriate for the journal website.

**Fund Raising or Crowd Funding:** Either method can provide another source of income. These methods are probably more appropriate for covering the one-time costs of flipping a journal to OA than for covering the ongoing costs of publishing the journal once OA. Seeking donations can be time consuming and may or may not be very successful. Seeking donations for creating an endowment, though very challenging, has the advantage of providing some level of funding for operating the journal indefinitely.

**Added Value Services:** Sale of added value services, sometimes called "[freemium](#)" can serve as a means of generating funding for operating an OA journal. For example, subscriptions to the paper version of the journal can cover the costs of operating the journal, allowing the digital version to be OA. Another option is to make the HTML version of the articles OA while charging

a fee for access to the PDF version. It also may be possible to sell formatted paper reprints for specific articles that help defray the costs of providing the digital version of the articles OA.

While it is unlikely any of these options alone will provide a significant portion of the funding necessary to operate a journal, they have the potential to provide additional revenue that can be helpful in maintaining a journal particularly one operating with volunteer effort and a limited budget.

**Martin Eve**

I am not convinced that these strategies offer sufficient long-term revenue generation to publish a journal.

**Jean-Claude Guédon**

What is here called “added value editions” broadly corresponds to the “freemium” model advocated by Open Edition.

**Rebecca Kennison**

Of these, I find (again, no surprise) most attractive the fundraising or crowdfunding, although these are labor intensive indeed. The only sustainable approach would be to create an endowment, rather than needing to rely on the ongoing kindness of any given community. One-time funds are easy to raise. Ongoing funds require ongoing effort.

**Alice Meadows**

I don't believe that any of these are viable ways of replacing subscription revenues and supporting OA, though in some cases they could contribute some supplemental income. Digital advertising is markedly less lucrative than print, so journals that previously received substantial advertising revenues are already out of pocket. Fund-raising or crowd-sourcing might be feasible for a specific purpose, but isn't a long-term, sustainable source of revenue. And added value editions are unlikely to be a very attractive proposition if there's already an OA version of the article freely available

**Lisa Norberg**

These are all excellent means for providing additional support for flipped journals, but I don't know if any could be used singularly to support flipping subscription journals, at least at scale.

**Pippa Smart**

Do you have examples of added value editions? I have heard discussed journals that provide basic PDF for free, but sell a value-added website, but do not know of any specific examples. (It seems to me like a good model!)

**Bonnie Tijerina**

I would encourage thinking creatively about how to diversify income to cover the costs of OA, whether that be advertising, income from a conference, or print subscriptions.

## 9 Conclusions

In this report, we have tried to structure the OA conversion landscape into a number of distinct scenarios. Some of these scenarios have been used by a large number of journals. Others may be of more interest to individual journals and publishers that are considering converting to OA. The two most important factors that differentiate between situations are whether a journal publisher has many journals or just a single one, and whether the converted OA journal will charge APCs or use some other form of funding. The differences are reflected in the scenario structure in the report.

In the 1990s and early 2000s, most conversions were by journals published by scholarly societies or university departments, journals which, at the time of conversion were only publishing print versions. These journals then opted not to charge subscription fees for access to their electronic versions. In many cases, such journals benefitted from national or regional portals like SciELO, and later on from open source journal management software such as OJS. In some cases, journals, especially in biomedicine, partnered with dedicated OA publishers (Horne 2010; Busch 2014a; Busch 2014b; Arkinstall 2014).

Eventually, large commercial publishers, university presses, and leading scholarly societies could no longer ignore OA. OA publishers like BMC and PLOS laid the groundwork by pioneering the APC mode of funding OA journals and major publishers like OUP started to experiment with the conversion of individual journals. In parallel, Springer started to offer the hybrid approach to vast numbers of journals. Many hybrid OA publishers have always marketed their hybrid approach as a path towards full OA. The uptake has, in general, been so low that there are still only isolated examples of journals that have converted via the hybrid path.

In the last few years, the big publishers have started to convert their journals to OA (Research Information 2015; Wolters Kluwer 2014; Wright 2011). Often, societies have outsourced their journals to these publishers, and the pressure to convert can have come from the societies themselves. However, in some cases, major publishers have flipped journals they own (Bourke 2014). Societies may also choose to partner with a new type of low-cost publisher like Ubiquity Press.

In a few areas of science, conversions have come about in a different way. The SCOAP3 project in high energy physics is a remarkable example of how large research institutes and universities, which traditionally have provided the bulk of subscription revenue, have been able to force most of the journals in their field to convert to OA. (Bianco et al. 2007) The OLH represents a promising more flexible approach where a large number of university libraries and research funders can pool the resources to publish journals that do not charge author fees (OLH 2015).

In many European countries, centralized government research funders have traditionally provided subsidies to national scholarly journals with the aim of supporting research in a local language or with a regional content. Such journals, especially in the social sciences and humanities, are prime targets for conversions. Therefore, the rules to receive subsidies are important instruments for steering journals towards conversion. There are good examples from countries like Canada (Haggerty 2008) and Norway (Lund and Lie, 2014) for how this can be accomplished.

Recent developments in a few European countries have raised concerns over the lack of transparency that may be the result of increasing bilateral agreements between big publishers and umbrella library organizations representing whole nations like the United Kingdom and the Netherlands. Such deals typically bundle subscriptions and hybrid OA APC the cover the faculty at the universities of that country. Essentially, one lump sum covers both an electronic subscription for a library consortium as well as assigning automatic hybrid OA status to all articles from corresponding authors from the universities involved. The financial details unfortunately are usually hidden behind non-disclosure clauses stifling competition. If such agreements proliferate it would be reasonable to expect that publishers will not be willing to convert their whole portfolios to OA unless they can get roughly the same revenue (Prosser 2003).

In the conversion process, there are several factors that need to be considered, and these show up in different combinations in different cases. Nevertheless, there are already numerous examples of successful conversions. We have been able to cover some of these in this report and hope that it can provide useful help for those still considering this big step.

#### **Stevan Harnad**

See my [blog post](#) from 2007, *Gold Conversion: A Prisoners' Dilemma?* Summary: Given the undeniable, irreversible and growing [clamour](#) for Open Access (OA) worldwide, journal publishers face two [Prisoners' Dilemmas](#). (1) The first concerns whether to continue business as usual, to mounting [opprobrium](#) from the academic community as well as the [tax-paying public](#), or to [convert directly](#) to [Gold OA](#) now, at the risk that institutional subscriptions at current prices for incoming journals may not transmute stably into institutional "memberships" for outgoing article publication costs at the same institutional price. If publishers convert from institutional subscriptions to institutional Gold OA "memberships" today, they counter the opprobrium and lock in current subscription rates for a year (or whatever duration-deal is agreed with institutions), but they risk institutional memberships defecting after the duration elapses, with cost-recovery fragmented to an anarchic individual author/article level that may not be enough to make ends meet. (2) The second Prisoners' Dilemma facing publishers is that if they instead counter the opprobrium by converting to [Green OA](#) now (as [62%](#) of them already have done), [Green OA Self-Archiving Mandates](#) may still force their conversion to Gold eventually, but because access-provision and archiving (and their costs) will by then be performed by the distributed network of mandated Green OA [Institutional Repositories](#), the revenues (and expenses) of journal publishing then may be [reduced](#) from what they are now.

## References

Anderson, Ivy. 2015 (November). "Pay it Forward, Investigating a Sustainable Model of Open Access article processing charges for Large North American Research Institutions," conference presentation. SLASAC meeting: Oakland, CA..

[http://libraries.universityofcalifornia.edu/groups/files/slasac/docs/PIF-SLASAC\\_slides\\_2015-11-05.pdf](http://libraries.universityofcalifornia.edu/groups/files/slasac/docs/PIF-SLASAC_slides_2015-11-05.pdf).

Arkinstall, Kam. 2014 (November). "On 20 Years and Open access: Q&A with Professor Wen-Chang Chang." *BioMed Central* (blog).

<http://blogs.biomedcentral.com/bmcblog/2014/11/20/on-20-years-and-open-access-ga-with-professor-wen-chang-chang/>.

Babini, Dominique. 2015. Personal interview with the authors. Conducted October 23.

Bauer, Matthias. 2011 (September). "Open Access Success Stories: Slowly but surely: a 15-year-long Step-by-Step Move to Open Access Sees Submissions Soar." *Open Access Success Stories* (blog). <http://www.oastories.org/2011/09/germany-journal-connotations/>.

Bird, Claire. 2008. "Oxford Journals' adventures in open access." *Learned Publishing* 21(3):200–208. <http://doi.org/10.1087/095315108X288910>.

Bird, Claire. 2010. "Continued adventures in open access: 2009 perspective." *Learned Publishing* 23(2):107–116. <http://doi.org/10.1087/20100205>.

Bianco, S., O.H. Ellestad, P. Ferreira, F. Friend, P. Gargiulo, R. Hanania, S. Henrot-Versille, A. Holtkamp, P. Igo-Kemenes, D. Jarroux-Declais, M. Jordão, B.C. Kämper, J. Krause, T. Lagrange, F. LeDiberder, A. leMasurier, A. Lengenfelder, C.M. Lindqvist, S. Mele, S. Plaszczynski, R. Schimmer, J. Vigen, R. Voss, M. Wilbers, J. Yeomans, K. Zioutas. Towards Open Access Publishing in High Energy Physics. CERN. Retrieved from <http://scoap3.org/files/Scoap3WPReport.pdf>.

Björk, B-C, M. Laakso, P. Welling, and P. Paetau. 2014 (February). "Anatomy of Green Open Access." *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology* 65(2): 237–250. <http://doi.org/10.1002/asi.22963> .

Björk, Bo-Christer. 2015 (May). "Have the 'Mega-Journals' Reached the Limits to Growth?" *PeerJ* 3:e981. <https://doi.org/10.7717/peerj.981>.

Björk, Bo-Christer. 2012 (August). "The Hybrid Model for open access publication of Scholarly Articles: A Failed Experiment?" *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology* 63(8):1496–1504.

Björk, Bo-Christer and David J. Solomon. 2013. "The Publishing Delay in Scholarly Peer-Reviewed Journals." *Journal of Informetrics* 7(4):914–923.  
<http://openaccesspublishing.org/oa11/article.pdf>.

Björk, Bo-Christer and David J. Solomon. 2014. "Developing an Effective Model for Open Access Article Processing Charges." <http://www.wellcome.ac.uk/About-us/Policy/Spotlight-issues/Open-access/Guides/WTP054773.htm>.

Boersma, Harald. 2013 (December). "Elsevier to Flip Seven Subscription Journals to Open Access in 2014." Elsevier press release. <https://www.elsevier.com/about/press-releases/research-and-journals/elsevier-to-flip-seven-subscription-journals-to-open-access-in-2014>.

[Botanical Society of America \(BSA\). 2016. Applications in Plant Sciences.](http://cms.botany.org/home/publications/apps.html)  
<http://cms.botany.org/home/publications/apps.html>.

Bourke, Amy. 2014 (September). "About NPG Nature Communications to become open access only." Nature Publishing Group press release.  
[http://www.nature.com/press\\_releases/ncomms-oa.html](http://www.nature.com/press_releases/ncomms-oa.html).

Busch, Stefan. 2015. Personal interview with the authors. Conducted October 16.

Busch, Stefan. 2014a (January). "The Careers of Converts—How a Transfer to BioMed Central Affects the Impact Factors of Established Journals." *BioMed Central* (blog).  
<http://blogs.biomedcentral.com/bmcblog/2014/01/15/the-careers-of-converts-how-a-transfer-to-biomed-central-affects-the-impact-factors-of-established-journals/>.

Busch, Stefan. 2014b (November). "The Impact Factor of Journals Converting from Subscription to Open Access." *BioMed Central* (blog).  
<http://blogs.biomedcentral.com/bmcblog/2014/11/06/the-impact-factor-of-journals-converting-from-subscription-to-open-access/>.

Busch, Stefan and Dieter Häussinger. 2012 (January). "Onwards and upwards: *European Journal of Medical Research* continues as an open access." *European Journal of Medical Research* 17(1):1. <http://doi.org/10.1186/2047-783X-17-1>.

The Canadian Press. 2014 (November). "Canadian medical journal, *Open Medicine*, Stops Publishing." <http://www.cbc.ca/news/health/canadian-medical-journal-open-medicine-stops-publishing-1.2823643>.

Cerejo, Clarinda and Jayashree Rajagopalan. 2015 (May). "Tips for Journal Editors Transitioning to Open Access and the Role of Mega-Journals in the Publishing Landscape." *Editage Insights* (blog). 2015. <http://www.editage.com/insights/tips-for-journal-editors-transitioning-to-open-access-and-the-role-of-mega-journals-in-the-publishing-landscape>.

Cooney-McQuat, Sarah, Stefan Busch, and Deborah Kahn. 2010 (April). "Open Access Publishing: A Viable Solution for Society Publishers." *Learned Publishing* 23(2):101–105. <http://doi.org/10.1087/20100204>.

Crow, Raym. 2015. Personal interview with the authors. Conducted November 2.

Crow, Raym. 2006 (September). "Publishing Cooperatives: An Alternative for Non-profit Publishers." *First Monday* 11(9). <http://firstmonday.org/ojs/index.php/fm/article/view/1396/1314>.

Crow, Raym and Howard Goldstein. 2004. *Guide to Business Planning for Converting a Subscription-based Journal to Open Access*. New York: Open Society Institute. [http://www.budapestopenaccessinitiative.org/pdf/business\\_converting.pdf](http://www.budapestopenaccessinitiative.org/pdf/business_converting.pdf).

Danely, Jason. 2014 (September). "How *Anthropology and Aging* became Open-Access: Some Thoughts on Transitions and Trajectories." *Association for Anthropology and Gerontology* (blog). <http://anthropologyandgerontology.com/?p=672>.

Daught, Gary. 2012 (June). "New Theology Review Goes Open Access with the Library as Publisher." *Omega Alpha Open Access* (blog). <http://oaopenaccess.wordpress.com/2012/06/22/new-theology-review-goes-open-access-with-the-library-as-publisher/>.

Davis, Philip M. 2011 (March). "Open Access, Readership, Citations: A Randomized Controlled Trial of Scientific Journal Publishing." *The FASEB Journal* 25(7):2,129–2,134. <http://doi.org/10.1096/fj.11-183988>

De Gruyter. 2014a (August). "De Gruyter Open Converts Eight Subscription Journals to Open Access Megajournals." De Gruyter Open press release. <http://degruyteropen.com/de-gruyter-open-converts-eight-subscription-journals-open-access-megajournals/>.

De Gruyter. 2014b (October). "Open Science Journals to Make Science More Open." Open Science. <http://openscience.com/open-science-journals-to-make-science-more-open/>.



Donner Institute. 2016. "Editorial Policies."

<http://ojs.abo.fi/index.php/scripta/about/editorialPolicies#focusAndScope>.

Elfenbein, Timothy W. 2014. "Cultural Anthropology and the Infrastructure of Publishing." *Cultural Anthropology* 29(2):288–303. <http://dx.doi.org/10.14506/ca29.2.06>.

Elsevier. 2015. Stem Cell Research. <http://www.journals.elsevier.com/stem-cell-research/>.

Eve, Martin Paul. 2015a (June). "Subscriptions No Longer Needed: Flipping Journals to Open Access While Supporting Existing OA Publications." *Martin Paul Eve* (blog). June 9, 2015. <http://blogs.lse.ac.uk/impactofsocialsciences/2015/06/09/flipping-journals-to-open-access/>.

Eve, Martin. 2015b. Personal interviews with the authors. Conducted November 4.

Eve, Martin Paul. 2014 (October). "Pondering a Solution to the Problem of Learned Societies and the Transition to Open Access." *Martin Paul Eve* (blog).

<https://www.martineve.com/2014/10/04/pondering-a-solution-to-the-problem-of-learned-societies-and-the-transition-to-open-access/>.

Frantsvåg, Jan Erik. Personal interview with the authors. Conducted September 30.

Giglia, Elena. 2012 (October). "Open Access: A Profitable Choice for Publishers." *Open Access Week* (blog). <http://www.openaccessweek.org/profiles/blogs/open-access-a-profitable-choice-for-publishers>.

Goldman, Helle. 2012 (June). "Open Access Success Stories: *Polar Research*." *Open Access Success Stories* (blog). <http://www.oastories.org/2012/06/polar-research/>.

GW4 Libraries. 2015. "Using Functional Cost Analysis to Evaluate the APC Payment Process." <https://gw4openaccess.wordpress.com/2015/03/20/using-functional-cost-analysis-to-evaluate-the-apc-payments-process/>.

Hallberg, Lillemor. 2011. "Six Years with International Journal of Qualitative Studies on Health and Well-Being—A Progress Report." *International Journal of Qualitative Studies on Health and Well-being* 6(2) 10.3402/qhw.v6i2.7090. Published online 2011 Apr 1.

<http://doi.org/10.3402/qhw.v6i2.7090> .

Haggerty, Kevin D. 2008 (March). "Taking the Plunge: Open Access at the *Canadian Journal of Sociology*." *Information Research* 13(1). <http://www.informationr.net/ir/13-1/paper338.html>.

Hitchcock, Steve. 2013. "The Effect of Open Access and Downloads ('Hits') on Citation Impact: A Bibliography of Studies." Open Citation Project.

<http://opcit.eprints.org/oacitation-biblio.html>.

Horne, Genevieve. 2010 (December). "Veterinary Research Goes Open Access with BioMed Central." *On Biology* (blog).

<http://blogs.biomedcentral.com/on-biology/2010/12/15/veterinary-research-goes-open-access-with-biomed-central/>.

Hotta, Nigishi. 2014 (December). "Brave New World: Our Journal Has Become an Open Access Journal." *Journal of Diabetes Investigation* 6(1):1–2.

<http://doi.org/10.1111/jdi.12306>.

Jaschik, Scott. 2015 (November). "Language of Protest." *Inside Higher Ed*.

<https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2015/11/02/editors-and-editorial-board-quit-top-linguistics-journal-protest-subscription-fees>.

Jiménez, Alberto Corsín, Dominic Boyer, John Hartigan, and Marisol de la Cadena. 2015 (May). "Open Access: A Collective Ecology for AAA Publishing in the Digital Age." *Cultural Anthropology*.  
<http://culanth.org/fieldsights/684-open-access-a-collective-ecology-for-aaa-publishing-in-the-digital-age>.

Jisc. 2014 (December). "Wiley and Jisc Announce New Open Access Agreement."

<https://www.jisc.ac.uk/news/wiley-and-jisc-announce-new-open-access-agreement-19-dec-2014>.

Jones, Roger, Hajira Dambha, and Catharine Hull. 2013 (April). "Open Access Publishing: Important Changes for the *BJGP*." *The British Journal of General Practice* 63(609):181.

<http://doi.org/10.3399/bjgp13X665125> .

Jones, Jackie. 2015. Personal Interview with the authors. Conducted October 5.

Jones, Jackie. 2014 (October). "Jackie Jones on When to Flip Your Journal Revenue Model to Open Access." Association of Learned and Professional Society Publishers (ALPSP) International Conference 2014 video, 14:33.  
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=XgScZeqvxf0>.

Jump, Paul. 2014 (September). "Nature Communications Goes Fully Open Access." *Times Higher Education*.  
<https://www.timeshighereducation.com/news/nature-communications-goes-fully-open-access/2015993.article>.

Kieńć, Witold. 2014 (April). "Transition to Open Access: The case of *Paladyn, Journal of Behavioral Robotics*." *Open Science* (blog).  
<http://openscience.com/transition-open-access-case-paladyn-journal-behavioral-robotics/>.

Kiley, Robert. 2015a (March). "The Reckoning: An Analysis of Wellcome Trust Open Access Spend 2013-14." *Wellcome Trust* (blog). <http://blog.wellcome.ac.uk/2015/03/03/the-reckoning-an-analysis-of-wellcome-trust-open-access-spend-2013-14/>.

Kiley, Robert. 2015b. Personal communication, 03-24-2014.

Laakso, Mikael. 2014 (May). "Green Open Access Policies of Scholarly Journal Publishers: A Study of What, When, and Where Self-archiving is Allowed." *Scientometrics* 99(2):475–494. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11192-013-1205-3>

Laakso, Mikael and Bo-Christer Björk. 2012 (October). "Anatomy of Open Access Publishing: a study of Longitudinal Development and Internal Structure." *BMC Medicine* 10(124). <http://doi.org/10.1186/1741-7015-10-124> .

Laakso, Mikael and Bo-Christer Björk. 2013 (July). "Delayed Open Access: An Overlooked High-Impact Category of Openly Available Scientific Literature." *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology* 64(7):1323–1329. <http://doi.org/10.1002/asi.22856> .

Lalasz, Bob. 2014 (October). "Why Conservation Letters is Going 100% Open Access." *Cool Green Science* (blog). <http://blog.nature.org/science/2014/10/20/conservation-letters-open-access-impact-factor-data-sharing>.

Lossius, Hans Morten and Kjetil Søreide. 2011 (January). "Open Access Publishing: A Girder in The Success of the *Scandinavian Journal of Trauma, Resuscitation and Emergency Medicine*." *Scandinavian Journal of Trauma, Resuscitation and Emergency Medicine* 19(1):7. <http://doi.org/10.1186/1757-7241-19-7>.

Lund, Christian and Else Lie. 2014 (January). "Changes to Funding Scheme for Journals: Open Access to Scientific Journals on Culture and Society." The Research Council of Norway. [http://www.forskningsradet.no/en/Newsarticle/Open\\_access\\_to\\_scientific\\_journals\\_on\\_culture\\_and\\_society/1253992543913/p1177315753918](http://www.forskningsradet.no/en/Newsarticle/Open_access_to_scientific_journals_on_culture_and_society/1253992543913/p1177315753918).

Meadows, Alice. 2015 (March). "Flipping, not Flopping: Converting Subscription Journals to Open Access." *The Scholarly Kitchen* (blog). <http://scholarlykitchen.sspnet.org/2015/03/04/flipping-not-flopping-converting-subscription-journals-to-open-access/>.

Morrison, Heather, Jihane Salhab, Alexis Calvé-Genest, and Tony Horava. 2015 (February). "Open Access Article Processing Charges: DOAJ Survey May 2014." *Publications* 3(1): 1–16. <http://doi.org/10.3390/publications3010001> .

Nature Communications Group. 2015. Assessing the Transition to Full Open Access After Six Months.

[http://figshare.com/articles/Nature\\_Communications\\_Assessing\\_the\\_transition\\_to\\_full\\_open\\_access/1466890](http://figshare.com/articles/Nature_Communications_Assessing_the_transition_to_full_open_access/1466890).

O'Donnell D, Hobma H, Cowan S, Ayers G., Bay J, Swanepoel M, Merkley W, Devine K, Dering E, Genee I. (2015) "Aligning Open Access Publication with the Research and Teaching Missions of the Public University: The Case of the Lethbridge Journal Incubator (If 'if's and 'and's were pots and pans)." *The Journal of Electronic Publishing* 18(3).

<http://dx.doi.org/10.3998/3336451.0018.309>.

Open Access Directory. 2016 (January). Journal Declarations of Independence.

[http://oad.simmons.edu/oadwiki/Journal\\_declarations\\_of\\_independence](http://oad.simmons.edu/oadwiki/Journal_declarations_of_independence)

Open Access Directory. 2015 (March). Free and Open-Source Journal Management Software. [http://oad.simmons.edu/oadwiki/Free\\_and\\_open-source\\_journal\\_management\\_software](http://oad.simmons.edu/oadwiki/Free_and_open-source_journal_management_software).

Open Library of Humanities (OLH). 2015 (November). "Four Subscription Journals to Flip to Fee-Free OA with the OLH in January 2016," press release, November 11, 2015.

<https://about.openlibhums.org/2015/11/27/four-subscription-journals-to-flip-to-fee-free-gold-oa-with-the-olh-in-january-2016/>

Peters, Paul. 2007 (July). "Going All The Way: How Hindawi Became an Open Access Publisher." *Learned Publishing* 20(3):191–195. <http://doi.org/10.1087/095315107X204049>.

Pinfield, S., J. Salter and P.A. Bath. 2015. "The 'Total Cost of Publication' in a Hybrid Open-Access Environment: Institutional Approaches to Funding Journal Article-Processing Charges in Combination with Subscriptions." *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology*. <http://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/81227/>

Piwowar, Heather. 2013 (May). "OA Options for a Society Journal." *Research Remix* (blog).

<http://researchremix.wordpress.com/2013/05/11/society-oa-options/>.

Prosser, David C. 2003 (July). "From Here to There: A Proposed Mechanism for Transforming Journals from Closed to Open Access." *Learned Publishing* 16(3): 163–166.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1087/095315103322110923>.

Reckling, Falk. 2015. Personal interview with the authors. Conducted October 17.

Reckling, Falk and Eva Scherag. 2013. "Initial Funding for High-Quality Open Access Journals in the Humanities and Social Sciences." Austrian Science Fund.

[http://www.fwf.ac.at/fileadmin/files/Dokumente/News\\_Presse/Veranstaltungsrueckblick/2013/11\\_Anschubfinanzierung\\_fuer\\_hochqualitative\\_OA-Zeitschriften/OAJ\\_Report\\_ENG.pdf](http://www.fwf.ac.at/fileadmin/files/Dokumente/News_Presse/Veranstaltungsrueckblick/2013/11_Anschubfinanzierung_fuer_hochqualitative_OA-Zeitschriften/OAJ_Report_ENG.pdf).

*Research Information*. 2015 (February). "Wiley converts three more journals to open access," press release. [http://www.researchinformation.info/news/news\\_story.php?news\\_id=1831](http://www.researchinformation.info/news/news_story.php?news_id=1831).

Romeu, Clément, Anne Gentil-Beccot, Alexander Kohls, Anne Mansuy, Salvatore Mele, and Martin Vesper. 2014 (April). "The SCOAP3 Initiative and the Open Access Article-Processing-Charge Market: Global Partnership and Competition Improve Value in the Dissemination of Science." CERN. <http://cds.cern.ch/record/1735210>.

Rydholm, Anders and Olle Svensson. 2009 (February). "New Format, Open Access, and Online Pre-Publication." *Acta Orthopaedica* 80(1):1. doi: [10.1080/17453670902804406](https://doi.org/10.1080/17453670902804406).

Schmoller, Seb. 2011 (March). *Journal Tendering for Societies: A Brief Guide*. Association for Learning Technology. <http://repository.alt.ac.uk/887/>.

Schmoller, Seb, David Jennings, Caroline Sutton, and Nicky Ferguson. 2012. "JISC Gold Open Access Project: Stakeholder Analysis." <http://repository.alt.ac.uk/2238/>.

SCOAP3. 2016. SCOAP3 Journals. <http://scoap3.org/scoap3journals>.

SCOAP3. 2013 (June). <http://scoap3.org/scoap3journals/journals-apc> .

Shen, Cenyu and Bo-Christer Björk. 2015. "'Predatory' Open Access: A Longitudinal Study of Article Volumes And Market Characteristics." *BMC Medicine* 13:230. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/s12916-015-0469-2>.

Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC). 2014. Aid to Scholarly Journals. [http://www.sshrc-crsh.gc.ca/funding-financement/programs-programmes/scholarly\\_journals-revues\\_savantes-eng.aspx](http://www.sshrc-crsh.gc.ca/funding-financement/programs-programmes/scholarly_journals-revues_savantes-eng.aspx).

Solomon, David J. 2013 (May). "Types of Open Access Publishers in Scopus." *Publications* 1(1): 16–26. <http://doi.org/10.3390/publications1010016>.

Solomon, David J. 2006 (June). "Strategies for Developing Sustainable Open Access Scholarly Journals." *First Monday* 11(6). <http://journals.uic.edu/ojs/index.php/fm/article/view/1335/1255>.

Solomon, David J. and Bo-Christer Björk. 2012 (January). "Publication Fees in Open Access Publishing: Sources of Funding and Factors Influencing Choice of Journal." *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology* 63(1):98–107. <http://doi.org/10.1002/asi.21660>.

Solomon, David J., Mikael Laakso, and Bo-Christer Björk. 2013. "A Longitudinal Comparison of Citation Rates and Growth Among Open Access Journals." *Journal of Infometrics* 7(3): 642–650. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.joi.2013.03.008> .

Springer. 2016. Institutional Agreements. <http://www.springer.com/gp/open-access/springer-open-choice/springer-compact>.

STM Publishing News. 2012 (March). "Bioscience Reports To Convert To Full Open-Access." <http://www.stm-publishing.com/bioscience-reports-to-convert-to-full-open-access/>.

Suber, Peter. 2012. *Open Access* (MIT Press). Book home page last modified December 17, 2015. <http://bit.ly/oa-book> .

Sutton, Caroline. 2015. Personal interview with the authors. Conducted October 20.

Swan, Alma. 2010 (August). "Open Access Citation Advantage: Studies and Results to Date." Technical Report, School of Electronics & Computer Science, University of Southampton. <http://eprints.ecs.soton.ac.uk/18516>.

Swan, Alma. 2012. Sustainability of Open Access Services: Report on Phase 1: Scoping the Challenge, Phase 2: Consulting the Stakeholders. Report commissioned by Knowledge Exchange. [http://repository.jisc.ac.uk/6201/1/Sustainability\\_OA\\_services\\_phases\\_1\\_%26\\_2.pdf](http://repository.jisc.ac.uk/6201/1/Sustainability_OA_services_phases_1_%26_2.pdf)

Van Wesenbeeck, Astrid and Frederick Friend. 2011 (September). *Scholarly Society Journals in Transition to Open Access*. Report on the Workshop Organized by the Knowledge Exchange Open Access Working Group, with the Assistance of SPARC Europe and the Open Access Scholarly Publishers Association: Tallinn, Estonia. [www.knowledge-exchange.info/reports/36](http://www.knowledge-exchange.info/reports/36).

VSNU. 2015. "Dutch Universities and Elsevier Reach Agreement in Principle on Open Access and Subscription." [http://www.vsnu.nl/en\\_GB/news-items.html/nieuwsbericht/241](http://www.vsnu.nl/en_GB/news-items.html/nieuwsbericht/241).

Walton, L., R. Cousens, and C. Graf. 2013. "What IJCP Authors Think About Open Access: 392 IJCP Authors Explain Their Preferences." *International Journal of Clinical Practice* 67(11):1211–1212. <http://doi.org/10.1111/ijcp.12282> .

Wagner, A. Ben. 2010. "Open Access Citation Advantage: An Annotated Bibliography." *Issues in Science and Technology Librarianship*, Winter 2010. <http://www.istl.org/10-winter/article2.html>

Ware, Mark. 2010 (March). *Submission Fees: A Tool In the Transition to Open Access ?* Bristol, United Kindom: Mark Ware Consulting.

[https://www.innovationpolicyplatform.org/system/files/KE\\_Submission\\_fees\\_Short\\_Report\\_2010-11-25%20\(1\).pdf](https://www.innovationpolicyplatform.org/system/files/KE_Submission_fees_Short_Report_2010-11-25%20(1).pdf).

White, Natasha. 2014 (October). "Exploring Open Access Publishing Opportunities." *Exchanges* (blog). <http://exchanges.wiley.com/blog/2014/10/27/exploring-open-access-publishing-opportunities/?hootPostID=6d7f506b6798fa716e0ec80420a7529a>.

Wiley. 2016. Institutional and Funder Payments.  
<http://olabout.wiley.com/WileyCDA/Section/id-420429.html>.

Wiley. 2012 (February). "Established Journal *Evolutionary Applications* to Publish Under Open Access Model," press release. <http://www.wiley.com/WileyCDA/PressRelease/pressReleaseId-102369.html>.

Winters, Judith. 2015. Editorial. *Internet Archaeology* 38. <http://dx.doi.org/10.11141/ia.38.10>.

Wolters Kluwer. 2014. "Wolters Kluwer Health Transitions the Journal Medicine to Fully Open Access, Broad-Based Biomedical Title in 2015," press release, February 5.  
<http://www.newswise.com/articles/wolters-kluwer-health-transitions-the-journal-medicine-to-fully-open-access-broad-based-biomedical-title-in-2015>.

Wright, Victoria. 2011 (July). "Taylor and Francis Group Widens Open Access Offerings," press release <http://editorresources.taylorandfrancisgroup.com/taylor-francis-group-widens-open-access-offerings/>.

Yu, Jeong-Sik. 2014. "Ultrasonography: A New Beginning with International Open Access." *Ultrasonography* 33(1):1-1. <http://dx.doi.org/10.14366/usg.13007>.

## Related Literature

### Michał Starczewski

The report "Open Science in Poland 2014. A Diagnosis" presents an overview of the current state of openness in Polish science. There is a lot about OA journals.

<http://pon.edu.pl/index.php/nasze-publikacje?pubid=16>

Bayaz, Renate. 2011. "Selected journals in Springer's Chinese Library of Science join Springer Open." Springer press release, February 22. [http://www.eurekalert.org/pub\\_releases/2011-02/s-sji022211.php](http://www.eurekalert.org/pub_releases/2011-02/s-sji022211.php).

Bernstein, Michael. 2013. "American Chemical Society Extends New Open Access Program Designed to Assist Authors." American Chemical Society press release, November 1.



<http://www.acs.org/content/acs/en/pressroom/newsreleases/2013/october/acs-extends-new-open-access-program-designed-to-assist-authors.html>.

Cuddy, Colleen. 2012. "President's Message: Open Access/Open Data." *Information Technology and Libraries (ITAL)* 31, no. 1: 1–2.

<http://ejournals.bc.edu/ojs/index.php/ital/article/view/1927/1734>.

Edgar, Brian and John Willinsky. 2010. "A Survey of Scholarly Journals Using Open Journal Systems." *Scholarly and Research Communication* 1(2).

<http://journals.sfu.ca/src/index.php/src/article/view/24/41> .

Fairbairn, Rebecca. 2013. "Korean Society of Occupational and Environmental Medicine partners with BioMed Central." BioMed Central press release on EurekAlert!, May 20.

[http://www.eurekalert.org/pub\\_releases/2013-05/bc-kso051713.php](http://www.eurekalert.org/pub_releases/2013-05/bc-kso051713.php).

Fisher, Julian H. 2008. "Scholarly Publishing Re-invented: Real Costs and Real Freedoms." *Journal of Electronic Publishing* 11(2). doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.3998/3336451.0011.204>.

Holdren, John P. 2013 (February). Increasing Access to the Results of Federally Funded Scientific Research. Memorandum from the Executive Office of the President Office of Science and Technology Policy.

[https://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/microsites/ostp/ostp\\_public\\_access\\_memo\\_2013.pdf](https://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/microsites/ostp/ostp_public_access_memo_2013.pdf).

Hollingworth, Nigel. 2014. "EDP Sciences Announces the Launch of EDP Open," press release.

<http://www.sspnet.org/community/news/edp-sciences-announces-the-launch-of-edp-open/>.

Hund, Richard. 2012 (July). "Botanical Society of America to Launch OA Journal: *Applications in Plant Sciences*," press release.

[http://www.eurekalert.org/pub\\_releases/2012-07/ajob-bso072712.php](http://www.eurekalert.org/pub_releases/2012-07/ajob-bso072712.php).

Jackson, Jason Baird. 2014. "Check Out the New Anthropod Podcast on Open Access." *Shreds and Patches* (blog). February 20. <http://jasonbairdjackson.com/2014/02/20/check-out-the-new-anthropod-podcast-on-open-access/>.

Jöttkandt, Sigi. 2009. "Print Journal Converts to OA, Joins OHP." Open Humanities Press press release, October 5. <https://mx2.arl.org/Lists/SPARC-OAForum/Message/5162.html>.

Kosanovic, Biljana. "doiSerbia." *Open Access Success Stories* (blog). September 2011.

<http://www.oastories.org/2011/09/serbia-repository-doiserbia/#more-16>.



Leach, Bruce. 2013. "The *Ohio Journal of Science* Moves to Open Access." *Digital Scholarship at the Libraries* (blog). April 22. <http://library.osu.edu/blogs/digitalscholarship/2013/04/22/ojs-moves-to-oo/>.

Lejenäs, Harald and Henning Rodhe. 2012. "Tellus A and Tellus B Open Up — Free Access to All Content." *Tellus A* 64. doi: 10.3402/tellusa.v64i0.16068.

LingOA. 2015. Linguistics in Open Access. <http://www.lingoa.eu>.

Mizera, Kamil. 2013. "American Anthropological Association Decides to be More Open." *Open Science* (blog). <http://openscience.com/american-anthropological-association-decides-to-be-more-open/>.

MSKCC Library Blog. 2013. "Cancer Science to be Open Access in 2014." December 31. <https://library.mskcc.org/blog/2013/12/cancer-science-to-be-open-access-in-2014/>.

Mueller, Deirdre. 2015. "Journal AWWA Peer-reviewed Articles Available Online at No Cost to the Public." American Water Works Association (AWWA) press release. January 15. <http://www.prweb.com/releases/2015/01/prweb12448106.htm>.

Neuman, Y., H. Strandberg, M. Gustafsson, and A. Pichler. 2014. "Report on Future Strategy of Open Access." AGORA—Scholarly Open Access Research in European Philosophy. [http://cordis.europa.eu/project/rcn/191888\\_en.pdf](http://cordis.europa.eu/project/rcn/191888_en.pdf).

Open Library of Humanities. 2015. "Announcing the First Subscription Journal to Flip to Open Access Through the Open Library of Humanities," press release, May 29. <https://www.openlibhums.org/2015/05/29/announcing-the-first-subscription-journal-to-flip-to-open-access-through-the-open-library-of-humanities/>.

Packer, Abel, Nicholas Cop, Adriana Luccisano, Amanda Ramalho, and Ernesto Spinak. 2014. *SciELO—15 Years of Open Access: An Analytic Study of Open Access and Scholarly Communication*. UNESCO, Paris. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.7476/9789230012373>.

Research Information Network. 2014. "Finch Report Implementation and Review." April 7. <http://www.researchinfonet.org/finch/>.

Rooryk, Johan, Anikó Lipták, Ianthi Tsimpli, Chung-hye Han, and Anne-Michelle Tessier. 2015. "Renegotiation of editorial collaboration – *Lingua* in Open Access." Correspondence with Christopher N. Tancock. <http://chronicle.com/blogs/ticker/files/2015/11/Letter-renegotiation-Lingua-OA.pdf>

Sachini, Evi, Victoria Tsoukala, Nikos C. Houssos, Ioanna-Ourania Stathopoulou, Christina-Eleni Paschou, and Aggeliki Paraskevopoulou. 2009 (June). "Open Access In The Humanities: A Case

Study Of Developing Three Open-Access Electronic Journals In Greece.” Paper presented at 13th International Conference on Electronic Publishing (ELPUB 2009): 543–556.

[http://elpub.scix.net/data/works/att/150\\_elpub2009.content.pdf](http://elpub.scix.net/data/works/att/150_elpub2009.content.pdf).

Schmidt, Stefan, Gavin R. Broad, Pavel Stoev, Daniel Mietchen, and Lyubomir Penev. 2013 (January). “The Move to Open Access and Growth: Experience from *Journal of Hymenoptera Research*.” *Journal of Hymenoptera Research* 30:1–6. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3897/jhr.30.4733>.

Schimmer, Ralf, Kai Karin Geschuhn, and Andreas Vogler. 2015 (April). Disrupting the Subscription Journals’ Business Model for the Necessary Large-Scale Transformation to Open Access: A Max Planck Digital Library Open Access Policy White Paper.

<http://doi.org/10.17617/1.3>.

Springer. 2014. “Springer to Collaborate with Five Japanese Societies on an Open Access Journal,” press release, May 12. <http://phys.org/wire-news/161347986/springer-to-collaborate-with-five-japanese-societies-on-an-open.html>.

Springer. 2013. “Springer to Collaborate with Scion on Open Access Journal,” press release, January 17. <http://phys.org/wire-news/119879233/springer-to-collaborate-with-scion-on-open-access-journal.html>.

Stokes, Mary. 2011 (January). “Wave of the present?” *Christopher Moore’s History News* (blog). <http://christophermoorehistory.blogspot.com/2011/01/wave-of-present.html>.

UKSG. 2014. “*Insights: The UKSG Journal is Going Fully Open Access from March 2014*.” UKSG press release, February 18. <http://www.uksg.org/node/694>.

Van Noorden, Richard. 2014. “Particle-Physics Papers Set Free.” *Nature* 505(7482). <http://www.nature.com/news/particle-physics-papers-set-free-1.14473>.

Wiley. 2013. “Four Leading International Wiley Journals Become Open Access,” press release, October 22. <http://phys.org/wire-news/143896254/four-leading-international-wiley-journals-become-open-access.html>.

Wolfers, Justin. 2011. “Economic Research Wants to Be Free.” *Freakonomics* (blog). March 22. <http://www.freakonomics.com/2011/03/22/economic-research-wants-to-be-free/>.

Yorio, Thomas. “Open Access Coming to *IOVS*.” *Investigative Ophthalmology and Visual Science* 56(9). <http://iovs.arvojournals.org/article.aspx?articleid=2426644>.

## Appendix I

### Annotated Bibliography of the Material Identified in the Study

This document contains lightly annotated references that were felt to be relevant to the project. These references are organized into four sections:

- Descriptions/discussions of flipped journals (94 references)
- Support programs and descriptions of models for flipping journal (38 references)
- How-to guides and recommendations for flipping (26 references)
- Miscellaneous materials (32 references)

#### Descriptions/Discussions of Flipped Journals

1. American Journal of Botany. "Botanical Society of America to launch OA journal: Applications in Plant Sciences." July 27, 2012. [http://www.eurekalert.org/pub\\_releases/2012-07/ajob-bso072712.php](http://www.eurekalert.org/pub_releases/2012-07/ajob-bso072712.php).

This press release describes a journal that is a spin-off from a section of the society's broader journal. It is "mega-journal-like" and publishes shorter notes and protocols. The APC is 1,200 USD, but for society members there is a reduced price of 350 USD.

2. Anderson, Kent. "Should the Journal of the Medical Library Association (JMLA) Stop Using PMC as Its Publishing Platform?" *Scholarly Kitchen* (blog). October 30, 2013. <http://scholarlykitchen.sspnet.org/2013/10/30/should-the-journal-of-the-medical-library-association-jmla-stop-using-pmc-as-its-publishing-platform/>.

This blog post protests JMLA using PubMed Central as the sole source for distributing the OA version of the journal's articles, which the journal has done since it joined PMC in 1999. The practice was acceptable at the time but the Library of Medicine has since required journals to have their own website for distributing articles; however, but the Library of Medicine grandfathered JMLA in, allowing them to continue.

3. Arkinstall, Kam. "On 20 Years and Open access: Q&A with Professor Wen-Chang Chang." *BioMed Central* (blog). November 20, 2014. <http://blogs.biomedcentral.com/bmcblog/2014/11/20/on-20-years-and-open-access-ga-with-professor-wen-chang-chang/>.

This blog post is an interview of the editor-in-chief of the *Journal of Biomedical Science*, Wen-Chang Chang. The journal launched 20 years before the interview and flipped to OA through BMC about five years ago.

4. Jones, Charles. "Coming Soon in Open Access: *Orientalia Suecana*." *The Ancient World Online* (blog). November 11, 2010. <http://ancientworldonline.blogspot.com/2010/11/coming-soon-in-open-access-orientalia.html>.

This blog post is an announcement that *Orientalia Suecana* is flipping with support from the Swedish government.

5. Ballantyne, Neil. "Aotearoa New Zealand Social Work: A Collective Approach." *Aotearoa New Zealand Social Work* (blog). November 16, 2015. <http://anzasw.nz/the-anzasw-journal-is-changing/>.

This blog post is an announcement that *Aotearoa New Zealand Social Work* will be flipping to OA and includes some of the reasons why. The paper version had always been distributed freely to members of the society, while the electronic version was available at a cost to libraries. They are also switching to using OJS as a platform.

6. Bauer, Matthias. "Open Access Success Stories: Slowly but Surely: A 15-Year-Long Step-by-Step Move to Open Access Sees Submissions Soar." *Open Access Success Stories* (blog). September 2011. <http://www.oastories.org/2011/09/germany-journal-connotations/>.

This blog post briefly discusses the transition to OA of *Connotations* international journal, which is a literary journal based in Germany. Submissions have gone up substantially since the journal became OA in 2010. It still publishes a subscription-based print edition, which appears to be supporting the OA version, and all of its back issues have been converted to a digital format. The blog post does not provide much information about the economics of the conversion.

7. Bayaz, Renate. "Selected journals in Springer's Chinese Library of Science join Springer Open." Springer press release, February 22, 2011. [http://www.eurekalert.org/pub\\_releases/2011-02/s-sji022211.php](http://www.eurekalert.org/pub_releases/2011-02/s-sji022211.php).

This press release announces that three journals, *Chinese Science Bulletin*, *Science China Life Sciences*, and *Photonic Sensors*, will be flipped to OA and added to the SpringerOpen. These journals are part of Springer's Chinese Library of Science (CLOs), which includes over 90 journals. The journals are co-published with Chinese-based publishers.

8. Bell, Frances. "Open Access is a Piece [of] Cake for *Research in Learning Technology*." *Francesbell's Blog*. November 28, 2011. <http://francesbell.wordpress.com/2011/11/28/open-access-is-a-piece-for-cake-for-research-in-learning-technology/>.

This post is a brief announcement about the conversion of *Research in Learning Technology* is made in this blog post. It appears to have been written before the transition took place. The journal is now published by Co-Action Publishing and appears to be doing well.

9. Biemiller, Lawrence. "QuickWire: Anthropology Journal Moves to Open-Access Model." *Wired Campus* (blog). February 4, 2014. <http://chronicle.com/blogs/wiredcampus/quickwire-anthropology-journal-moves-to-open-access-model/50099>.

This is a news item on the website announcing that the first OA issue of *Cultural Anthropology* has been published. There are more complete discussions of the issues around flipping the journal.

10. Bird, Claire. 2008. "Oxford Journals' adventures in open access." *Learned Publishing* 21, no. 3 (2008): 200–208. <http://doi.org/10.1087/095315108X288910>.

This is a very relevant article that provides an in-depth case study of Nucleic Acids Research's (NAR) transition to OA.

11. Bird, Claire. "Continued adventures in open access: 2009 perspective." *Learned Publishing* 23, no. 2 (2010): 107–116. <http://doi.org/10.1087/20100205>.

As noted in the title this is an update of Ms. Bird's earlier article on Oxford's OA journal program. The article contains a lot of useful information on the program.

12. Boersma, Harald. "Elsevier to Flip Seven Subscription Journals to Open Access in 2014." Elsevier press release, December 17, 2013. <https://www.elsevier.com/about/press-releases/research-and-journals/elsevier-to-flip-seven-subscription-journals-to-open-access-in-2014>.

This press release announces journals Elsevier flipped in 2014. Two were flipped as part of the SCOAP3 project.

13. Bourke, Amy. "About NPG Nature Communications to become open access only." Nature Publishing Group press release, September 23, 2014. [http://www.nature.com/press\\_releases/ncomms-oa.html](http://www.nature.com/press_releases/ncomms-oa.html).

This is a press release from Nature about *Nature Communications* becoming the first fully OA journal published by Nature.

14. Bourget, David. Institutional subscriptions. PhilPapers. Accessed <http://philpapers.org/subscriptions/>.

This webpage discusses PhilPapers and their need to begin charging libraries in high GDP countries for access. From the post:

"Starting on July 1, 2014, the PhilPapers Foundation requires that research and teaching institutions located in high-GDP countries and offering a BA or higher degree in philosophy subscribe to PhilPapers in order to have the right of access to its index. Access to certain services, such as the public API and the Open Access Archive, remains free, as does access to PhilEvents and PhilJobs: Jobs for Philosophers. Access also remains free for individuals accessing PhilPapers from home."

They apparently feel there is no other way to maintain the site.

15. Branin, Joseph. "College and Research Libraries Goes Fully Open Access." *College and Research Libraries* 72 no. 2 (March 2011): 108–109. <http://crl.acrl.org/content/72/2/108.short>.

This editorial discusses *College and Research Libraries* going fully OA. This shift is also discussed in a blog post by Phil Davis, as noted below.

16. Busch, Stefan and Dieter Häussinger. "Onwards and upwards: *European Journal of Medical Research* continues as an open access." *European Journal of Medical Research* 17 no. 1 (January 2012): 1. <http://doi.org/10.1186/2047-783X-17-1>.

This editorial discusses the transition to OA of *European Journal of Medical Research* using BMC. There was an initial drop in submissions but this has rebounded and while the citation rate remained roughly the same.

17. Cuddy, Colleen. "President's Message: Open Access/Open Data." *Information Technology and Libraries (ITAL)* 31, no. 1 (2012): 1–2. <http://ejournals.bc.edu/ojs/index.php/ital/article/view/1927/1734>.

This short editorial from 2012 announces the flipping of the journal *Information Technology and Libraries (ITAL)* founded in 1982 to an online only OA journal utilizing the OJS platform. It seems to be free for authors. This is a publication of the Library and Information Technology Association, a division of the American Library Association.

18. Danely, Jason. "How *Anthropology and Aging* became Open-Access: Some Thoughts on Transitions and Trajectories." *Association for Anthropology and Gerontology* (blog). September 2, 2014. <http://anthropologyandgerontology.com/?p=672>.

This is a brief description of how the journal flipped to OA. They first converted to an online version in 2012 with support from the University Library System and the University of Pittsburgh. They were able to host it online and eventually convert to OA. The journal runs on volunteer effort and help from the ULS. Note: it only accepts manuscripts from society members, and the society costs 28 USD to join. This serves as an example of a society journal that flipped with help from a university scholarly publishing office.

19. Daught, Gary. "New *Theology Review* Goes Open Access with the Library as Publisher." *Omega Alpha Open Access* (blog). June 22, 2012. <http://oaopenaccess.wordpress.com/2012/06/22/new-theology-review-goes-open-access-with-the-library-as-publisher/>.

This is an interview with the editor of *New Theology Review* who flipped *New Theology Review* from a struggling as a subscription journal to a successful OA journal with a small subsidy from a library and volunteer labor. It is a very interesting OA success story.

20. Davis, Amanda. "*Tsinghua Science and Technology Journal* Goes Open Access." *The Institute*. May 6, 2013. <http://theinstitute.ieee.org/briefings/business/itsinghua-science-and-technology-journal-goes-open-access>.

This is a short news item announcing that "articles published in the *Tsinghua Science and Technology Journal* are now available for free in the IEEE Xplore digital library."

21. Davis, Phil. "College and Research Libraries Adopts Open Access." *Scholarly Kitchen* (blog). March 22, 2011. <http://scholarlykitchen.sspnet.org/2011/03/22/college-and-research-libraries-adopt-open-access/>.

This interesting blog post is about what Davis feels were the motivations to flip the journal and the impact of this action on the Association of College and Research Libraries finances.

22. De Gruyter. "De Gruyter Open Converts Eight Subscription Journals to Open Access Megajournals." De Gruyter Open press release, August 9, 2014. <http://degruyteropen.com/de-gruyter-open-converts-eight-subscription-journals-open-access-megajournals/>.

This is a short press release outlining how De Gruyter flipped eight STM subscription journals previously operated by Springer and renamed and rebranded the journals starting in 2015.

23. De Gruyter. "Open Science Journals to Make Science More Open." Open Science. October 28, 2014. <http://openscience.com/open-science-journals-to-make-science-more-open/>.

This is another short press release outlining the move by De Gruyter where eight STM subscription journals previously operated by Springer were flipped, renamed, and rebranded, starting in 2015.

24. DiBartola, S.P. "Word Limits, Open Access, and Publication Metrics." *Journal of Veterinary Internal Medicine* 29, no. 5 (September-October 2015): 1287. <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/jvim.13592/full>.

This progress report was published six months after the journal flipped to full digital OA. Readership has grown considerably based on downloads. However, it is too early to determine growth in citation statistics.

25. Doherty, Michael, Simon J. More, and John F. Mee. "Significant Milestone for the Irish Veterinary Journal." *Irish Veterinary Journal* 67, no.23 (October 2014). [doi:10.1186/2046-0481-67-23](https://doi.org/10.1186/2046-0481-67-23).

This editorial discusses the successful conversion of the *Irish Veterinary Journal* to OA using the BioMed Central (BMC) as a platform. The journal is receiving an adequate number of good-quality submissions and the Impact Factor (IF) held steady for a couple years after the journal flipped. The IF increased from 0.44 to 1.71 in 2013, the first year based solely on OA content.

26. Eldredge, Gregory and Niles Eldredge. "Evolution: *Education and Outreach* Goes Open Access!" *Education and Outreach* 6, no.1. doi:10.1186/1936-6434-6-1.

This article announces that a Springer journal has flipped six years after it launched. The journal currently seems to be doing reasonably well, publishing about 25 articles in 2015.

27. Elfenbein, Timothy W. "Cultural Anthropology and the Infrastructure of Publishing." *Cultural Anthropology* 29, no. 2 (2014): 288–303. <http://dx.doi.org/10.14506/ca29.2.06>.



Extended interview with Timothy W. Efenbein managing editor about the transition of *Cultural Anthropology* to OA.

28. Fairbairn, Rebecca. "World Allergy Organization's Official Journal to Become Open Access." BioMed Central Press release on EurekAlert!, December 20, 2012. [http://www.eurekalert.org/pub\\_releases/2012-12/bc-wao121912.php](http://www.eurekalert.org/pub_releases/2012-12/bc-wao121912.php).

This is a press release issued by BMC announcing that the *World Allergy Organization Journal (WAO Journal)* will join BMC and flip to becoming an APC OA journal from January 2013.

29. Fairbairn, Rebecca. "Korean Society of Occupational and Environmental Medicine partners with BioMed Central." BioMed Central press release on EurekAlert!, May 20, 2013. [http://www.eurekalert.org/pub\\_releases/2013-05/bc-kso051713.php](http://www.eurekalert.org/pub_releases/2013-05/bc-kso051713.php).

This press release announces that *Annals of Occupational and Environmental Medicine (AOEM)* was flipped to OA in 2013 and now published with BMC. The journal appears to be doing quite well at this point.

30. Gardner, Victoria and David Green. "How Are Established, Subscription-Based Publishers Making the Transition to Open Access?" *Insights* 27, no. 1: 32–37. <http://doi.org/10.1629/2048-7754.138>.

The authors are employed by Taylor and Francis, and the article focuses on the Taylor and Francis journal portfolio. It mentions that Taylor and Francis has implemented hybrid OA in many journals and created the Cogent OA mega-journal imprint. It closes with the notion that it is ultimately the authors who decide if OA becomes more prominent. The article notes that at the end of 2013, Taylor and Francis publishing as a whole was 99 percent dependent on institutional sales models or subscription publishing.

31. Giglia, Elena. "Open Access: A Profitable Choice for Publishers." *Open Access Week* (blog). October 26, 2012. <http://www.openaccessweek.org/profiles/blogs/open-access-a-profitable-choice-for-publishers>.

This is an interesting post describing a somewhat unique approach to funding OA. The post describes SEEd, which is an Italian medical publishing house that was founded in 2000 and is based in Turin, Italy. *Farmeconomia and Therapeutic Pathways*, established by SEEd in 2000, converted to the OAI in 2012 with a business model that is not based on APCs. OA is reported to enable SEEd to generate higher revenue from the increased visibility of the products distributed according to the traditional channels.

32. Goldman, Helle. "Open Access Success Stories: *Polar Research*." *Open Access Success Stories* (blog). June 2012. <http://www.oastories.org/2012/06/polar-research/>.

This short but useful post describes the flipping process of the journal *Polar Research*, which was founded in 1982 by the Norwegian Polar Institute. "It was produced in-house until 2007 when it joined forces with Wiley Blackwell. In 2010 the partnership with Wiley ended and *Polar*



*Research* successfully became a fully OA journal, funded by the Institute” and published by Co-Action Publishing.

33. Haggerty, Kevin D. “Taking the Plunge: Open Access at the *Canadian Journal of Sociology*.” *Information Research* 13, no. 1 (March 2008). <http://www.informationr.net/ir/13-1/paper338.html>.

This article describes the conversion of the *Canadian Journal of Sociology* from print subscription to digital full OA. The author is the editor of the journal. They were able to fund the journal via a grant from the Canadian government. The conversion was made around 2007, and the journal is still being published OA and does not appear to charge APCs. The author is still editor and they are publishing many articles. They went from no journal management system, doing peer review and other communication via e-mail, to using OJS in the transition, to fully digital OA publication. A main takeaway is that no matter how carefully you plan, the transition is a leap of faith, and you never know fully how it will work out. Haggerty’s opinion is that it is much more difficult to transition from subscription to OA than to start a new OA journal due to legacy issues with subscribers, the publisher, aggregators, and, in their case, an existing funder. Another legacy issue is the prior content and potentially copyright/licensing issues.

34. Herbert, Robert D. and Chris Massis. “Open access to *Journal of Physiotherapy*.” *Journal of Physiotherapy* 59, no. 4: 217. [http://doi.org/10.1016/S1836-9553\(13\)70195-4](http://doi.org/10.1016/S1836-9553(13)70195-4).

This editorial announces the Australian *Journal of Physiotherapy* is flipping to OA. There will be no APC, but it is not clear how it will be funded.

35. Hinds, L. “Step forward in the digitalization of science in Poland.” *Against the Grain*. January 18, 2011. <http://www.against-the-grain.com/2011/01/step-forward-in-the-digitalization-of-science-in-poland/>.

This short announcement concerns a number of Polish Academy of Science journals that were flipped to OA through Versita, later becoming part of de Gruyter Open. There is more comprehensive literature collected about this development as part of this literature review.

36. Hoffman, Liz. “*Chiropractic and Manual Therapies*—Journal Relaunched. *On Health* (blog). January 14, 2011. <http://blogs.biomedcentral.com/on-health/2011/01/14/chiropractic-manual-therapies-journal-relaunched/>.

This is an announcement that *Chiropractic and Osteopathy* has now relaunched as *Chiropractic and Manual Therapies* and is published for the European Academy of Chiropractic (EAC) and the Chiropractic and Osteopathic College of Australasia (COCA). The societies covered the APC for about two years.

37. Horne, Genevieve. “*Veterinary Research* Goes Open Access with BioMed Central.” *On Biology* (blog). December 15, 2010. <http://blogs.biomedcentral.com/on-biology/2010/12/15/veterinary-research-goes-open-access-with-biomed-central/>.

This is an announcement that *Veterinary Research* began being published OA by BMC on behalf of the French National Institute for Agricultural Research (INRA) in 2011.

38. Hotta, Nigishi. "Brave New World: Our Journal Has Become an Open Access Journal." *Journal of Diabetes Investigation* 6, no. 1(December 2014): 1–2. <http://doi.org/10.1111/jdi.12306>.

This is a fairly detailed editorial describing the process by which the *Journal of Diabetes Investigation* flipped to OA. The journal was launched in 2010 as a bimonthly subscription journal of the Asian Association for the Study of Diabetes (AASD). The journal had a strong start and obtained an IF of 1.801 for 2011 and receiving around 359 submissions in 2013 with a 27 percent acceptance rate. The journal transitioned to a new publishing platform (though the editorial does not mention which one) in 2013 in order to prepare for the transition at the beginning of 2014. A strong motivator for going OA seems to be maximizing the journal's reach and exposure.

39. Hotta, Nigishi. "We have become an Open Access journal!" *Journal of Diabetes Investigation* 5, no.1 (January 2014): 1–2. doi: 10.1111/jdi.12180.

This is a different article but contains essentially the same information as the one released in December 2014, listed previously.

40. Institute of Development Studies (IDS). "IDS Bulletin to Go Open Access in 2016." Institute of Development Studies press release, July 14, 2014. <https://www.ids.ac.uk/news/ids-journal-to-go-open-access-in-2016>.

This release announces that *IDS Bulletin* will be flipped in 2016 when their contract with Wiley ends. All back issues, approximately 50 years' worth, will also be made available. Pressure from funders and the Research Councils UK (RCUK) was listed as a contributing factor to this conversion. The announcement says nothing about how they plan to fund operating the journal, which annually publishes about six thematic issues of about 10 articles each.

41. Jacobs, Laverne. "Windsor Yearbook of Access to Justice Now Open Access." *Slaw* (blog). March 12, 2015. <http://www.slw.ca/2015/03/12/windsor-yearbook-of-access-to-justice-now-open-access/>.

This post announces that the *Windsor Yearbook of Access to Justice* has become an OJS-hosted OA journal. The status of this journal is not clear; the latest issue on the OJS website was published in January 2013.

42. Jaschik, Scott. "Language of Protest." *Inside Higher Ed*. November 2, 2015. <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2015/11/02/editors-and-editorial-board-quit-top-linguistics-journal-protest-subscription-fees>.

This news article covers the mass resignation of editors and editorial board members of the linguistics journal *Lingua* over a dispute with Elsevier over its subscription price and for refusing

to flip the journal to OA. Those who resigned plan to start a new open-access journal, *Glossa*, which will be hosted by the Open Library of the Humanities.

43. Jiménez, Alberto Corsín, Dominic Boyer, John Hartigan, and Marisol de la Cadena. "Open Access: A Collective Ecology for AAA Publishing in the Digital Age." *Cultural Anthropology*. May 27, 2015. <http://culanth.org/fieldsights/684-open-access-a-collective-ecology-for-aaa-publishing-in-the-digital-age>.

This commentary on the website of *Cultural Anthropology* publicizes their satisfaction with the decision to abandon publishing co-operation with Wiley and go OA as an independent journal. It also argues that other AAA (American Anthropological Association) journals should follow suit and abandon publishing co-operation with Wiley.

44. Jones, Roger, Hajira Dambha, and Catharine Hull. "Open Access Publishing: Important Changes for the *BJGP*." *The British Journal of General Practice* 63, no. 609 (April 2013):181. doi:10.3399/bjgp13X665125.

This is a short editorial from *British Journal of General Practice* that announces the journal is adding a hybrid OA option. The change is noteworthy because they are placing it in context of the RCUK OA policy. They analyzed 216 articles published in the *BJGP* over the past two years and found that 49 percent were funded by organizations that would fund APCs, and UK authors were more likely than other authors to receive funding from organizations willing to pay APCs.

45. Jöttkandt, Sigi. "Print Journal Converts to OA, Joins OHP." Open Humanities Press press release, October 5, 2009. <https://mx2.arl.org/Lists/SPARC-OAForum/Message/5162.html>.

This press release announces *Filozofski vestnik International*, a peer-reviewed journal from the Institute of Philosophy, Scientific Research Centre of the Slovenian Academy of the Arts and Sciences converted to OA and become part of the Open Humanities Press collective.

46. Jump, Paul. "Nature Communications Goes Fully Open Access." *Times Higher Education*. September 25, 2014. <https://www.timeshighereducation.com/news/nature-communications-goes-fully-open-access/2015993.article>.

This short article announces that *Nature Communications* is flipping to a fully OA journal.

47. K., Pablo. "What Does It Mean To Become An Open Access Journal?" *The Disorder of Things* (blog). October 15, 2013. <http://thedisorderofthings.com/2013/10/15/what-does-it-mean-to-become-an-open-access-journal/>.

This is an interview with Professor Brad Weiss of the College of William and Mary and president of the Society for Cultural Anthropology, which publishes *Cultural Anthropology (CA)*, the premier journal of the American Anthropological Association (AAA). The interview provides a considerable amount of information about the transition to OA.

48. Kieńć, Witold. "Transition to Open Access: The case of *Paladyn, Journal of Behavioral Robotics*." *Open Science* (blog). April 14, 2014. <http://openscience.com/transition-open-access-case-paladyn-journal-behavioral-robotics/>.

This is an announcement that *Paladyn: Journal of Behavioral Robotics* will flip to APC funded OA. The journal was a subscription-based publication by Springer for its first four years but is changing its publisher to Versita (De Gruyter) as part of flipping to OA. This serves as a good example of a journal with low subscription numbers where OA format makes more financial sense than a paper-based subscription journal.

49. Kivett, Tom. "Drugs in R and D Gets Reinvented as an Open Access Journal." PR Newswire press release, June 7, 2010. <http://www.prnewswire.com/news-releases/drugs-in-rd-gets-reinvented-as-an-open-access-journal-95759769.html>.

*Drugs in R and D* was owned by Aldis/Wolters-Kluwer Pharma. The journal converted to OA in 2010. Currently, the journal is owned by Springer.

50. Lalasz, Bob. "Why Conservation Letters is Going 100% Open Access." *Cool Green Science* (blog). October 20, 2014. <http://blog.nature.org/science/2014/10/20/conservation-letters-open-access-impact-factor-data-sharing>.

This post announces that the journal *Conservation Letters* is flipping to full OA. The idea for the flip came from the publisher, Wiley. The post includes interview answers from associate editor Eddie Game. The journal had a low subscriber base but a high IF, a profile that Wiley has found conducive for a flip to APC-funded OA.

51. Leach, Bruce. "The *Ohio Journal of Science* Moves to Open Access." *Digital Scholarship at the Libraries* (blog). April 22, 2013. <http://library.osu.edu/blogs/digitalscholarship/2013/04/22/ojs-moves-to-oo/>.

This post announces the conversion of the *Ohio Journal of Science* to hybrid OA. This society journal is published from the Ohio State University library institutional repository, known as the Knowledge Bank. Although it is touted as a hybrid journal, it appears to be fully OA.

52. Lossius, Hans Morten and Kjetil Søreide. "Open Access Publishing: A Girder in The Success of the *Scandinavian Journal of Trauma, Resuscitation and Emergency Medicine*." *Scandinavian Journal of Trauma, Resuscitation and Emergency Medicine* 19, no. 1 (January 2011): 7. <http://doi.org/10.1186/1757-7241-19-7>.

This editorial discusses the process of flipping a Scandinavian emergency medicine journal to OA using BMC as a platform. The process appeared to be a success two years out with submissions and citations rising and the journal accepted into PubMed, Medline, Scopus, and provisionally into the WoS. The conversion was funded by a couple of governmental agencies that picked up the APC costs during the first two years.

53. Mahlknecht, Ulrich. "Clinical Epigenetics Is Now a Fully Open Access Journal." *Clinical Epigenetics* 3, no. 1 (2011): 1–2. doi:10.1186/1868-7083-3-1. <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3257543/pdf/1868-7083-3-1.pdf>.

This is an announcement of another society journal converted to full OA with BioMed Central as the publisher.

54. Mitchell, Karlei. "New journals for 2015." *Exchanges: Our Ideas, Research and Discussion Blog*. December 29, 2014. <http://exchanges.wiley.com/blog/2014/12/29/new-journals-for-2015/>.

This blog post announces newly published journals at Wiley. It appears they are flipping ten journals, mostly of the society type, this year. Most were published by societies but several were previously published by other commercial publishers.

55. Moldovan, O.T. "A Big Step Forward: *Subterranean Biology* Journal Moves to Advanced Open Access Publishing." Pensoft Publishers press release, April 30, 2013. [http://www.eurekalert.org/pub\\_releases/2013-04/pp-abs043013.php](http://www.eurekalert.org/pub_releases/2013-04/pp-abs043013.php).

In this release, Pensoft Publishers announces the conversion of *Subterranean Biology* to OA.

56. *MSKCC Library Blog*. "Cancer Science to be Open Access in 2014." December 31, 2013. <https://library.mskcc.org/blog/2013/12/cancer-science-to-be-open-access-in-2014/>.

This is an announcement of the OA conversion of a journal published by Wiley on behalf of the Japanese Cancer Association. APCs will be charged.

57. Mueller, Deirdre. "Journal AWWA Peer-reviewed Articles Available Online at No Cost to the Public." American Water Works Association (AWWA) press release. January 15, 2015. <http://www.prweb.com/releases/2015/01/prweb12448106.htm>.

The *Journal of the American Water Works Association* flipped in 2015, and also made back issues for the previous of 25 volumes OA available online. The association is covering the cost and is making the journal OA. The journal appears to have been self-published before flipping. A print edition is still produced and sent out to the around 50,000 members. Based on JCR data, the journal seems to be doing well in terms of articles published and citation rate. The IF went up slightly and the journal is publishing about the same number of articles.

58. National Documentation Centre (EKT). "Historein: EKT announces the journal's new online edition," press release, September 17, 2012. <http://epset.gr/en/Press-Center/News/historein-ekt-e-publishing>.

The National Documentation Centre (EKT) funded the production of a freely available electronic version of *Historein*, a Greek language history journal that had been published since 1999. The Centre provide web hosting using OJS as well as expertise, guidance, and support services. All issues of the journal are available online; however, the last issue was published in 2014, making it questionable that the journal is still being published electronically.

59. Nature Publishing Group. "Assessing the Transition to Full Open Access After Six Months." Poster published online at Figshare.com, June 29, 2015. [http://figshare.com/articles/Nature Communications Assessing the transition to full open access/1466890](http://figshare.com/articles/Nature_Communications_Assessing_the_transition_to_full_open_access/1466890).

This poster shows results of an assessment of the impact of *Nature Communications'* transition to full OA from six months after transition.

60. Open Library of Humanities. "Announcing the First Subscription Journal to Flip to Open Access Through the Open Library of Humanities," press release, May 29, 2015. <https://www.openlibhums.org/2015/05/29/announcing-the-first-subscription-journal-to-flip-to-open-access-through-the-open-library-of-humanities/>.

This is an announcement that the *Journal of British and Irish Innovative Poetry* will be the first subscription journal to flip to OA through the Open Library of Humanities.

61. Open Library of Humanities. "Four Subscription Journals to Flip to Fee-Free OA with the OLH in January 2016," press release, November 11, 2015. <https://about.openlibhums.org/2015/11/27/four-subscription-journals-to-flip-to-fee-free-gold-oa-with-the-olh-in-january-2016/>.

This release announces four journals, *Journal of 21st-century Writings*, *Laboratory Phonology*, the *Journal of Portuguese Linguistics*, and *Glossa*, will be published first by Ubiquity Press and later moved to the OLA. These four journals are receiving funding to transition to OA through the [LingOA](#) initiative.

62. Ort, Donald R. "RT-Plant Physiology: Full Open Access Publishing at No Charge to ASPB Members." *Plant Physiology* 142, no. 1 (September 2006): 5. doi: [10.1104/pp.104.900204](https://doi.org/10.1104/pp.104.900204).

This article announces that all papers from members of the American Society of Plant Biologists will be published in *Plant Physiology* online at no charge. It is not clear what the fees will be for non-members or if their articles would only be published in the paper journal. Membership is only 115 USD per year. The announcement goes on to highlight the benefits of OA.

63. Packer, Abel Laerte. "The Emergence of Journals of Brazil and Scenarios for Their Future." *Educação e Pesquisa* 40, no. 2 (April/June 2014): 301–323. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/S1517-97022014061860>.

[From the abstract] "This article presents an overview of the main bibliometric and editorial management characteristics of the 400 journals of Brazil indexed in Scientific Electronic Library Online (SciELO), Scopus, and Web of Science (WoS). It also projects scenarios for changing the current framework by promoting journals considered as international benchmarks and the way journals are evaluated and funded."

64. Peters, Paul. 2007 (July). "Going All The Way: How Hindawi Became an Open Access Publisher." *Learned Publishing* 20(3):191–195. <http://doi.org/10.1087/095315107X204049>.



This article recounts the story of the rise of the Egyptian publisher Hindawi and the reasons for its total conversion to OA.

65. Piven, Joseph. "Journal of Neurodevelopmental Disorders Is Now a Fully Open Access Journal." *Journal of Neurodevelopment Disorders* 4, no. 1 (February 2012): 1–2. doi: [10.1186/1866-1955-4-1](https://doi.org/10.1186/1866-1955-4-1).

The journal flipped in 2012 and is now published by BMC. It appears to be doing quite well. The IF is 3.27 with 27 publications in 2015 as of Sept 12, 2015.

66. *Research Information*. "Wiley converts three more journals to open access," press release, February 4, 2015. [http://www.researchinformation.info/news/news\\_story.php?news\\_id=1831](http://www.researchinformation.info/news/news_story.php?news_id=1831).

This press release announces that Wiley converted three journals, *Conservation Letters*, *Thoracic Cancer*, and *The Journal of Veterinary Internal Medicine*, to OA.

67. Rota, Jadranka. "Nota Lepidopterologica Combines Tradition and Innovation Through Open Access and Advanced Publishing Model." *Nota Lepidopterologica* 37, no. 1 (June 15, 2014): 1–2. <http://doi.org/10.3897/nl.37.8008>.

This is a short editorial about *Nota Lepidopterologica* flipping to OA using Pensoft as the publisher. The journal was founded in 1977 by Societas Europaea Lepidopterologica (SEL) and was operating on a subscription basis until the start of 2014, when it transferred to Pensoft and started publishing using an APC-funded OA model. The society covers the APC for up to 25 pages a year for members who are the first-listed author of a paper. For others the fee is 25 EUR per page with a minimum of 100 EUR per article.

68. Royal Society of Chemistry. "Royal Society of Chemistry's Flagship Journal Goes Gold Open Access," press release, July 15, 2014. <http://www.rsc.org/AboutUs/News/PressReleases/2014/Chemical-Science-goes-Gold-open-access.asp>.

This press release announces the flip of a high-impact society journal using an APC funding model. The APC will be waived for two years.

69. Rundkvist, Martin. "Major Archaeological Journal Goes Open Access." *ScienceBlogs*. March 18, 2009. <http://scienceblogs.com/aardvarchaeology/2009/03/18/major-archaeological-journal-g/>.

This is an announcement of a Scandinavian archaeology and medieval art journal going OA. Few details are given. The journal seems to be doing fine, although it publishes relatively few articles.

70. Rydholm, Anders and Olle Svensson. "New Format, Open Access, and Online Pre-Publication." *Acta Orthopaedica* 80, no. 1 (February 2009): 1. doi: [10.1080/17453670902804406](https://doi.org/10.1080/17453670902804406).

This is an announcement that *Acta Orthopaedica* is changing from pocket-size to full-size print version for economic reasons. The journal, founded in 1930, transitioned to OA in 2005. The

authors, who include the editor-in-chief, convey that they value the fact that the journal is free for both authors and readers online but warn that the trend in declining subscriptions might mean that the journal has to introduce a page charge within a few years. Abandoning the paper version is also discussed, but they mention that there is still such a strong demand for that potentially dropping it would be a significant change. The journal is using Taylor and Francis' platform and seems to be publishing quite a few articles, all OA.

71. Sachini, Evi, Victoria Tsoukala, Nikos C. Houssos, Ioanna-Ourania Stathopoulou, Christina-Eleni Paschou, and Aggeliki Paraskevopoulou. "Open Access In The Humanities: A Case Study Of Developing Three Open-Access Electronic Journals In Greece." Paper presented at 13th International Conference on Electronic Publishing (ELPUB 2009), June 2009: 543–556. [http://elpub.scix.net/data/works/att/150\\_elpub2009.content.pdf](http://elpub.scix.net/data/works/att/150_elpub2009.content.pdf).

This paper presents a type of OA pilot project which has been quite typical in European countries, where a centralized national or EU funding source has been available to support the transitioning of clusters of journals. A similar project has also been undertaken in Finland. Another typical trait is that the project used OJS as the journal management platform. There were technical challenges involved (use of ancient Greek) for which the pooling of resources was important. A very important aspect of the project was the digitization of back issues, which was challenging given the copyright issues. This appears to be a successful project that also raises awareness about OA.

This paper presents a type of OA pilot project quite common in Europe, where some centralized national or EU funding has been available to support the transitioning of clusters of journals.

72. Schmidt, Stefan, Gavin R. Broad, Pavel Stoev, Daniel Mietchen, and Lyubomir Penev. "The Move to Open Access and Growth: Experience from *Journal of Hymenoptera Research*." *Journal of Hymenoptera Research* 30 (January 2013): 1–6. doi: 10.3897/jhr.30.4733.

This is an editorial-like article in the *Journal of Hymenoptera Research* that describes the journal's flipping process. The journal was launched in 1992, publishing two issues per year. In 2011, the society decided to transition to OA with Pensoft as the publisher. The journal has been able to publish much larger volumes of papers since eliminating its print format, doubling from around 350 papers per year to around 700 in 2012. Access has also almost doubled since the journal flipped to OA. Authors are encouraged to publish multimedia or other digital material with their manuscripts.

73. Siegmund, F. "Internet-Zeitung: Die Zeitschrift 'Archäologische Informationen' erscheint im Open Access mit Early Views." *Internet Zeitung* (blog). October 15, 2013. <http://internet-zeitung.blogspot.com/2013/10/die-zeitschrift-archaologische.html>.

This blog post, which is in German, announces that the journal is transitioning to OA. It does not go into much detail about how this will be accomplished other than it has support from Heidelberg University Library and that it will be hosted on OJS.



74. Simpson, Valerie. "Chemical Science moves to Gold Open Access." *RSC Publishing Blog*. July 15, 2014. <http://blogs.rsc.org/rscpublishing/2014/07/15/chemical-science-moves-to-gold-open-access/>.

75. Springer. "Springer to Collaborate with Five Japanese Societies on an Open Access Journal," press release, May 12, 2014. <http://phys.org/wire-news/161347986/springer-to-collaborate-with-five-japanese-societies-on-an-open.html>.

This press release dated announces Springer's collaboration with Japanese academic societies to flip one of its high-impact journals, *Earth, Planets and Space (EPS)*, through SpringerOpen. *Earth, Planets and Space* covers scientific articles in earth and planetary sciences, and in particular geomagnetism, astronomy, space science, seismology, volcanology, geodesy, and planetology. The journal also publishes articles in new and interdisciplinary subjects, including instrumentations. In 2012, EPS had an IF of 2.921.

76. Springer. "Springer to Collaborate with Scion on Open Access Journal," press release, January 17, 2013. <http://phys.org/wire-news/119879233/springer-to-collaborate-with-scion-on-open-access-journal.html>.

This press release announces that the *New Zealand Journal of Forestry Science* is flipping to OA through SpringerOpen, coinciding with its inclusion into ISI. The publication costs for the journal are covered by New Zealand Forest Research Institute Limited (Scion), so authors do not need to pay an APC.

77. Springer. "Springer to Convert Two Journals in High Energy Physics to Open Access," press release, September 27, 2012. <http://www.springer.com/about+springer/media/pressreleases?SGWID=0-11002-6-1390944-0>.

This press release announces that Springer is joining the SCOAP3 initiative with two journals. They are the *Journal of High Energy Physics*, published for the International School for Advanced Studies (SISSA, Trieste, Italy), and the *European Physical Journal C*, published with Società Italiana di Fisica.

78. STM Publishing News. "Bioscience Reports To Convert To Full Open-Access." STM Publishing News. March 29, 2012. [http://www.stm-publishing.com/bioscience-reports-to-convert-to-full-open-access/?goback=.gde\\_2367178\\_member\\_104355240](http://www.stm-publishing.com/bioscience-reports-to-convert-to-full-open-access/?goback=.gde_2367178_member_104355240).

This interesting press release notes that one of the journals published by the Biochemical Society has converted to full OA after having had a hybrid option for two years with a reasonable uptake. What is particularly interesting is that the journal seems to practice the "mega-journal" approach to peer review. That is accept all "sound" science. The annual number of articles published is around 200, and the APC is 1,350 USD. The publisher is using the increasingly common cascading approach to peer review from its other journals, which has probably helped with successfully transitioning to OA.

79. Stokes, Mary. "Wave of the present?" *Christopher Moore's History News* (blog). January 26, 2011. <http://christophermoorehistory.blogspot.com/2011/01/wave-of-present.html>.

This blog post announces that *Historical Studies in Education* has flipped to OA with the help of OJS. The post notes that "*Historical Studies in Education*, Canada's only peer reviewed, bilingual, history of education journal, is now a fully online, open-access periodical. Accessible at no cost worldwide, the journal is poised to broaden its circulation of original articles and reviews in the history of schooling, childhood, post-secondary education, and related subjects."

80. Sutton, Caroline. "*Microbial Ecology in Health and Disease* Re-launches Under an Open Access Model." Society for Microbial Ecology and Disease press release, June 27, 2011. [http://www.somed.nu/official\\_journal.htm](http://www.somed.nu/official_journal.htm).

This press release announces a journal's transition to OA with a new OA publisher.

81. Informa PLC. "Taylor and Francis Group widens Open Access offerings," press release, October 29, 2011. <http://www.4-traders.com/INFORMA-PLC-001140/news/INFORMA-PLC-Taylor-Francis-Group-widens-Open-Access-offerings-13864967/>.

Three journals, *Green Chemistry Letters and Reviews*, *Journal of Biological Dynamics*, and *Smart and Nano Materials* were flipped to OA by Taylor and Francis. The digital archives of these titles will also be made OA.

82. Lejenäs, Harald and Henning Rodhe. "*Tellus A* and *Tellus B* Open Up — Free Access to All Content." *Tellus A* 64 (2012). doi: 10.3402/tellusa.v64i0.16068.

This is an announcement that *Tellus A* and *Tellus B* have transitioned to OA through Co-Action publishing. The journal's original per page charge of 50 EUR under the subscription model has been continued, and thus should have little financial impact for authorship.

83. UKSG. "*Insights: The UKSG Journal* is Going Fully Open Access from March 2014." UKSG press release, February 18, 2014. <http://www.uksg.org/node/694>.

This journal flipped in 2014 without author fees. As a society journal, the society may be using other society resources to fund the journal, but the funding source is not named. The URL indicates it is hosted at Boston College.

84. Welborn, A. "Cultural Anthropology Takes Open Access Publishing at Duke to Next Level." *Duke University Libraries: News, Events, and Exhibits* (blog). <http://blogs.library.duke.edu/blog/2013/03/15/cultural-anthropology-takes-open-access-publishing-at-duke-to-next-level/>.

This post provides some more background on the conversion of *Cultural Anthropology* and also discusses some other OA initiatives at Duke.

85. Wiley. "Established Journal *Evolutionary Applications* to Publish Under Open Access Model," press release, February 6, 2012. <http://www.wiley.com/WileyCDA/PressRelease/pressReleaseId-102369.html>.

This press release notes that the journal *Evolutionary Applications* has been converted to full OA.

86. Wiley. "Four Leading International Wiley Journals Become Open Access," press release, October 22, 2013. <http://phys.org/wire-news/143896254/four-leading-international-wiley-journals-become-open-access.html>.

This release announces the transition of four journals to the Wiley Open Access publishing program. The journals are *Aging Cell*, *Cancer Science*, *Influenza and Other Respiratory Viruses*, and the *Journal of Diabetes Investigation*. The program has 28 journals.

87. Wiley. "Plant Biotechnology Journal Joins the Wiley Open Access Publishing Program." *Plant Biotechnology Journal* home page. Accessed February 18, 2016. <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/journal/10.1111/%28ISSN%291467-7652/homepage/News.html>.

Another fairly high impact journal is being flipped to OA by Wiley. This is mainly an announcement without much substantive information.

88. Winters, Judith. Editorial. *Internet Archaeology* 38. 2015. <http://dx.doi.org/10.11141/ia.38.10>.

This editorial discusses the transition process for *Internet Archaeology*. They used a gradual approach over four years, changing the license, and making back issues OA while adjusting the subscription charge to reflect these changes. They received help from JISC which provided some transition funding.

89. Wolters Kluwer. "Wolters Kluwer Health Transitions the Journal *Medicine* to Fully Open Access, Broad-Based Biomedical Title in 2015," press release, February 5, 2014. <http://www.newswise.com/articles/wolters-kluwer-health-transitions-the-journal-medicine-to-fully-open-access-broad-based-biomedical-title-in-2015>.

This press release announces the conversion of the journal *Medicine* to full OA using an APC funding model starting in 2015. The journal is broad-based with a moderately high IF.

90. Wright, Victoria. "Taylor and Francis Group Widens Open Access Offerings," press release, July 1, 2011. <http://editorresources.taylorandfrancisgroup.com/taylor-francis-group-widens-open-access-offerings/>.

This press release announces the expansion of hybrid OA options and the following with regards to journal flipping: "Three cutting-edge titles currently available on a subscription basis will be converted to full Open Access for 2012. The digital archives of these titles will also be made Open Access." These titles—*Green Chemistry Letters and Reviews*, *Journal of Biological Dynamics*, and *Smart and Nano Materials*—publish significant research in their fields and have author communities with a strong interest in publishing research in an Open Access model."

91. Wolfers, Justin. "Economic Research Wants to Be Free." *Freakonomics* (blog). March 22, 2011. <http://www.freakonomics.com/2011/03/22/economic-research-wants-to-be-free/>.

The blog post discusses OA from an economic perspective. A major economics journal, the *Brookings Papers On Economic Activity*, converts to OA. Most papers seem to be solicited papers, though, and there is no information about APCs on the journal website.

92. Yorio, Thomas. "Open Access Coming to *IOVS*." *Investigative Ophthalmology and Visual Science* 56, no. 9 (August 2015). <http://iovs.arvojournals.org/article.aspx?articleid=2426644>.

This is a press release about a journal, *Investigative Ophthalmology and Visual Science (IOVS)*, that was flipped to full OA. There will be a flat APC with a 350 USD discount to society members.

93. Yu, Jeong-Sik. "Ultrasonography: A New Beginning with International Open Access." *Ultrasonography* 33, no. 1 (2014): 1-1. <http://dx.doi.org/10.14366/usg.13007>.

This brief editorial from announces that the *Ultrasonography* journal has decided to flip and strive towards broader international reach and impact. There are no submission or publication related fees. The Korean Society of Ultrasound Medicine will cover the cost of publication.

94. Zimmermann, Dominique. "Jump Into the Future: *Deutsche Entomologische Zeitschrift* Goes for Advanced Open Access In its 157th Publishing Year." *Deutsche Entomologische Zeitschrift* 61, no. 1 (May 29, 2014): 1. <http://doi.org/10.3897/dez.61.7967>.

This editorial discusses the transition of *Deutsche Entomologische Zeitschrift (DEZ)*, an Austrian journal that is 157 years old and converted to OA in 2014. It does not provide much information on how or why they made the transition; it mainly covers the benefits of OA in general terms.

### Support Programs and Descriptions of Models for Flipping Journals

1. Berlin 12 Conference Presentations. 2015. <http://www.berlin12.org/presentations/>.

This invitational conference focused specifically on transitioning existing journals to OA based on a recent publication by a recent white paper by the Max Planck Digital Library (<http://dx.doi.org/10.17617/1.3>). The presentation slides for each presentation are available on the site.

2. Bernstein, Michael. "American Chemical Society Extends New Open Access Program Designed to Assist Authors." American Chemical Society press release, November 1, 2013. <http://www.acs.org/content/acs/en/pressroom/newsreleases/2013/october/acs-extends-new-open-access-program-designed-to-assist-authors.html>.

This press release announces proposed plans for OA initiatives in the ACS publishing program in the coming year.

3. Bianco, S., O.H. Ellestad, P. Ferreira, F. Friend, P. Gargiulo, R. Hanania, S. Henrot-Versille, A. Holtkamp, P. Igo-Kemenes, D. Jarroux-Declais, M. Jordão, B.C. Kämper, J. Krause, T. Lagrange, F. LeDiberder, A. leMasurier, A. Lengenfelder, C.M. Lindqvist, S. Mele, S. Plaszczynski, R. Schimmer, J. Vigen, R. Voss, M. Wilbers, J. Yeomans, K. Zioutas. Towards Open Access Publishing in High Energy Physics. CERN. 2007. Retrieved from <http://scoap3.org/files/Scoap3WPReport.pdf>.

Report on the SCOAP3 project from the working party. It provides a fairly detailed but very early description of the program.

4. Bohannon, John. "In Unique Deal, Elsevier Agrees to Make Some Papers by Dutch Authors Free." *Science Insider*. December 11, 2015. <http://news.sciencemag.org/scientific-community/2015/12/unique-deal-elsevier-agrees-make-some-papers-dutch-authors-free>.

This article describes the very recent deal between the Dutch universities (VSNU) and Elsevier to make a portion of the VSNU publications OA. The actual agreement is covered by a non-disclosure clause and the details are not publically available.

5. Butler, Declan. "Dutch Lead European Push to Flip Journals to Open Access." *Nature News*. January 6, 2016. <http://www.nature.com/news/dutch-lead-european-push-to-flip-journals-to-open-access-1.19111>.

This article is an interesting and very current discussion of the push to transition journals in Western Europe especially in the Netherlands and the Association of Universities in the Netherlands (VSNU). It discusses the big deals that include allowing authors from the participating institutions to publish their articles in hybrid OA at no extra charge. While furthering OA, these deals lack transparency and are arguably a hindrance to a full reasonably priced transition to OA.

6. Chan, Leslie, Sidnei de Sousa, and Jen Sweezie. (2005). "Integrating the 'Green' and 'Gold' road to Open Access: Experience from Bioline International." Paper presented at ELPUB2005 Conference on Electronic Publishing, Katholieke Universiteit Leuven, Heverlee, Belgium, June 2005. Available online at [https://tspace.library.utoronto.ca/bitstream/1807/4272/1/Bioline\\_elpub2005.pdf](https://tspace.library.utoronto.ca/bitstream/1807/4272/1/Bioline_elpub2005.pdf).

This conference paper describes Bioline, a not-for-profit publishing platform, its rationale, benefits, structure, and outcomes. Bioline was (at the time) a platform used by over 30 journals, mainly in the developing world. It also acts as a mirror site in Brazil. The platform is a bit old and not directly relevant to this study, but its success at maintaining journals like Postgraduate Medicine may provide some useful examples.

7. Cooney-McQuat, Sarah, Stefan Busch, and Deborah Kahn. "Open Access Publishing: A Viable Solution for Society Publishers." *Learned Publishing* 23, no. 2(April 2010): 101–105. <http://doi.org/10.1087/20100204>.

This article is authored by BMC employees and concerns flipped journals published by BMC. The authors make the case that flipping can be done successfully and briefly discusses a few examples.

8. Corsín Jiménez, Alberto, John Willinsky, Dominic Boyer, Giovanni da Col, and Alex Golub. "Why an Open Access Publishing Cooperative Can Work: A Proposal for the AAA's Journal Portfolio." *Journal of Ethnographic Theory* 5, no. 2 (2015): v–xiii. <http://www.culanth.org/fieldsights/743-why-an-open-access-publishing-cooperative-can-work-a-proposal-for-the-aaa-s-journal-portfolio>

This article provides a detailed description of a cooperative/consortium proposal by the Public Knowledge Project and SPARC in response to the American Anthropological Association (AAA)'s announcement of a pending RFP for publishing their journals.

9. Crow, Raym. "Publishing Cooperatives: An Alternative for Non-profit Publishers." *First Monday* 11, no. 9 (September 4, 2006). <http://firstmonday.org/ojs/index.php/fm/article/view/1396/1314>.

This is a very useful article on developing publishing cooperatives to provide the necessary scale for small societies to efficiently publish their journals without resorting to commercial publishers.

10. Dennis, Alasia Datonye. "The Impact of the Open Access Movement on Medical Based Scholarly Publishing in Nigeria." *First Monday* 12, no. 10 (2007). <http://firstmonday.org/article/view/1957/1834>.

This article describes the challenges of publishing journals in developing countries with a focus on Nigeria and Africa in general. The article analyzes the challenges of publishing medical journals in Nigeria and the impact of OA on publishing in developing countries.

11. O'Donnell, Daniel, Heather Hobma, Sandra Cowan, Gillian Ayers, Jessica Bay, Marinus Swanepoel, Wendy Merkley, Kelaine Devine, Emma Dering, Inge Genee. "Aligning Open Access Publication with the Research and Teaching Missions of the Public University: The Case of the Lethbridge Journal Incubator (If 'if's and 'and's were pots and pans)." *The Journal of Electronic Publishing* 18, no. 3 (Summer 2015). <http://dx.doi.org/10.3998/3336451.0018.309>.

This article describes a publishing model based on using undergraduate and graduate students in a university scholarly publishing program. Students and graduate students gain valuable publishing experience and expertise, and the university reduces what is spent on publishing and recycles the cost of publishing back into the university instead of having the funds flow out to a publishing company.

12. Eve, Martin Paul. "Pondering a Solution to the Problem of Learned Societies and the Transition to Open Access." *Martin Paul Eve* (blog). October 4, 2014. <https://www.martineve.com/2014/10/04/pondering-a-solution-to-the-problem-of-learned-societies-and-the-transition-to-open-access/>.

This post discusses the problem of learned societies becoming dependent on revenue from their journals funding other operations of the societies. The author proposes a library consortium model used by the Open Library of Humanities.

13. Eve, Martin Paul. "Flipping Journals to OA While Supporting Existing OA Publications." *Martin Paul Eve* (blog). May 31, 2015. <https://www.martineve.com/2015/05/31/flipping-journals-to-oa-while-supporting-existing-oa-publications/>.

This post announces the first journal that flipped from subscription to the Open Library of Humanities.

14. Eve, Martin Paul. "Subscriptions No Longer Needed: Flipping Journals to Open Access While Supporting Existing OA Publications." *Martin Paul Eve* (blog). June 9, 2015. <http://blogs.lse.ac.uk/impactofsocialsciences/2015/06/09/flipping-journals-to-open-access/>.

This post provides a rationale for the development of the Open Library of the Humanities and the problems with subscription based and APC funded OA models.

15. Foundation for Open Access Statistics. 2013. *Journal of Statistical Software*. <http://www.foastat.org/jss.html>.

This is a website for an OA journal that is free for both authors and readers. While it did not flip, it provides an interesting example of a journal largely run on volunteer effort.

16. Fugelsnes, Elin. "Advarer mot dårlig kvalitet når forskningsartikler blir gratis." *forskning.no* (blog). March 2015. <http://forskning.no/forskningsetikk-om-forskning/2015/03/gratistforskning>.

This post offers a discussion of the advantages and disadvantages of OA from a Norwegian perspective. It warns of poor quality journals.

17. Guttikonda, Aneeta and Sridhar Gutam. "Prospects of Open Access to Indian Agricultural Research: A Case Study of ICAR." *First Monday* 14, no. 7 (July 6, 2009). <http://dx.doi.org/10.5210/fm.v14i7.2488>.

This article discusses the challenges for small local Indian journals, many without a Web presence.

18. Hollingworth, Nigel. "EDP Sciences Announces the Launch of EDP Open." Society for Scholarly Publishing press release, February 4, 2014. <http://www.sspnet.org/community/news/edp-sciences-announces-the-launch-of-edp-open/>.

In this press release, EDP Sciences, a learned-society owned publisher, announces the launch of EDP Open, a dedicated OA imprint and web platform to support society journals transitioning or creating new OA journals.



19. Kiley, Robert. "The Reckoning: An Analysis of Wellcome Trust Open Access Spend 2013-14." *Wellcome Trust* (blog). March 3, 2015. <http://blog.wellcome.ac.uk/2015/03/03/the-reckoning-an-analysis-of-wellcome-trust-open-access-spend-2013-14/>.

This post is an excellent analysis of the Wellcome Trust OA funding policy and the lack of compliance with the policy. The analysis shows just how complex the issues are in achieving what would appear to be fairly straightforward compliance issues.

20. Kosanovic, Biljana. "doiSerbia." *Open Access Success Stories* (blog). September 2011. <http://www.oastories.org/2011/09/serbia-repository-doiserbia/#more-16>.

This post discusses a shared national portal, in this stage hosted by the national library, to help existing journals convert to online and OA.

21. MackIntosh, Paul St. John. "A New Cooperative Model for Open Access Publishing." *Teleread* (blog). December 13, 2015. <http://www.teleread.com/writing/a-new-cooperative-model-for-open-access-publishing/>.

This is a short blog post summarizing Schmid's (2015) announcement about the American Anthropological Association RFP for publishing their journals.

22. Matthews, David. "Open Library of Humanities Aims to 'Flip' Journals to Open Access: New Publishing Model Aims to Make Research Accessible to All Without Charging Authors." *Times Higher Education*. <https://www.timeshighereducation.com/research-intelligence/open-library-humanities-aims-flip-journals-open-access>.

This is a news article about the OLH.

23. Neuman, Y., H. Strandberg, M. Gustafsson, and A. Pichler. "Report on Future Strategy of Open Access." AGORA—Scholarly Open Access Research in European Philosophy. August 18, 2014. [http://cordis.europa.eu/project/rcn/191888\\_en.pdf](http://cordis.europa.eu/project/rcn/191888_en.pdf).

This is an EU project report focusing on the topic of OA publishing of monographs and journals within philosophy. The report contains a useful breakdown of the possible revenue types for funding OA journals.

24. OpenAIRE. "Action Plan towards Open Access Publications: Global Research Council." September 13, 2013. <http://www.openaire.eu/en/component/content/article/9-news-events/460-action-plan-towards-open-access-publications-global-research-council>.

This is an action plan endorsed by the Global Research Council in a meeting in May 2013. The GRC is a common forum for the heads of national research funding agencies from different countries. Thus guidelines discussed there might influence policies by funders to require or support either gold or green OA. The plan includes 14 different items, many of which deal with raising awareness.



**Iryna Kuchma**

It would be more accurate to replace this OpenAIRE work on the GRC action plan with the GRC action plan itself, which is already listed in How-To Guides/Recommendations for Flipping: Global Research Council. Action Plan towards Open Access Publications. Report presented at Global Research Council Annual Global Meeting, Berlin, May 27–29, 2013.

[http://www.globalresearchcouncil.org/sites/default/files/pdfs/grc\\_action\\_plan\\_open\\_access%20FINAL.pdf](http://www.globalresearchcouncil.org/sites/default/files/pdfs/grc_action_plan_open_access%20FINAL.pdf).

25. Open Library of the Humanities. “OLH Partners with LingOA and Ubiquity Press to Provide Long-Term Sustainability for Flipped Journals.” *OLH* (blog). October 12, 2015.

<https://about.openlibhums.org/2015/10/12/olh-partners-with-lingoa-and-ubiquity-press-to-provide-long-term-sustainability-for-flipped-journals/>.

This is a blog post by the OLH announcing that the Open Library of Humanities is partnering with the LingOA. The goal is to facilitate flipping subscription journals in linguistics to OA funded by the OLH’s consortium approach.

26. Prosser, David C. “From Here to There: A Proposed Mechanism for Transforming Journals from Closed to Open Access.” *Learned Publishing* 16, no. 3(July 2003): 163–166.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1087/095315103322110923>.

This is a classic article proposing hybrid OA as a vehicle for flipping to OA.

27. Reckling, Falk and Eva Scherag. “Initial Funding for High-Quality Open Access Journals in the Humanities and Social Sciences.” Austrian Science Fund. 2013.

[http://www.fwf.ac.at/fileadmin/files/Dokumente/News\\_Presse/Veranstaltungsrueckblick/2013/11\\_Anschubfinanzierung\\_fuer\\_hochqualitative\\_OA-Zeitschriften/OAJ\\_Report\\_ENG.pdf](http://www.fwf.ac.at/fileadmin/files/Dokumente/News_Presse/Veranstaltungsrueckblick/2013/11_Anschubfinanzierung_fuer_hochqualitative_OA-Zeitschriften/OAJ_Report_ENG.pdf).

This report describes a grant program by the FWF to fund OA journals in the humanities and social sciences. It discusses the proposals received and the journals selected to receive funding.

28. Research Information Network. “Finch Report Implementation and Review.” April 7, 2014.

<http://www.researchinfonet.org/finch/>.

This is a summary evaluation of the RCUK Policy on Open Access Supporting Guidance.

29. Romeu, Clément, Anne Gentil-Beccot, Alexander Kohls, Anne Mansuy, Salvatore Mele, and Martin Vesper. “The SCOAP3 Initiative and the Open Access Article-Processing-Charge Market: Global Partnership and Competition Improve Value in the Dissemination of Science.” CERN. April 7, 2014. <http://cds.cern.ch/record/1735210>.

This article describes the SCOAP3 consortium project for funding OA journals in particle physics. It discusses the model, tendering process, and the results of a study looking at APC price and IF in physics. It also notes the relationship is relatively high in gold OA journals and much lower in hybrid journals. It makes the point that the SCOAP3 tendering process results in otherwise hybrid journal APCs having as similar to gold journals.

30. Schmid, Oona. "AAA's Publishing Partnership: Steps Toward the Future." *Anthropology News*. September 23, 2015. <http://www.anthropology-news.org/index.php/2015/09/23/aaas-publishing-partnership/>.

This news article announces an RFP by the American Anthropological Association for publishing their journals. The journals are currently published by Wiley.

31. Science ORF.at. "FWF Supports Eight Open Access Journals." November 12, 2015. <http://science.orf.at/stories/1729833/>.

This is an announcement about the FWF funding eight humanities and social science OA journals. This program is described in more detail in Reckling, and Scherag, 2013, referenced above.

32. Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council. "Aid to Scholarly Journals: June 2014 Competition." Accessed February 18, 2016 [http://www.sshrc-crsh.gc.ca/funding-financement/programs-programmes/scholarly\\_journals-revues\\_savantes-eng.aspx](http://www.sshrc-crsh.gc.ca/funding-financement/programs-programmes/scholarly_journals-revues_savantes-eng.aspx).

This webpage describes a Canadian government grant program that will provide up to \$30,000 CAD to cover the costs of publishing a journal. A maximum of three years of support is provided. (It's not clear how competing renewals are handled.) The journal publisher receives \$850 per published article and up to \$5,000 for distribution costs or for transitioning a journal from subscription to OA.

33. Solomon, David J. "Strategies for Developing Sustainable Open Access Scholarly Journals. *First Monday* 11 no. 6 (June 5, 2006). <http://journals.uic.edu/ojs/index.php/fm/article/view/1335/1255>.

This article describes a number of strategies for sustaining a small OA journal without charging authors or readers for publishing. The article uses Medical Education Online as an example.

34. Suber, Peter. "Flipping a Journal to Open Access." *SPARC Open Access Newsletter*. October 2, 2007.

<https://dash.harvard.edu/handle/1/4322572>.

This article discusses the idea of in theory flipping journals using the funding already being spent for subscriptions. It is based on an interview with Mark Rowse that was conducted in 2003. Mr. Rowse was the CEO of Ingenta at the time of the interview.

35. Tonta, Yaşar, Güleda Doğan, Umut Al and Orçun Madran. "Open Access Policies of Research Funders: The Case Study of the Austrian Science Fund (FWF)." Report funded by the European Commission. November 2015. <http://www.pasteur4oa.eu/sites/pasteur4oa/files/resource/FWF-OA-Policy-Case-Study-7-Nov-2015-final.pdf>.

This report describes the FWF's OA programs in great detail. It appears to be more descriptive than analytic.

36. Van Noorden, Richard. "Particle-Physics Papers Set Free." *Nature* 505, no. 7482 (January 7, 2014). <http://www.nature.com/news/particle-physics-papers-set-free-1.14473>.

This short article discusses the SCOAP3 project after the American Physical Society pulled out of the consortium.

37. Walker, Stephanie R. "Bioline International: A Case Study in Open Access and Its Usage for Enhancement of Research Distribution for Scientific Research from Developing Countries." *Digital Library Perspectives* 25, no. 2 (2009): 125–134. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/10650750910961929>.

This article provides a summary of the creation and evolution of Bioline. According to the text Bioline (a non-profit) started out in 1993 operating from Brazil and the United Kingdom with its primary focus in providing digitized scientific articles from six journals on-demand as text-only emails to researchers in developing countries. Since then the service has become website-based and acts as an aggregator, digitizer, and publisher for journals.

38. White, Natasha. "Exploring Open Access Publishing Opportunities." *Exchanges* (blog). October 27, 2014. <http://exchanges.wiley.com/blog/2014/10/27/exploring-open-access-publishing-opportunities/?hootPostID=6d7f506b6798fa716e0ec80420a7529a>.

This post is a short overview of Wiley's OA activities. Of particular interest is the direct marketing of small ecosystems of high prestige subscription journals which feed more general mega-journal like OA journals with rejected manuscript.

### **How-To Guides/Recommendations for Flipping**

1. Björk, Bo-Christer and Turid Hedlund. "Two Scenarios for How Scholarly Publishers Could Change Their Business Model to Open Access." *The Journal of Electronic Publishing* 12, no. 1 (February 1, 2009). <http://dx.doi.org/10.3998/3336451.0012.102>.

This paper discusses two scenarios for how established publishers with subscription-based journals could convert to OA. The instantaneous flip is probably unrealistic except for very special conditions, such as in the field of high energy physics, where the clients are starting to require OA and are backing this with funding to buy the open accessibility of the leading journals in their field.

2. Bruch, Christoph, Gernot Deinzer, Kai Geschuhn, Petra Hätscher, Kristine Hillenkötter, Ulrike Kreß, Heinz Pampel, Hildegard Schäffler, Ursula Stanek, Arnulf Timm, and Alexander Wagner. *Positions on Creating an Open Access Publication Market Which is Scholarly Adequate..* Potsdam, Germany: Positions of the Ad Hoc Working Group Open Access Gold in the Priority

Initiative “Digital Information” of the Alliance of Science Organisations in Germany, 2015. <http://doi.org/10.2312/allianzoa.009>.

This is a well written position statement on transitioning from a subscription to OA market. Their recommendations are sound and based on research. They define five factors that are seen as defining the foundations of the transformation process from subscription to a scholarly adequate OA publication system.

3. Cerejo, Clarinda and Jayashree Rajagopalan. “Tips for Journal Editors Transitioning to Open Access and the Role of Mega-Journals in the Publishing Landscape.” *Editage Insights* (blog). May 15, 2015. <http://www.editage.com/insights/tips-for-journal-editors-transitioning-to-open-access-and-the-role-of-mega-journals-in-the-publishing-landscape>.

This post is an interesting discussion with Duncan MacRae, senior manager, open access, editorial, Wolters Kluwer. He discusses the transition of *Medicine* from subscription to OA and advises against flipping if you have a financially successful subscription journal that gets plenty of submissions. In his opinion, it probably makes more sense to go hybrid. However, if your journal gets plenty of submissions but your subscription base is waning and the authors are predisposed to publishing in OA journals, it might be a good candidate.

Transitioning an existing subscription journal to OA creates some challenges. Foremost is dealing with subscribing institutions and the backlog of articles submitted to the subscription journal. For *Medicine*, they had a yearlong transition period. He did not state how they dealt with back issues of the journal, which has been around since 1922.

4. Clarke, Michael T. “Open Sesame? Increasing Access to Medical Literature.” *Pediatrics* 114, no. 1 July 2004): 265–268. <http://pediatrics.aappublications.org/content/114/1/265>.

This is a somewhat outdated discussion of OA in relation to the American Academy of Pediatrics (AAP). It announces that upon request, authors will be able to make their articles freely available with no APC charge. The article also points out what the AAP feels are problems with moving to an APC-funded model for their journal.

5. Clarke, Roger. “The Cost Profiles of Alternative Approaches to Journal Publishing.” *First Monday* 12, no. 12 (December 3, 2007). <http://firstmonday.org/article/view/2048/1906>.

This is a useful though a bit outdated article that provides a taxonomy and breakdown of the costs associated with publishing a journal. This article is a bit detail intensive but may be useful in making sure no aspect of publishing is missing in a cost analysis. The paper discusses the definition of OA and of an academic journal as well as the impact of digitalization on the definition of a journal. The article delineates the roles of a publisher and the impact of Web-based journal management software. It defines three types of publishers: “unincorporated mutual,” similar to OASPA’s scholar publishers; not-for-profit associations; and for-profit publishers. The article correctly makes the distinction between fixed and variable (individual article) costs. It defines establishment, submission, article related, and issue related costs. The author also defines generic costs such as marketing and customer-related (very different

depending on whether a subscription, APC, or OA without subscription model is being used. The article goes on to present estimated costs for various approaches to publishing, though it is mainly based on the author's experience.

6. Crow, Raym and Howard Goldstein. *Model Business Plan: A Supplemental Guide for Open Access Journal Developers & Publishers*. New York: Open Society Institute, 2003. [http://www.budapestopenaccessinitiative.org/pdf/oaj\\_supplement\\_0703.pdf](http://www.budapestopenaccessinitiative.org/pdf/oaj_supplement_0703.pdf).

This is a comprehensive, well-developed guide for developing a business plan for an OA journal. It is somewhat out-of-date, but most of the information is just as applicable today

7. Crow, Raym and Howard Goldstein. *Guide to Business Planning for Converting a Subscription-based Journal to Open Access*. New York: Open Society Institute, 2004. [http://www.budapestopenaccessinitiative.org/pdf/business\\_converting.pdf](http://www.budapestopenaccessinitiative.org/pdf/business_converting.pdf).

This is a comprehensive discussion of business models for flipping a journal. It is a little outdated but there is still good information, such as the first appendix, which includes an inventory of potential sources of funding along with advantages and disadvantages and the like.

8. Fisher, Julian H. (2008). "Scholarly Publishing Re-invented: Real Costs and Real Freedoms." *The Journal of Electronic Publishing* 11, no. 2 (Spring 2008). <http://doi.org/10.3998/3336451.0011.204>.

This article discusses the costs of publishing based on the author's experience operating the Scholarly Exchange, a publishing platform for journals based on OJS. The estimates, while potentially realistic for scholarly publishers, are probably not realistic for large-scale publishing. The article is somewhat dated. Also, based on my own experience (DJS) the cost listed for copyediting and XML generation are not realistic. A publisher like Ubiquity Press might serve as a better example.

9. Graf, C. "What IJCP Authors Think About Open Access: Exploring One Possible Future for Publishing Clinical Research in a General and Internal Medicine Journal." *International Journal of Clinical Practice* 66, no. 2 (February 2012). <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1742-1241.2011.02884.x>.

This editorial notifies authors and readers that the Wiley-published *International Journal of Clinical Practice (IJCP)* will be surveying submitting authors for their opinions on OA and will use the collected responses to help decide whether *IJCP* should become an APC OA journal instead of the subscription-based (with hybrid OA option) journal it was at the time of writing.

10. Jones, Jackie. "Jackie Jones on When to Flip Your Journal Revenue Model to Open Access." Association of Learned and Professional Society Publishers (ALPSP) International Conference 2014 video, 14:33. Posted October 6, 2014. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=XgScZeqvxfo>.

This is a very useful and informative video discussing Wiley's experience flipping journals. It includes discussion of what journals make the most sense to flip and many useful suggestions

about the flip process and how to make it successful. This content is useful for journals flipping to APC-funded OA, although much of the information will probably be useful for flipping journals to another OA business model.

11. Kulczycki, Emanuel. "Mój poradnik dla redaktorów i wydawców czasopism Open Access." | *Warsztat badacza* (blog). October 9, 2013. [http://ekulczycki.pl/warsztat\\_badacza/moj-poradnik-dla-redaktorow-i-wydawcow-czasopism-open-access/](http://ekulczycki.pl/warsztat_badacza/moj-poradnik-dla-redaktorow-i-wydawcow-czasopism-open-access/).

This is a Polish-language blog post by what appears to be a society. It provides a guide for flipping journals.

**Iryna Kuchma**

I think this would be a better description: In this blog post Emanuel Kulczycki announces his guide for journal editors and publishers on OA journals: launching new OA journals and flipping journals (in Polish language). This guide itself is here:

[https://repozytorium.amu.edu.pl/bitstream/10593/7853/1/Kulczycki Otwarte czasopisma %20Zak%C5%82adanie czasopism naukowych oraz transformacja czasopism zamknietych.pdf](https://repozytorium.amu.edu.pl/bitstream/10593/7853/1/Kulczycki%20Otwarte%20czasopisma%20Zak%C5%82adanie%20czasopism%20naukowych%20oraz%20transformacja%20czasopism%20zamknietych.pdf)

12. Lund, Christian and Else Lie. "Changes to Funding Scheme for Journals: Open Access to Scientific Journals on Culture and Society." The Research Council of Norway. January 31, 2014. [http://www.forskingsradet.no/en/Newsarticle/Open\\_access\\_to\\_scientific\\_journals\\_on\\_culture\\_and\\_society/1253992543913/p1177315753918](http://www.forskingsradet.no/en/Newsarticle/Open_access_to_scientific_journals_on_culture_and_society/1253992543913/p1177315753918).

The program is not exactly bridge funding. Instead, its goal is facilitating a three-year transition period for all 40 journals in the social sciences and humanities, which have been supported on a continuous basis. They must convert to full OA immediately as a condition for continuing support.

13. Global Research Council. *Action Plan towards Open Access Publications*. Report presented at Global Research Council Annual Global Meeting, Berlin, May 27–29, 2013. [http://www.globalresearchcouncil.org/sites/default/files/pdfs/grc\\_action\\_plan\\_open\\_access%20FINAL.pdf](http://www.globalresearchcouncil.org/sites/default/files/pdfs/grc_action_plan_open_access%20FINAL.pdf).

This is an action plan endorsed by the Global Research Council in a meeting in May 2013. The GRC is a common forum for the heads of national research funding agencies from different countries. Thus, guidelines discussed there might influence policies by funders to require or support either gold or green OA. The plan includes 14 different items, many of which deal with raising awareness.

14. Meadows, Alice. "Flipping, not Flopping: Converting Subscription Journals to Open Access." *The Scholarly Kitchen* (blog). March 4, 2015. <http://scholarlykitchen.sspnet.org/2015/03/04/flipping-not-flopping-converting-subscription-journals-to-open-access/>.

This is a short but very useful blog post about Wiley's experience flipping journals. The post provides a list of what they feel are journal features that are compatible with flipping. It makes

essentially the same points as Jones (2014) but in written form rather than a digital presentation.

15. Piwowar, Heather. "Concrete options for a society journal to go OA." *Research Remix* (blog). July 13, 2012. <http://researchremix.wordpress.com/2012/07/13/oa-taskforce/>.

Heather Piwowar discusses her evaluation of the options for AMIA converting their journal, *JAMIA*, to OA (or not). She provides a thoughtful evaluation of a variety of options including publishing through a number of different OA publishers.

16. Piwowar, Heather. "OA Options for a Society Journal." *Research Remix* (blog). May 11, 2013. <http://researchremix.wordpress.com/2013/05/11/society-oa-options/>.

This is an update of Heather Piwowar's 2012 blog post. It presents a thoughtful assessment of the issues around flipping a society journal.

17. Prosser, David C. "From Here to There: A Proposed Mechanism for Transforming Journals From Closed to Open Access." *Learned Publishing* 16, no. 3 (2003): 163–166.

David Prosser in this seminal article outlines the use of hybrid OA as a strategy for transitioning subscription journals to OA. Although Springer used this rationale to set the price point of 3,000 USD for Springer Open.<sup>8</sup> While most publishers also set their hybrid options at this level, other than in a few cases, the hybrid has not served as a transition strategy to full OA.

Science Europe. Principles for the Transition to Open Access to Research Publications. April 2013.

[http://www.scienceeurope.org/uploads/PublicDocumentsAndSpeeches/SE\\_OA\\_Pos\\_Statement.pdf](http://www.scienceeurope.org/uploads/PublicDocumentsAndSpeeches/SE_OA_Pos_Statement.pdf)

This is a position statement on Open Access published by Science Europe, and agreed upon by all its member organizations, on April 2013. "Science Europe is a Brussels-based association of 51 European national research organisations. It was founded in October 2011 with the aim of promoting the collective interests of members and providing them with a platform to collaborate at both policy and activity level."

18. Schmoller, Seb. *Journal Tendering for Societies: A Brief Guide*. Association for Learning Technology. March 25, 2011. <http://repository.alt.ac.uk/887/>.

This is a very useful guide. It was developed by the Association for Learning Technology with encouragement from Jisc. They discuss the lessons learned from going through the process of reviewing and cancelling a contract with a major commercial subscription publisher and going OA published by Co-Action. The report contains a great deal of practical information and good advice about the whole process of negotiating with publishers and what to consider. It is very

8 Personal communication with Peter Binfield.



open-minded and nonjudgmental in its discussion of what to consider when making such a decision.

19. Shieber, Stuart. "A true transitional open-access business model." *The Occasional Pamphlet On Scholarly Communication* (blog). March 28, 2014. <http://blogs.law.harvard.edu/pamphlet/2014/03/28/a-true-transitional-open-access-business-model/>.

This is a very useful blog post. It provides a theoretical discussion of how publishers could use a hybrid journal for a smooth transition to a full OA journal. The post also discusses various revenue-neutral scenarios. By revenue-neutral Schieber means that the hybrid APC is fully offset in reduced subscription income for the publisher. There are two extreme cases, in the first of which the offset equally benefits all subscribers. In the other case, the authors' institution receives the full benefit. In the short run, the latter solution is more effective in raising uptake. He calls this approach the transitional one. Schieber points out that the Gold-for-Gold program of the Royal Society of Chemistry as well as the Jisc-Wiley pilot come close to this scenario.

20. Sutton, Caroline. *Stakeholder Analysis (OAIG Gold Open Access Project)*. Association for Learning Technology. November 19, 2012. <http://repository.alt.ac.uk/2238/>.

This is one of the most detailed case studies of a journal flipping, considering the process from a very analytical perspective. This is highly-relevant case study, and in particular the lessons learned should be considered essential for constructing the journal flipping process's framework and considerations.

21. Swan, Alma and John Houghton. *Going for Gold? The costs and benefits of Gold Open Access for UK Research Institutions: Further Economic Modelling*. Report to the UK Open Access Implementation Group, June 2012. <http://repository.jisc.ac.uk/610/>.

This report explores the various scenarios under both the assumption of worldwide OA and unilateral OA adopted by specific institutions. The report explores both gold and green scenarios.

22. Swan, Alma. *Sustainability of Open Access Services: Report on Phase 1: Scoping the Challenge, Phase 2: Consulting the Stakeholders*. Report commissioned by Knowledge Exchange, 2012. [http://repository.jisc.ac.uk/6201/1/Sustainability\\_OA\\_services\\_phases\\_1\\_%26\\_2.pdf](http://repository.jisc.ac.uk/6201/1/Sustainability_OA_services_phases_1_%26_2.pdf)

This report was commissioned by Knowledge Exchange, a co-operation between Jisc, SURF, DFG, and DEFF, four national agencies supporting the university library sector. It looks at a vast array of services that support both green and gold OA, especially from a sustainability viewpoint. In particular, focus for gold OA are services such as OS software (OJS), national portals (such as SciELO), indexes (DOAJ), and APC payment mechanisms and agencies. There is no particular discussion of the conversion from subscription to OA, but indirectly some of the discussions are relevant. The central message is that while the technical expertise is often available for such services, there is often a lack of business planning knowhow, which would be



needed to secure long-term operations after the initial phase, often funded by limited time projects.

23. Van Wesenbeeck, Astrid and Frederick Friend. *Scholarly Society Journals in Transition to Open Access*. Report on the Workshop Organized by the Knowledge Exchange Open Access Working Group, with the Assistance of SPARC Europe and the Open Access Scholarly Publishers Association, held in Tallinn, Estonia September 21, 2011. <http://www.knowledge-exchange.info/reports/36>.

This is a short summary of a Knowledge Exchange workshop with relevant information for supporting journal flipping processes.

24. Ware, Mark. *Submission Fees: A Tool In the Transition to Open Access ?* Bristol, United Kindom: Mark Ware Consulting, March 2010. [https://www.innovationpolicyplatform.org/system/files/KE\\_Submission\\_fees\\_Short\\_Report\\_2010-11-25%20\(1\).pdf](https://www.innovationpolicyplatform.org/system/files/KE_Submission_fees_Short_Report_2010-11-25%20(1).pdf).

This is an assessment of charging submission fees. It is based on a review of the literature and discussions with publishers that use submission fees. This reference is of particular use to flipped journals that are considering these fees as a source of income.

25. White, Natasha. "Exploring Open Access Publishing Opportunities." *Exchanges* (blog). October 27, 2014. <http://exchanges.wiley.com/blog/2014/10/27/exploring-open-access-publishing-opportunities/?hootPostID=6d7f506b6798fa716e0ec80420a7529a>.

This is an overview of Wiley's OA activities. Of particular interest is the direct marketing of small ecosystems of prestigious subscription journals, which feed more general mega-journal like OA journals with rejected manuscripts. The post also mentions one of the eight converted journals, *Journal of Cellular and Molecular Medicine*, which is a relatively new subscription journal with low circulation. Prior to the conversion, an analysis of published papers, probably of external funding sources mentioned, demonstrated that many authors would have funding for ACPs available.

### Miscellaneous Materials

1. Busch, Stefan. "The Careers of Converts—How a Transfer to BioMed Central Affects the Impact Factors of Established Journals." *BioMed Central* (blog). January 15, 2014. <http://blogs.biomedcentral.com/bmcblog/2014/01/15/the-careers-of-converts-how-a-transfer-to-biomed-central-affects-the-impact-factors-of-established-journals/>.

This post analyses the longitudinal development of JCR index factors for five journals that have flipped through BioMed Central. The findings suggest that journal IFs rise after flipping to OA and switching to BMC as a publisher. The evidence, however, is anecdotal and the effect of a change in publisher and a change in business model are confounded.

2. Busch, Stefan. "The Impact Factor of Journals Converting from Subscription to Open Access." *BioMed Central* (blog). November 6, 2014. <http://blogs.biomedcentral.com/bmcblog/2014/11/06/the-impact-factor-of-journals-converting-from-subscription-to-open-access/>.

This blog post addresses the same topic as the author's January 15 post. Again, there is evidence that journals that migrate to BMC in the process of flipping from subscription to OA see an increase in IF as well as access. This finding, however, is anecdotal and it is difficult to distinguish the effect of switching publishers and switching business models. Both papers provide evidence that switching to a well-established and respected OA publisher in the process of flipping a journal can help ensure the transition is successful.

3. The Canadian Press. "Canadian Medical Journal, *Open Medicine*, Stops Publishing." *CBCNews*. November 4, 2014. <http://www.cbc.ca/news/health/canadian-medical-journal-open-medicine-stops-publishing-1.2823643>.

This news article discusses *Open Medicine* ceasing publication. *Open Medicine* was founded by editorial board members of the *Canadian Medical Association Journal* after the editor was fired over a dispute about editorial independence. The journal received advice and support from John Willinsky and the PKP, operating on very little funding from 2006 until 2014. The editorial board gave up and stopped publishing because the burden of publishing a high-quality clinical journal largely on volunteer effort. It demonstrates that a high-quality journal can be operated largely on volunteer effort, but maintaining that level of volunteer effort is very difficult to achieve over the long term.

Although this was not a "flipped" journal in the true sense, its story highlights the difficulty of maintaining a high-quality journal with very little funding and a largely volunteer staff.

4. Chant, Ian. "Academic Movers 2014: In-Depth with Emily Drabinski." *Library Journal's Academic Newswire*. June 26, 2014. <http://lj.libraryjournal.com/2014/06/people/academic-movers/academic-movers-2014-in-depth-with-emily-drabinski/#>.

This is an interview of a librarian. There is one noteworthy paragraph in the interview, which concerns how she helped a journal convert to OA:

"*Radical Teacher* had never had a librarian on the board before. I think that new perspective was helpful to them, having someone who understood the economics of publishing to help them make decisions about their future and survive as a publication. It reminded me that librarians know things. We're a fundamentally helpful and self-effacing field, and that means it can be easy to forget what we know. *Radical Teacher* didn't know why they were losing institutional subscriptions. As a librarian, I knew because I had cancelled them two or three times in the course of my career at that point."

5. Chung, Emily. "No More Free Access to Canadian Science Journals." *CBS News Technology and Science*. <http://www.cbc.ca/news/technology/no-more-free-access-to-canadian-science-journals-1.1044255>.

This news article discusses the impact of the privatization of the National Research Council's government-owned publishing arm. The privatization resulted in the public's loss of free access to 17 journals. Free access to the back issues remained temporarily, but as of 2011 there is a \$10 per article download (not clear if this is in Canadian or US dollars) for users without a subscription.

6. Collins, Scott L. "Opening Access to ESA Journals." *Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment* 11, no. 1 (February 2013): 3. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1890/1540-9295-11.1.3>.

This is a guest editorial in which the author ponders the consequences for different OA options with regards to society journals (as the ESA standards for Ecological Society of America). In particular, the author discusses the implications of national mandates possibly eating away the already low subscription prices that ESA journals have. The subscriptions fund not only the publication process but also many other membership activities. As a conclusion, Collins suggests that delayed OA could be the compromise between the interests of different stakeholders.

7. Hayes, Clayton and Robert P. Holley. "The university press: trends, initiatives and collaborations over the past several years." *Collection Building* 33, no. 3 (2014): 73–80. <http://doi.org/10.1108/CB-03-2014-0016>.

This article provides a discussion of the challenges facing university presses and how they are being addressed. It is of tangential interest to our study. They mention OA publications and the possibility of going that route for journals published by university presses, noting that there is limited support for presses moving to a full OA business model. They are also concerned about the financial impact when these presses are already under great financial stress.

8. Holdren, John P. Increasing Access to the Results of Federally Funded Scientific Research. Memorandum from the Executive Office of the President Office of Science and Technology Policy. February 22, 2013. [https://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/microsites/ostp/ostp\\_public\\_access\\_memo\\_2013.pdf](https://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/microsites/ostp/ostp_public_access_memo_2013.pdf).

This policy statement from the US Office of Science and Technology Policy (OSTP) announces increased access to the results of federally funded scientific research. While the policy mandates green OA for all federally funded research in the US, it indirectly facilitates OA journals.

9. Houghton, John, Bruce Rasmussen, Peter Sheehan, Charles Oppenheim, Anne Morris, Claire Creaser, Helen Greenwood, Mark Summers, and Adrian Gourlay. *Economic Implications of Alternative Scholarly Publishing Models: Exploring the Costs and Benefits*. Report to the Joint Information Systems Committee. January 2009. [http://vuir.vu.edu.au/15222/1/El-ASPM\\_Report.pdf](http://vuir.vu.edu.au/15222/1/El-ASPM_Report.pdf).

The Houghton study is perhaps the most extensive study comparing the global costs of subscription publishing with the costs of OA publishing. The overall conclusion is that OA would

be somewhat less expensive in particular because the print versions of journals would be scrapped. Nevertheless, the report suffers from the problem of making a many rather crude estimates on the micro-level, which means that it is difficult to trust the conclusions on the macro-level. The report is also fairly dated.

10. Moore, Malcolm A. and Kazuo Tajima. "Publishing the APJCP—Open Access and Who Should Pay? An Aside to the Financial Report for the 2nd APOCP General Assembly Conference." *Asian Pacific Journal of Cancer Prevention* 4 (2003), 342–344.  
[http://www.apjcpcontrol.org/paper\\_file/issue\\_abs/Volume5\\_No4/Editorial.pdf](http://www.apjcpcontrol.org/paper_file/issue_abs/Volume5_No4/Editorial.pdf).

This editorial discusses the finances of the Asian Pacific Organization for Cancer Prevention and the costs of publishing their journal OA. The editors discuss the expenses, sources of funding for the organization and journal, and that they rely heavily on volunteer effort. They also discuss the financial burden of the organization and how it largely rests on the Japanese. The article is useful for putting OA in the context of a society largely based in developing countries.

11. Kahn, Deborah. "Open Access for European Science Journals. *European Science Editing* 38, no. 4(November 2012): 91–93.

This essay provides a general introduction to the shift to digital publishing and OA. The two last pages of the article discuss *Acta Veterinaria Scandinavica*, a publication of the Veterinary Association of the Nordic Countries founded in 1959 and flipped in 2006 while transferring publishing duties to BMC. Prior to flipping, the journal was challenged by low subscription rates and difficulty attracting high-quality submissions. Since the flip, both submissions and the number of published articles have increased, and the IF has increased threefold (from 0.4 to 1.2). The author's main conclusion is that "open access has proved to be a good choice for regional society journals wishing to increase their impact and reach."

12. Li, R., Yan, S., Yao, Y., Wan, M., & Qian, J. "A New Digital Platform to Open Up Chinese University Journals: Publishing, Communication and Some OA Initiatives. *Serials* 21, no. 2 (2007): 83–88. <http://serials.uksg.org/article/download/2183/1338/>.

This article focuses on Chinese University journals and the pressure among Chinese researchers to publish in international journals. University journals in China were traditionally the single outlet for university faculty of a specific university to publish, with one journal per university. Attempts at merging the journals into national-level discipline-specific journals were reported to mostly have failed so far.

Regional portals were being developed to facilitate OA, according to the article, but not on a broad or national level. One portal discussed is Electronic Journal Archives of Chongqing.

13. Lin, Shu-Kun. "Full Open Access Publishing Policy Imposed in 2007: Molecules Publishes Many More Papers This Year—More than 2000 Pages Published up to Issue 8." *Molecules* 12, no. 8 (August 2007): 2001–2002. [doi:10.3390/12082001](https://doi.org/10.3390/12082001).

In three editorials of the journal *Molecules*, Shu-Kun Lin explains the OA experiments that the publisher MDPI conducted from 2005 through 2006 with several journals. The journals had previously offered full OA and expected voluntary contributions from authors, but many had not complied. During this period, authors who paid up front were published OA, and others were published behind pay walls. The percentage of articles published OA in *Molecules* was around 50 percent. As a result, the journal's IF decreased significantly due to considerably lower citation counts for non-OA articles. The same happened to the other journals, and as a result, MDPI converted all of its journals to full OA starting in 2007. There was a subsequent increase in the IFs, a very important sales factor for the journals. Only very high quality articles get waivers. It should be mentioned that MDPI, despite being an OASPA member, has been a controversial publisher.

14. Morrison, Heather. "International Communication Association on Open Access." *Poetic Economics* (blog). April 2010. <http://poeticeconomics.blogspot.com/2010/04/international-communication-association.html>.

This essay demonstrates that the surplus funds obtained from International Communication Association publications, which range from 500,000 to 600,000 dollars, could fund all of the articles published in their journals at an estimated APC of 1,600 dollars per paper. Their journals are published by Wiley, and the essay does not reveal the profit they are making. It is not clear if the author is presenting the data in US or Canadian dollars.

15. Morrison, Heather. "Economics of Scholarly Communication in Transition." *First Monday* 18, no. 6 (June 3, 2013). <http://firstmonday.org/ojs/index.php/fm/article/view/4370/3685>.

Morrison discusses the global costs of journal publishing and the fact that libraries pay the bulk of the costs. Hence, the way they spend their money is key to a potential large-scale transition to OA. A key message of the article is that libraries could work together in order to best achieve this through a library consortia approach.

16. Morrison, Heather, Jihane Salhab, Alexis Calvé-Genest, and Tony Horava. "Open Access Article Processing Charges: DOAJ Survey May 2014." *Publications* 3, no. 1 (February 5, 2015): 1–16. doi:10.3390/publications3010001.

This paper discusses the authors' large scale survey of APC prices. It most likely contains the most comprehensive, up-to-date data on APC prices.

17. O'Doherty, Sean and Bob Boissy. "Is There a Future for the Traditional Subscription-Based Journal?" *The Serials Librarian* 56, no. 1-4 (2009): 155–162. <http://doi.org/10.1080/03615260802678582>.

Representatives from two different journal publishers, Berkeley Electronic Press (bepress) and Springer, discuss ways publishers are adapting to changes in the academic journal publishing market.

18. Owens, Susan R. "Revolution or evolution?" *EMBO Reports* 4, no. 8 (August 2003): 741–743. <http://doi.org/10.1038/sj.embor.embor913> .

This is a report of a workshop on OA organized in 2003 by the European Molecular Biology Organization. The meeting had high-profile speakers, including Jean-Claude Guedon, Derk Haank and Michael Eisen. The information presented was basic. One useful comment notes that some journals have many review articles. These journals would have difficulty converting to OA financed by APCs because journals generally do not charge APCs for review articles.

19. Reinsfelder, Thomas. "Donations as a Source of Income for Open Access Journals : An Option To Consider?" *Journal of Electronic Publishing* 18, no. 3 (Summer 2015). <http://quod.lib.umich.edu/j/jep/3336451.0018.307?view=text;rgn=main>.

This is a survey of journals that solicit donations. It focuses on English-language journals published in the USA. The authors searched journals' websites for a donation button or other solicitation. They found that about five percent of journals solicited donations. The authors then surveyed those that sought donations and got a 48 percent response rate. According to respondents, most donations are small and, with few exceptions, generated only a small amount of funding. Therefore, the donation method does not seem like a productive means of funding journals flipping from subscription to OA.

20. Oransky, Ivan. "Updated: Ski Resort Paper Hits a (Media) Mogul and Gets Retracted." *Retraction Watch* (blog). June 21, 2012. <http://retractionwatch.wordpress.com/2012/06/21/ski-resort-paper-hits-a-media-mogul-and-gets-retracted/>.

This blog post describes the retraction of an article. The chain of events is not entirely clear, but one component is that Taylor and Francis bought a previously OA journal and then all previously-published articles were placed behind a paywall. In response, some authors requested to retract their articles in protest of this development. The events described here relate to reverse flipping, so it is not entirely relevant to this literature review, but it is worth noting.

Research Information Network. *Nature Communications*: Citation Analysis.

[http://www.nature.com/press\\_releases/ncomms-report2014.pdf](http://www.nature.com/press_releases/ncomms-report2014.pdf).

This report is a very interesting by analysis by RIN of articles published in *Nature Communications* in hybrid versus non-hybrid format. The study found a small citation advantage for the hybrid articles, which could have been a statistical artifact given the uncontrolled nature of the study. As in virtually all similar studies, there was a large difference in the number of accesses. The raw data can be reviewed at

[http://figshare.com/authors/Nature\\_Communications/598818](http://figshare.com/authors/Nature_Communications/598818).

21. Research Information Network. "BMC Says IFs of its Society Journals Increased After Move to OA." *Research Information*. August 6, 2014. [http://www.researchinformation.info/news/news\\_story.php?news\\_id=1653](http://www.researchinformation.info/news/news_story.php?news_id=1653).

This brief news article quotes BMC stating that citations increased after society journals flipped to OA and published through BMC.

22. Schimmer, Ralf, Kai Karin Geschuhn, and Andreas Vogler. Disrupting the Subscription Journals' Business Model for the Necessary Large-Scale Transformation to Open Access: A Max Planck Digital Library Open Access Policy White Paper. April 28, 2015. <http://doi.org/10.17617/1.3>.

The authors estimate the total global article output to 2.0 million per year, and that total subscription income would be 7.6 billion EUR. This leads to a calculation that the expense per article on average would be 3,800 EUR. There is a long discussion of data concerning APCs in OA journals from Germany, Austria, and the United Kingdom. The overall conclusion is that "all the available evidence that has been published or discussed in various reports points consistently to a predicted APC level of well below EUR 2,000 in a purely open access scenario." A follow-up conclusion notes that "there is currently already enough money in the system. A large-scale transformation from subscription to open access publishing is possible without added expense." They make some calculations of the costs in a large-scale transformation for the United Kingdom, Germany, and France, and also some very preliminary calculations for the United States.

This report is a companion piece to the Houghton studies. The scenario is a massive conversion of existing journals to OA. The problem is whether major publishers will also convert their journals if the average APC is below 2,000 USD.

23. Schmidt, Stefan, Gavin R. Broad, Pavel Stoev, Lyubomir Penev. "The Move to Open Access and Growth: Experience from *Journal of Hymenoptera Research*." *Journal of Hymenoptera Research* 30 (January 30, 2013): 1–6. [doi:10.3897/JHR.30.4733](https://doi.org/10.3897/JHR.30.4733).

This article mentions that the number of submissions has increased since the *Journal of Hymenoptera Research* went OA. Also, the number of pages published per year has almost doubled. Three significant benefits of OA publishing are mentioned: rapid lead time from submission to publishing (no issues), the journal can accept longer articles than before when it appeared in print, and it is easier to include multimedia appendices.

24. Shearer, Kathleen. Report on Berlin 12 Open Access Conference. ARL. December 18, 2015. <http://www.arl.org/storage/documents/publications/2015.12.18-Berlin12Report.pdf>.

This is a summary from ARL of the small, invitation-only conference that focused on the journal flipping issues discussed in the [Schimmer, Geschuhn, and Vogler paper](#). The presentation slides from the conference are available at <http://www.berlin12.org/presentations/>.

25. Solomon, David J., Mikael Laakso, and Bo-Christer Björk. "A Longitudinal Comparison of Citation Rates and Growth Among Open Access Journals." *Journal of Infometrics* 7, no. 3(2013) : 642–650. doi:10.1016/j.joi.2013.03.008.

This study compares growth in OA articles and their citations with subscription journals based on combining DOAJ and Scopus data.



26. Solomon, David J. and Bo-Christer Björk. "Publication Fees in Open Access Publishing: Sources of Funding and Factors Influencing Choice of Journal." *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology* 63, no. 1 (January 2012): 98–107. doi: 10.1002/asi.21660.

The article describes a survey of 1,038 authors from a stratified sample (by discipline) of 74 APC funded OA journals. The goals of the survey were to identify sources of funding the APC, what influenced the authors to choose the journal, determine what authors are willing to pay in terms of an APC and to describe the authors.

27. Solomon, David J. "Types of Open Access Publishers in Scopus." *Publications* 1, no. 1 (May 6, 2013): 16–26. <http://doi.org/10.3390/publications1010016>.

From the abstract: "This study assessed characteristics of publishers who published 2010 open access (OA) journals indexed in Scopus. Publishers were categorized into six types: professional, society, university, scholar/researcher, government, and other organizations. Type of publisher was broken down by number of journals/articles published in 2010, funding model, location, discipline and whether the journal was born or converted to OA."

28. Suber, Peter. Open Access Overview. Last revised December 5, 2015. <http://bit.ly/oa-overview>.

This is a very succinct though compressive overview of OA publishing.

29. Thatcher, Sanford G. "The Challenge of Open Access for University Presses." *Learned Publishing* 20, no. 3 (July 2007): 165–172. <http://doi.org/10.1087/095315107X205084>.

This essay, by a representative of a university press (Penn State), is about how such organizations should approach OA. Thatcher rightly points out that university presses are widely engaged in journals in the social sciences and humanities as well as in book publishing; therefore, their situation differs from that of commercial scholarly publishers. Among potential dangers are the negative effects on current non-OA electronic publishing initiatives such as project MUSE and JSTOR. Also, one particular aspect of APC-funded journals is that because authors have differing possibilities of funding APCs, elaborate waiver systems would need to be put in place. This need requires administrative overhead, which would need to be recovered from those authors that can pay.

30. Velterop, Jan. "Should Scholarly Societies Embrace Open Access (or Is It the Kiss of Death)?" *Learned Publishing* 16, no. 3 (July 1, 2003): 167-169. <http://www.ingentaconnect.com/content/alpsp/lp;jsessionid=9ns3sfeebioo8.alice>.

This essay by Jan Velterop, who at that time was CEO of BMC, discusses OA issues from the viewpoint of scientific societies. He sees OA as clearly in line with the fundamental mission of such societies, but discusses the practicalities in journal publishing. The essay is somewhat dated.



31. Wiley. "British Ecological Society Partners with Wiley Open Access Journal *Ecology and Evolution*," press release, October 12, 2012. [http://www.eurekalert.org/pub\\_releases/2012-10/w-bes102612.php](http://www.eurekalert.org/pub_releases/2012-10/w-bes102612.php).

This press release describes the creation of a cascading journal, which is an increasingly common practice. Authors of scientifically sound manuscripts rejected from very selective journals are given the option of having their manuscripts published in a lower-quality, APC-funded OA journal. From a review perspective, the process is efficient for both the author and publisher but feeds into the belief that OA journals are lower quality.

32. Willinsky, John. "The Stratified Economics of Open Access." *Economic Analysis and Policy* 39, no. 1 (March 2009): 53–70. [http://doi.org/10.1016/S0313-5926\(09\)50043-4](http://doi.org/10.1016/S0313-5926(09)50043-4).

This essay focuses on the history and evolution of OA, both gold and green. A central feature is the examination of the conditions of journal publishing in the three publishing segments, independent publishers, society publishers, and commercial publishers. Unsurprisingly, it seems the society publishers—at least the bigger US and UK ones—have been the most reluctant in starting OA experiments. Their preferred route has in many cases been delayed OA.

OA is, on the other hand, almost a pre-condition for the emergence of journals published by individual scholars or groups of scholars. Commercial publishers, who unlike society publishers do not need to worry about the loss of members, are more willing to experiment, for instance with hybrid OA, provided that they perceive OA as profitable.

**Appendix II**  
**List of Converted Journals Mentioned in the Report<sup>9</sup>**

<i>Acta Orthopaedica</i>	Nordic Orthopaedic Federation	<a href="http://www.actaorthop.org/">http://www.actaorthop.org/</a>
<i>Acta Veterinaria Scandinavica</i>	BioMed Central	<a href="http://actavetscand.biomedcentral.com/">http://actavetscand.biomedcentral.com/</a>
<i>Aging Cell</i>	John Wiley & Sons Ltd and The Anatomical Society	<a href="http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/journal/10.1111/%28ISSN%291474-9726">http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/journal/10.1111/%28ISSN%291474-9726</a>
<i>American Journal of Botany</i>	Botanical Society of America	<a href="http://www.amjbot.org/">http://www.amjbot.org/</a>
<i>Annals of Occupational and Environmental Medicine</i>	BioMed Central	<a href="http://aoemj.biomedcentral.com/">http://aoemj.biomedcentral.com/</a>
<i>Anthropology and Aging</i>	Association for Anthropology & Gerontology (AAGE)	<a href="http://anthro-age.pitt.edu/ojs/index.php/anthro-age">http://anthro-age.pitt.edu/ojs/index.php/anthro-age</a>
<i>Archäologische Informationen</i>	Deutschen Gesellschaft für Ur- und Frühgeschichte (DGUF)	<a href="http://www.dguf.de/index.php?id=37">http://www.dguf.de/index.php?id=37</a>
<i>Austrian Journal of Political Science</i>	Innsbruck University Press	<a href="http://oezp.univie.ac.at/index.php/zfp">http://oezp.univie.ac.at/index.php/zfp</a>
<i>Bioscience Reports</i>	Biochemical Society	<a href="http://www.bioscirep.org/">http://www.bioscirep.org/</a>

<sup>9</sup> The list of journals includes only the converted journals mentioned in the report. Other journals that had converted to OA were reviewed in the process of compiling this report.

<i>British Medical Journal</i>	BMJ Publishing Group	<a href="http://www.bmj.com/">http://www.bmj.com/</a>
<i>Brookings Papers On Economic Activity</i>	Brookings Institution	<a href="http://www.brookings.edu/about/projects/bpea">http://www.brookings.edu/about/projects/bpea</a>
<i>Canadian Journal of Sociology</i>	Department of Sociology, University of Alberta	<a href="https://ejournals.library.ualberta.ca/index.php/CJS/">https://ejournals.library.ualberta.ca/index.php/CJS/</a>
<i>Cancer Science</i>	Japanese Cancer Association	<a href="http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/journal/10.1111/%28ISSN%291349-7006">http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/journal/10.1111/%28ISSN%291349-7006</a>
<i>Chemical Science</i>	Royal Society of Chemistry	<a href="http://pubs.rsc.org/en/Journals/JournalIssues/SC#!recentarticles&amp;adv">http://pubs.rsc.org/en/Journals/JournalIssues/SC#!recentarticles&amp;adv</a>
<i>Chinese Science Bulletin</i>	Chinese Academy of Sciences (CAS)	<a href="http://www.springer.com/popular/journal/11434">http://www.springer.com/popular/journal/11434</a>
<i>Chiropractic and Manual Therapies</i>	European Academy of Chiropractic (EAC), the Royal College of Chiropractors (RCC), and Chiropractic & Osteopathic College of Australasia (COCA)	<a href="http://chiromt.biomedcentral.com/">http://chiromt.biomedcentral.com/</a>
<i>College and Research Libraries</i>	Association of College & Research Libraries	<a href="http://crl.acrl.org/">http://crl.acrl.org/</a>
<i>Connotations</i>	Connotations Society	<a href="http://www.connotations.uni-tuebingen.de/">http://www.connotations.uni-tuebingen.de/</a>
<i>Conservation Letters</i>	Wiley Periodicals, Inc.	<a href="http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/journal/10.1111/%28ISSN%291755-263X">http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/journal/10.1111/%28ISSN%291755-263X</a>
<i>Cultural Anthropology</i>	Society for Cultural Anthropology	<a href="http://www.culanth.org/">http://www.culanth.org/</a>

	(SCA)	
<i>Deutsche Entomologische Zeitschrift</i>	Museum für Naturkunde, Leibniz Institute for Research on Evolution and Biodiversity	<a href="http://dez.pensoft.net/">http://dez.pensoft.net/</a>
<i>Diabetes Investigation</i>	Asian Association for the Study of Diabetes and Wiley Publishing Asia Pty Ltd	<a href="http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/journal/10.1111/%28ISSN%292040-1124">http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/journal/10.1111/%28ISSN%292040-1124</a>
<i>Drugs in R and D</i>	Adis	<a href="http://link.springer.com/journal/40268">http://link.springer.com/journal/40268</a>
<i>Earth, Planets and Space</i>	Society of Geomagnetism and Earth, Planetary and Space Sciences, the Seismological Society of Japan, the Volcanological Society of Japan, the Geodetic Society of Japan, and the Japanese Society for Planetary Sciences	<a href="http://www.earth-planets-space.com/">http://www.earth-planets-space.com/</a>
<i>European Journal of Medical Research</i>	BioMed Central	<a href="http://eurjmedres.biomedcentral.com/">http://eurjmedres.biomedcentral.com/</a>
<i>European Physical Journal C</i>	Particles and Fields	<a href="http://www.springer.com/physics/particle+and+nuclear+physics/journal/10052">http://www.springer.com/physics/particle+and+nuclear+physics/journal/10052</a>
<i>Evolutionary Applications</i>	John Wiley & Sons Ltd	<a href="http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/journal/10.1111/%28ISSN%291752-4571">http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/journal/10.1111/%28ISSN%291752-4571</a>
<i>Farmeconomia and Therapeutic Pathways</i>	SEEd Medical Publishers	<a href="http://journals.edizioniseed.it/index.php/FE">http://journals.edizioniseed.it/index.php/FE</a>

<i>Filozofski vestnik International</i>	Institute of Philosophy at the Scientific Research Centre of the Slovenian Academy of Sciences and Arts	<a href="http://filozofskivestnikonline.com/index.php/journal">http://filozofskivestnikonline.com/index.php/journal</a>
<i>Green Chemistry Letters and Reviews</i>	Taylor & Francis	<a href="http://www.tandfonline.com/loi/tgcl20#.VsUxdUBtDm4">http://www.tandfonline.com/loi/tgcl20#.VsUxdUBtDm4</a>
<i>Historein</i>	Cultural and Intellectual History Society (Athens)	<a href="http://ejournals.epublishing.ekt.gr/index.php/historein">http://ejournals.epublishing.ekt.gr/index.php/historein</a>
<i>IDS Bulletin</i>	Institute of Development Studies (IDS)	<a href="http://www.ids.ac.uk/publications/ids-series-titles/ids-bulletin">http://www.ids.ac.uk/publications/ids-series-titles/ids-bulletin</a>
<i>Influenza and Other Respiratory Viruses</i>	John Wiley & Sons Ltd	<a href="http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/journal/10.1111/%28ISSN%291750-2659">http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/journal/10.1111/%28ISSN%291750-2659</a>
<i>Information Technology and Libraries</i>	Library and Information Technology Association	<a href="https://ejournals.bc.edu/ojs/index.php/ital/index">https://ejournals.bc.edu/ojs/index.php/ital/index</a>
<i>Insights (UKSG journal)</i>	UKSG	<a href="http://insights.uksg.org/">http://insights.uksg.org/</a>
<i>International Journal of Qualitative Studies on Health and Well-being</i>	Co-Action Publishing	<a href="http://www.ijqhw.net/index.php/qhw">http://www.ijqhw.net/index.php/qhw</a>
<i>Internet Archaeology</i>	Department of Archaeology at the University of York	<a href="http://intarch.ac.uk/">http://intarch.ac.uk/</a>
<i>Investigative Ophthalmology and Visual Science</i>	Association for Research in Vision and Ophthalmology	<a href="http://iovs.arvojournals.org/">http://iovs.arvojournals.org/</a>
<i>Irish Veterinary</i>	BioMed Central	<a href="http://irishvetjournal.biomedcentral.com/">http://irishvetjournal.biomedcentral.com/</a>

<i>Journal</i>		
<i>Journal of Biological Dynamics</i>	Taylor & Francis	<a href="http://www.tandfonline.com/toc/tjbd20/current#.VsU4G0BtDm4">http://www.tandfonline.com/toc/tjbd20/current#.VsU4G0BtDm4</a>
<i>Journal of Biomedical Science</i>	BioMed Central	<a href="http://jbiomedsci.biomedcentral.com/about">http://jbiomedsci.biomedcentral.com/about</a>
<i>Journal of British and Irish Innovative Poetry</i>	Gylphi	<a href="http://www.gylphi.co.uk/journals/InnovativePoetry/">http://www.gylphi.co.uk/journals/InnovativePoetry/</a>
<i>Journal of Cellular and Molecular Medicine</i>	Foundation for Cellular and Molecular Medicine/John Wiley & Sons Ltd	<a href="http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/journal/10.1111/%28ISSN%291582-4934">http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/journal/10.1111/%28ISSN%291582-4934</a>
<i>Journal of Diabetes Investigation</i>	Asian Association for the Study of Diabetes and Wiley Publishing Asia Pty Ltd	<a href="http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/journal/10.1111/%28ISSN%292040-1124">http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/journal/10.1111/%28ISSN%292040-1124</a>
<i>Journal of High Energy Physics</i>	International School for Advanced Studies (SISSA - Trieste, Italy)	<a href="http://www.springer.com/physics/particle+and+nuclear+physics/journal/13130">http://www.springer.com/physics/particle+and+nuclear+physics/journal/13130</a>
<i>Journal of Hymenoptera Research</i>	International Society of Hymenopterists	<a href="http://jhr.pensoft.net/">http://jhr.pensoft.net/</a>
<i>Journal of Neurodevelopmental Disorders</i>	SpringerOpen	<a href="http://jneurodevdisorders.biomedcentral.com/">http://jneurodevdisorders.biomedcentral.com/</a>
<i>Journal of Physiotherapy</i>	Australian Physiotherapy Association	<a href="http://www.journalofphysiotherapy.com/">http://www.journalofphysiotherapy.com/</a>
<i>Journal of Portuguese Linguistics</i>	Ubiquity Press,	<a href="http://jpl.letas.ulisboa.pt/">http://jpl.letas.ulisboa.pt/</a>
<i>Journal of the American Medical</i>	American Medical	<a href="http://jamia.oxfordjournals.org/">http://jamia.oxfordjournals.org/</a>

<i>Informatics Association</i>	Informatics Association	
<i>Journal of the American Water Works Association</i>	American Water Works Association	<a href="http://www.awwa.org/publications/journal-awwa.aspx">http://www.awwa.org/publications/journal-awwa.aspx</a>
<i>Journal of the Medical Library Association</i>	Medical Library Association	<a href="http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/journals/93/">http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/journals/93/</a>
<i>Medicine</i>	Wolters Kluwer	<a href="http://journals.lww.com/md-journal/Pages/default.aspx">http://journals.lww.com/md-journal/Pages/default.aspx</a>
<i>Microbial Ecology in Health and Disease</i>	CoAction Publishing	<a href="http://www.microbecolhealthdis.net/index.php/mehd">http://www.microbecolhealthdis.net/index.php/mehd</a>
<i>Molecules</i>	Molecular Diversity Preservation International (MDPI)	<a href="http://www.mdpi.com/journal/molecules">http://www.mdpi.com/journal/molecules</a>
<i>Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report</i>	Centers for Disease Control	<a href="http://www.cdc.gov/mmwr/index2015.html">http://www.cdc.gov/mmwr/index2015.html</a>
<i>Nature Communications</i>	Nature Publishing Group	<a href="http://www.nature.com/ncomms/index.html">http://www.nature.com/ncomms/index.html</a>
<i>New Theology Review</i>	Catholic Theological Union	<a href="http://newtheologyreview.com/index.php/ntr">http://newtheologyreview.com/index.php/ntr</a>
<i>New Zealand Journal of Forestry Science</i>	Scion	<a href="http://www.scionresearch.com/general/publications/nzjfs">http://www.scionresearch.com/general/publications/nzjfs</a>
<i>Nota Lepidopterologica</i>	Societas Europaea Lepidopterologica (SEL)	<a href="http://nl.pensoft.net/">http://nl.pensoft.net/</a>
<i>Nucleic Acids Research</i>	Oxford University Press	<a href="http://nar.oxfordjournals.org/">http://nar.oxfordjournals.org/</a>
<i>Nuclear Physics B</i>	Elsevier	<a href="http://www.journals.elsevier.com/nuclear-physics-b/">http://www.journals.elsevier.com/nuclear-physics-b/</a>
<i>Ohio Journal of Science</i>	The Ohio Academy of Science	<a href="https://kb.osu.edu/dspace/handle/1811/686">https://kb.osu.edu/dspace/handle/1811/686</a>
<i>Orientalia Suecana</i>	Institutionen för	<a href="http://www.lingfil.uu.se/inst/publikationsserier/orientalia_suecana/">http://www.lingfil.uu.se/inst/publikationsserier/orientalia_suecana/</a>

	lingvistik och filologi	
<i>Paladyn: Journal of Behavioral Robotics</i>	De Gruyter	<a href="http://www.degruyter.com/view/j/pjbr">http://www.degruyter.com/view/j/pjbr</a>
<i>Photonic Sensors</i>	SpringerOpen	<a href="http://www.springer.com/physics/optics+%26+lasers/journal/13320">http://www.springer.com/physics/optics+%26+lasers/journal/13320</a>
<i>Physics Letters B</i>	Elsevier	<a href="http://www.journals.elsevier.com/physics-letters-b/">http://www.journals.elsevier.com/physics-letters-b/</a>
<i>Plant Biotechnology Journal</i>	Society for Experimental Biology, Association of Applied Biologists and John Wiley & Sons Ltd	<a href="http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/journal/10.1111/%28ISSN%291467-7652">http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/journal/10.1111/%28ISSN%291467-7652</a>
<i>Polar Research</i>	Norwegian Polar Institute	<a href="http://www.polarresearch.net/index.php/polar">http://www.polarresearch.net/index.php/polar</a>
<i>Research in Learning Technology</i>	Association for Learning Technology	<a href="http://www.researchinlearningtechnology.net/index.php/rlt">http://www.researchinlearningtechnology.net/index.php/rlt</a>
<i>Scandinavian Journal of Trauma, Resuscitation and Emergency Medicine</i>	Norwegian Air Ambulance Foundation	<a href="http://www.sjtrem.com/">http://www.sjtrem.com/</a>
<i>Science China Life Sciences</i>	Chinese Academy of Sciences and the National Natural Science Foundation of China	<a href="http://www.springer.com/life+sciences/journal/11427">http://www.springer.com/life+sciences/journal/11427</a>
<i>Scripta Instituti Donneriani Aboensis</i>	Donner Institute for Research in Religious and Cultural History	<a href="http://ojs.abo.fi/index.php/scripta">http://ojs.abo.fi/index.php/scripta</a>
<i>Smart and Nano Materials</i>	Taylor & Francis	<a href="http://www.tandfonline.com/toc/tsnm20/current">http://www.tandfonline.com/toc/tsnm20/current</a>
<i>Stem Cell Research</i>	Elsevier	<a href="http://www.journals.elsevier.com/stem-cell-research/">http://www.journals.elsevier.com/stem-cell-research/</a>
<i>Subterranean</i>	International	<a href="http://subtblol.pensoft.net/">http://subtblol.pensoft.net/</a>



<i>Biology</i>	Society for Subterranean Biology [SIBIOS]	
<i>Tellus A</i>	International Meteorological Institute	<a href="http://www.tellusa.net/index.php/tellusa">http://www.tellusa.net/index.php/tellusa</a>
<i>Tellus B</i>	International Meteorological Institute	<a href="http://www.tellusb.net/index.php/tellusb">http://www.tellusb.net/index.php/tellusb</a>
<i>Thoracic Cancer</i>	China Lung Oncology Group and Wiley Publishing Asia Pty Ltd	<a href="http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/journal/10.1111/%28ISSN%291759-7714">http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/journal/10.1111/%28ISSN%291759-7714</a>
<i>Tsinghua Science and Technology Journal</i>	Tsinghua University	<a href="http://ieeexplore.ieee.org/xpl/RecentIssue.jsp?reload=true&amp;punumber=5971803">http://ieeexplore.ieee.org/xpl/RecentIssue.jsp?reload=true&amp;punumber=5971803</a>
<i>Ultrasonography</i>	Korean Society of Ultrasound in Medicine	<a href="http://e-ultrasonography.org/">http://e-ultrasonography.org/</a>
<i>Veterinary Research</i>	BioMed Central	<a href="http://veterinaryresearch.biomedcentral.com/">http://veterinaryresearch.biomedcentral.com/</a>
<i>World Allergy Organization Journal</i>	World Allergy Organization	<a href="http://www.waojournal.org/">http://www.waojournal.org/</a>

## About the Authors, Panelists, and Editor

### *About the authors*

**Bo-Christer Björk** is professor of Information Systems Science at the Hanken School of Economics, Helsinki, Finland. He founded the Open Access "Journal of Information Technology in Construction" in 1996, and has over the past fifteen years done extensive and highly cited research on different aspects of scholarly publishing and in particular OA. His ORCID is [0000-0003-1545-9642](https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1545-9642).

**Mikael Laakso** is an Assistant Professor in Information Systems Science at Hanken School of Economics, Helsinki, Finland. His research has primarily focused on the changing landscape of scholarly publishing through the introduction of open access. Mikael defended his doctoral thesis on the topic of open access in 2014. He is currently chairing a working group on open publishing practices as part of the national Open Science Initiative in Finland. His ORCID is [0000-0003-3951-7990](https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3951-7990).

**David Solomon** retired from Michigan State University (MSU) in 2015 as a Professor in the Department of Internal Medicine and the Office of Medical Education Research and Development. He was trained as an educational psychologist and worked in medical education at MSU's College of Human Medicine and the University of Texas Medical Branch in Galveston. His research areas included student/program evaluation, curriculum development and the use of simulation in teaching and evaluating medical trainees. In 1996 Dr. Solomon founded Medical Education Online (MEO) the first fully digital peer reviewed journal in medical education. He operated the journal along with a colleague Ann Frye for 12 years. The journal continues to be a fully indexed well respected Open Access (OA) journal published by Co-Action Publishing. Through publishing MEO, Dr. Solomon became interested in OA publishing, writing a book, *Developing Open Access Journals: A practical guide*, and helping form the Open Access Publishing Association (OASPA) as one of its founding board members. Since 2010, most of his research has been on the growth and economics of OA publishing including publishing about 20 articles on the subject and participating in several major foundation funded studies in collaboration with Bo-Christer Björk and Mikael Laakso. His ORCID is [0000-0002-3130-5240](https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3130-5240)

### *About the panelists*

**Virginia (Ginny) Barbour** is Executive Officer of the [Australasian Open Access Support Group](#), a position she took up in 2015. She is Chair of the [Committee on Publication Ethics \(COPE\)](#). She was one of the three founding editors of [PLOS Medicine](#), and was Medicine and Biology Editorial Director of PLOS from 2014 until 2015. She also has a part time position as Professor in the Office of Research Ethics & Integrity at Queensland University of Technology (QUT). She has

a medical degree from Cambridge University, and a DPhil from the University of Oxford. She has been involved in a number of reporting guidelines including [CONSORT](#), PRISMA and TIDieR statements. She is an advisor to a number of publishing and ethics initiatives and is on the steering group of the [AllTrials initiative](#). She is based in Brisbane, Australia. Her ORCID is [0000-0002-2358-2440](#).

**Stefan Busch** is a PhD in German Literature (University of Mainz, 1997). Visiting Fellow and Tutor in German at the University of Oxford (Lincoln College and Queen's, 1997 – 2003). Left academia and joined BioMed Central in 2003. For many years working on journal acquisitions and development, then increasingly involved in business operations (contracts, licenses, APCs, reporting, ...). 2013 return to Germany. Based in Springer's (owner of BioMed Central since 2008) Heidelberg office, at the time of writing Acting Head of SpringerOpen. Following the merger of Springer and NPG/Macmillan in 2015 I joined the Business Operations & Policy team that works across Springer Nature's open access activities and brands. His ORCID is [0000-0001-6880-8573](#).

**Raym Crow** is managing partner of Chain Bridge Group, an independent consultancy to scholarly and professional societies, university presses, academic libraries, philanthropic foundations, and other nonprofit publishers. Crow has over 30 years' experience in academic and scholarly publishing, specializing in strategic business planning and practical sustainability models for open access journals, monographs, digital humanities projects, and infrastructure services. For over a decade, Crow has focused on collective models to support the provision of open access services. Since 2002, he has been Senior Consultant of the SPARC Consulting Group. His ORCID is [0000-0003-0803-0901](#).

**Martin Paul Eve** is Professor of Literature, Technology and Publishing at Birkbeck, University of London. He is the author of */Open Access and the Humanities: Contexts, Controversies and the Future/* and a founder and director of the Open Library of Humanities. His ORCID is [0000-0002-5589-8511](#).

**Eve Gray** is a research associate in the Intellectual Property Unit in the Faculty of Law at the University of Cape Town, where she brings her publishing background to bear in research into the geo-politics of developing country scholarly publishing in a digital world. Her particular interest is in potential of open access publishing and open licensing from a southern perspective, seeking development impact on social and economic imperatives in the region rather than competitive drives for 'impact factor' status in the global North. Her ORCID is [0000-0002-2176-0143](#).

**Jean-Claude Guédon** is a professor of digital humanities and Internet culture at the Université de Montréal. One of the original signatories of the Budapest Open Access Initiative, he has been associated with the Program Committee of the Internet Society's Inet meetings from 1996 until 2002 (and he co-chaired this committee in 1996, 1998 and in 2000). He also worked on the

Information Sub-Board of the Open Society Institute (now Foundations) from 2002 to 2006. Between 2006 and 2008, he was Vice-President of the Canadian Federation for the Humanities and Social Sciences. Since 2008, he is regularly called to Brussels to act as expert for the European Commission. Since 2011, he is a Trustee of the Nexa Center for Internet and Society at the Politecnico of Milan. Since 2015, Jean-Claude Guédon is on the advisory Board of Redalyc in Mexico. In 2016, he became part of the editorial team in charge of a series on Open Access at the University of Ottawa Press. His ORCID is [0000-0002-7342-8046](https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7342-8046).

**Cara Kaufman** is the cofounder and Managing Partner of KWF Consulting, the largest consultancy serving scholarly publishing. Established more than 15 years ago, KWF now has more than 15 publishing experts serving the increasing needs of clients. The firm's services include strategic planning, new product development, business modeling, publishing audits, RFP management, marketing and market research, and executive and editor recruiting. Clients include societies and other service providers in the life and physical sciences, medicine, and the social sciences. Sister company, KWF Editorial, offers its clients managing editor, peer review administration, and productivity tracking tools. Her ORCID is [0000-0002-6289-4631](https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6289-4631).

**Rebecca Kennison** is a principal at [K|N Consultants](https://www.kjnconsultants.com), a not-for-profit 501(c)(3) organization that provides strategic and operational guidance to mission-driven organizations such as academic institutions, libraries, learned societies, scholarly publishers and university presses, government agencies, and private foundations and whose major undertaking is development of the [Open Access Network](https://openaccessnetwork.org). Prior to working full time at K|N, Rebecca was the founding director of the [Center for Digital Research and Scholarship](https://www.library.columbia.edu/digital-research-and-scholarship), a division of the Columbia University Libraries/Information Services, where for nearly 8 years she was responsible for developing programs to facilitate scholarly research and the communication of that research through technology solutions. Rebecca has worked primarily in the scholarly publishing industry, including production leadership roles at Cell Press (now owned by Elsevier), Blackwell Publishing (now owned by Wiley), and (as their very first employee) the open-access publisher Public Library of Science (PLOS). Her ORCID is [0000-0002-1401-9808](https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1401-9808).

**Iryna Kuchma** is the Open Access Programme Manager for EIFL. Iryna is a member of Directory of Open Access Journals (DOAJ) and Open Access Publishing Cooperative Study Advisory Boards, DSpace Community Advisory Team (DCAT), Networked Digital Library of Theses and Dissertations (NDLTD) Board of Directors, the Open Library of Humanities Internationalisation Committee, Public Library of Science (PLOS) International Advisory Group, and the Open Access Button Steering Committee. Iryna also chairs a Working Group 'Repository and Repository Networks Support and Training' in the Confederation of Open Access Repositories (COAR). Her ORCID is [0000-0002-2064-3439](https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2064-3439).

**Alice Meadows** is Director of Community Engagement & Support for ORCID, a not-for-profit organization whose vision is a world in which all who participate in research, scholarship, and innovation are uniquely identified and connected to their contributions and affiliations across

disciplines, borders, and time. Alice has many years' experience of scholarly publishing, including a number of senior positions in marketing and communications for Wiley and, before that, Blackwell Publishing. She was recently elected to the Board of the Society for Scholarly Publishing and is a regular contributor to The Scholarly Kitchen and other industry blogs and journals. Her ORCID is [0000-0003-2161-3781](https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2161-3781).

**Salvatore Mele** holds a PhD in Physics and is head of Open Access at CERN, where he architected the [SCOAP3 initiative](#): a global partnership which converted to Open Access the majority of High-Energy Physics literature at no cost for authors. Together with major research laboratories, his team runs the INSPIRE service [[inspirehep.net](http://inspirehep.net)], a global Open Access digital library for High-Energy Physics, and develops solutions for Open Data in the field [[opendata.cern.ch](http://opendata.cern.ch)]. Salvatore serves on the Boards of Director the ORCID and the DataCite initiatives. Long ago, he enjoyed a fifteen years carriers in physics as a research scientist both at CERN and at the Italian National Institute for Nuclear Physics, measuring fundamental physics constants and searching for such exotic things as extra space dimensions. His ORCID is [0000-0003-0762-2235](https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0762-2235).

**Lisa Norberg** is a Principal at K|N Consultants, providing strategic and operational guidance via a range of consultation services to academic and research libraries, scholarly societies, and other organizations. She has close to 25 years of experience in academic librarianship, having held positions at Barnard College, the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Penn State Harrisburg, and George Mason University. She is interested in the libraries' role in an open-access scholarly information ecosystem, organizational transformation in academic libraries, and the evolving role of librarians in teaching and learning. Her ORCID is [0000-0001-8592-2044](https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8592-2044).

**Abel L. Packer** is Director of the Scientific Electronic Library Online (SciELO) Program of the São Paulo Research Foundation (FAPESP) and Project Coordinator at the Foundation of the Federal University of São Paulo (UNIFESP), Brazil, since June 2010. Previously, he was Director of the Latin American and Caribbean Center on Health Sciences (BIREME) of the Pan American Health Organization/World Health Organization for 11 years. He participated pro-actively in the conception, management, operation and dissemination of major Latin American and Caribbean multilingual scientific information networks, such as the Latin American Population Documentation System (DOCPAL), the Virtual Health Library (VHL) and the Scientific Electronic Library Online network that indexes and publishes currently about 1000 gold open access journals through national collections from 15 countries most from Latin American in addition to Portugal, Spain and South Africa. Mr. Packer holds a bachelor degree in Sciences and a Master Degree in Library Sciences. His ORCID is [0000-0001-9610-5728](https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9610-5728).

**Pippa Smart** is a publishing consultant with over 25 years' experience of working within STM publishing. She now advises publishers (particularly non-commercial associations) and editors on the development of their publishing programmes and journals – particularly on editorial strategy. She also provides extensive training around the world for publishers and editors in

both publishing strategies and copyright/contractual issues. She is the Editor-in-Chief of *Learned Publishing*, writes a monthly newsletter on behalf of the Association of Learned and Professional Society Publishers (ALPSP), is Vice-President of the European Association of Science Editors and a non-Executive Director of Practical Action Publishing. Her ORCID is [0000-0002-5528-4704](https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5528-4704).

**Mackenzie Smith** is the University Librarian at the University of California, Davis, charged with integrating digital resources and information technology necessary to support the academic community of the 21st Century. Smith is a long-time academic research librarian, specializing in technology and digital knowledge management. She previously worked for the libraries of Harvard and MIT, in Cambridge, Massachusetts, where she led cutting-edge projects on digital libraries and archives, such as the popular DSpace open source software platform; Web systems for online scholarly communication; and digital data curation in support of e-science. Smith has consulted widely in the library field, notably for the Association of Research Libraries to design and lead its E-Science Institute, and as a research fellow for Creative Commons to develop its strategy for sharing scientific research data and advocacy for Open Access to scholarship. Her ORCID is [0000-0002-4642-1121](https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4642-1121)

**Caroline Sutton** is currently co-founder and Editorial Director with Co-Action Publishing. Caroline served as the first President of the Open Access Scholarly Publishers Association (OASPA) from 2008-2013 and is a member of the present board. She is currently Director at [Infrastructure Services for Open Access](#) (IS4OA), which manages the [Directory of Open Access Journals](#). She also previously served on the board of [SPARC Europe](#) (2010-2013), the Lund University Library Board (2008-2010), the Advisory Board for Linköping University Press and the Advisory Board for [OAPEN](#). She is a recognized advocate and expert on Open Access publishing, has acted as Rapporteur for the European Commission, participated in the Budapest Open Access Initiative talks in 2012, and regularly speaks and holds workshops on Open Access publishing. Caroline received her PhD from Uppsala University, Sweden. Her ORCID is [0000-0002-8531-8952](https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8531-8952).

**Alma Swan** is a consultant working in the field of scholarly communication. She is a director of Key Perspectives Ltd and Convenor for Enabling Open Scholarship, an organisation of university managers around the world that promotes the principles of open scholarship and open science. She is also a director of the Directory of Open Access Journals and of the umbrella organisation Infrastructure Services for Open Access. Alma has BSc and PhD degrees in biology from the University of Southampton, and an MBA from Warwick Business School and holds honorary academic positions in the University of Southampton School of Electronics & Computer Science and the University of Warwick Business School. Her work covers market research and business modelling, project management and evaluation, research communication practices and behaviours, and the study and promotion of new forms of scholarly communication in the age of the Web. She writes and makes frequent presentations on scholarly communication issues. She was Adviser to the World Bank when it developed its Open Access policy in 2011 and to

UNESCO as it developed its policy in 2013. She also wrote the UNESCO Policy Guidelines on Open Access. Alma is a Fellow of the Society of Biology and a Chartered Biologist, served three terms as an elected member of the Governing Board of Euroscience (the European Association for the Promotion of Science & Technology) and is the former editor of its online magazine, The Euroscientist. She serves or has served on many advisory boards or steering committees for scholarly communication-related initiatives, conferences and projects. Her ORCID is [0000-0002-3676-4622](https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3676-4622).

**Bonnie Tijerina** was Fellow and now Researcher at Data & Society, a research institute focused on social, cultural, and ethical issues arising from data-centric technological development. There she focuses on ethics in big data research and online privacy education in libraries. Bonnie has worked in electronic resource management and leadership positions in libraries for over 10 years, most recently as the Head of Electronic Resources and Serials at Harvard University. Bonnie has written and presented on new roles for librarians and the ways libraries can support their communities in the digital world. She is founder and President of ER&L (Electronic Resources & Libraries) conference and organization, created to facilitate communication and collaboration among librarians and information professionals who provide access to digital content. She is co-founder of Designing for Digital, a two-day meeting of UX and design professionals from tech, media, academia, and libraries. In addition, Bonnie has served in an advisory capacity on the American Library Association's Office of Information Technology Policy Advisory Committee for seven years. Her ORCID is [0000-0002-1973-363X](https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1973-363X).

**Johannes (Jan) Velterop** (1949 - The Hague, The Netherlands) is marine geophysicist who became a science publisher in the mid-1970s. He started his publishing career at Elsevier in Amsterdam. In 1990 he became director of a Dutch newspaper, but returned to international science publishing in 1993 at Academic Press in London, where he developed the first country-wide deal that gave electronic access to all AP journals to all institutes of higher education in the United Kingdom (later known as the BigDeal, although considerably altered in nature). He next joined Nature as director, but moved quickly on to help get BioMed Central off the ground. He participated in the Budapest Open Access Initiative. In 2005 he joined Springer, based in the UK as Director of Open Access. In 2008 he left to help further develop semantic approaches to accelerate scientific discovery. He is an active advocate of BOAI-compliant open access (i.e. open access with re-use rights) and of the use of microattribution, the hallmark of so-called "nanopublications", which he hopes will enable researchers to deal with the scientific information overload. He published many articles and (guest) blog posts, and speaks regularly, on both topics as well as on peer review reform. Velterop serves on the advisory boards of several companies and initiatives active in open access publishing and open science in general. His ORCID is [0000-0002-4836-6568](https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4836-6568).

**John Willinsky** is Khosla Family Professor of Education and Director of the Program in Science, Technology, and Society at Stanford University, as well as Professor (Part-Time) of Publishing Studies at Simon Fraser University. He directs the Public Knowledge Project, which conducts



research and develops open source scholarly publishing software in support of greater access to knowledge. His books include the *Empire of Words: The Reign of the OED* (Princeton, 1994); *Learning to Divide the World: Education at Empire's End* (Minnesota, 1998); *Technologies of Knowing* (Beacon 2000); and *The Access Principle: The Case for Open Access to Research and Scholarship* (MIT Press, 2006). His ORCID is [0000-0001-6192-8687](https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6192-8687).

### ***About the editor***

**Peter Suber** is the Director of the [Harvard Office for Scholarly Communication](#), Director of the [Harvard Open Access Project](#), Senior Researcher at the [Berkman Klein Center for Internet & Society](#), and Senior Researcher at the [Scholarly Publishing and Academic Resources Coalition](#) (SPARC). He's also a non-practicing lawyer. He gave up his position as a tenured full professor of philosophy in 2003 to work full-time on open access. He was the principal drafter of the [Budapest Open Access Initiative](#), sits on the boards of many groups devoted to open access and scholarly communication, and has been active in fostering open access for more than 15 years through his research, speaking, and writing. He has published [widely](#) on open access. His latest book is a collection of 44 of the most influential articles, [Knowledge Unbound](#) (MIT Press, 2016). His previous book, [Open Access](#) (MIT Press, 2012) was named by *Choice* an Outstanding Academic Title for 2013. Both books are open access. His ORCID is [0000-0002-3577-2890](https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3577-2890).