

### Scientific Publications: Free for All?

U.K. House of Commons Science and Technology Committee lade den 20 juli fram sin slutrapport "**Scientific Publications: Free for All?**", resultatet av en serie noggranna utfrågningar av viktiga aktörer inom vetenskaplig publicering: förlag, forskare, forskningsfinansiärer och bibliotek. Rapporten rekommenderar bl.a. följande:

- att regeringen ger finansiella bidrag till universiteten så att dessa kan bygga upp egna OA-arkiv
- att författare till artiklar baserade på offentligfinansierad forskning skall publicera dessa i universitetens arkiv
- att regeringen skapar finansiella möjligheter för författare att betala artikelavgifter till OA-tidskrifter
- att universiteten utvecklar kapacitet att hantera den copyright forskarna i allt större utsträckning väntas behålla i framtiden

<http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm200304/cmselect/cmsctech/399/39902.htm>

### EU-kommissionen inleder undersökning

Europeiska kommissionen vill se ett effektivt vetenskapligt publiceringssystem i Europa och informerade den 15 juni om att de inlett en undersökning av den ekonomiska och tekniska utvecklingen av den europeiska vetenskapliga publikationsmarknaden.

Rapporten skall vara klar under 2005 och skall ta upp viktiga punkter som

- Framtiden för tryckta reviews
- Open Access för alla

- De risker prishöjningar kan medföra för informationstillgängligheten

<http://europa.eu.int/comm/research/press/2004/pr1506en.cfm>

## NIH planerar för tillgänglighet

Den 14 juli antog det amerikanska Representanhusets Appropriations Committee ett antal rekommendationer för nästa års budget. Bl.a. rekommenderades NIH – **National Institutes of Health** - att villkora sina forskningsanslag med att artiklar som baseras på NIH-finansierad forskning skall deponeras i PubMed Central. Kommitten vill i december ha en rapport från NIH om hur denna policy skall implementeras. Två alternativ föreslås:

1. Artiklarna blir fritt tillgängliga i PubMed efter sex månader
2. Artiklarna blir omedelbart tillgängliga i PubMed om NIH betalar artikelavgifter för publicering i OA-tidskrifter.

NIH har därefter i ett dokument från 3 september släppt kravet att artiklar som NIH betalat någon del publiceringskostnaderna för skall publiceras omedelbart. NIH säger bara att OA-versionen kommer i PubMed Central sex månader efter publikationsdatum eller tidigare om förlaget tillåter.

Se SPARC OpenAccessNewsletter 76

<http://www.earlham.edu/~peters/fos/newsletter/08-02-04.htm>

och för NIH:s Notice: Enhanced Public Access to NIH Research Information daterad 3 september <http://grants.nih.gov/grants/guide/notice-files/NOT-OD-04-064.html>

NIH tar tacksamt emot kommentarer till sin plan.

## Alliance for Taxpayer Access

Den 24 augusti annonserade en koalition av s.k. public interest groups att de bildat en **Alliance for Taxpayer Access** för att stödja NIH och Kongressen i försöken att göra sakkunnigbedömda artiklar baserade på NIH-finansierad forskning fritt tillgängliga för alla. En supporter är **dr Richard Roberts, nobelpristagare i medicin 1993**. Han säger bl.a.:

"Open access to the scientific literature is the single most important advance that we can make in the distribution of research results to scientists and the public alike. I find that a majority of my fellow scientists and Nobel Laureates agree that this new initiative is groundbreaking, long overdue and will ensure that we all can read about the results of our government's support of research."

Läs mer på Taxpayer Access hemsida <http://www.arl.org/ata/>

## Open Access i Skottland

**Scottish Science Information Strategy Working Group** har en undergrupp som arbetar med Open Access. Denna grupp har i dagarna presenterat ett utkast till en Open Access deklARATION för Skottland. Rekommendationerna påminner om dem som görs i den engelska underhuskommittens rapport. Den skotska deklARATIONENS slutsats är att man vill göra sitt bästa för att försäkra sig om att den forskning som bedrivs i Skottland publiceras som Open Access, även om de inser att en övergångsfas kan vara nödvändig inom vissa områden. Den slutliga utformningen av deklARATIONEN skall beslutas vid ett möte i Edinburgh den 11 oktober.

<http://scuri.ac.uk/WG/SSI SWGOA/declaration.htm>

## Open Choice för författare

**Springer Verlag** lanserade nyligen Open Choice för sina författare. Open Choice innebär att författaren kan välja Open Access för sin artikel när den accepterats för publicering. För detta betalar författaren USD 3000. Eventuella avgifter för färgbilder, etc debiteras separat enligt den enskilda tidskriftens policy. Förlaget fortsätter att kräva överlåtelse av copyright. <http://www.springeronline.com/sgw/cda/frontpage/0,11855,1-40359-12-115394-0,00.html>

<http://www.springeronline.com/sgw/cda/frontpage/0,11855,1-40359-12-115394-0,00.html>

## Fler förlag accepterar egenpublicering

Andelen förlag som accepterar att författarna publicerar antingen preprints eller postprints (den referentbedömda versionen) är nu 92% enligt **Eprints/RoMEO:s** version av registret över förlagsattityder till egenpublicering. Antalet förlag är 100 och av dessa accepterar 69,4 % postprints och 22,16% preprints. Som meddelats tidigare accepterar exempelvis Elsevier att postprints (dock icke förlagets pdf utan t.ex. en Wordfil) läggs ut i ett institutionellt arkiv.

<http://romeo.eprints.org/stats.php>

---

Nyheter och Notiser är sammanställda av **Ingegerd Rabow**, projektledare ScieCom, förste bibliotekarie Lunds Universitets Bibliotek, Biblioteksdirektionen  
[Ingegerd.Rabow@lub.lu.se](mailto:Ingegerd.Rabow@lub.lu.se)

---

Svenskt Resurscentrum för vetenskaplig kommunikation  
Box 134, 221 00 Lund  
Telefon: 046-222 00 00 (vx), Fax: 046-222 36 82  
[www.sciecom.org](http://www.sciecom.org)  
Ansvarig utgivare: Ingegerd Rabow, [sciecom@sciecom.org](mailto:sciecom@sciecom.org)

## On the consumer market economics of scientific knowledge

**Mats G. Lindquist**

Göteborg University Library,  
Economics Library

[mats.lindquist@ub.gu.se](mailto:mats.lindquist@ub.gu.se)

[mats.lindquist@bibsam.kb.se](mailto:mats.lindquist@bibsam.kb.se)

(after 2004-09-12)



With an increased commercialization of traditionally public activities a significant portion of scientific communication has become subject to relatively uncontrolled market forces. Regulatory measures have not yet been developed although “there is evidence to suggest that the market for STM [Scientific, Technical, and Medical] journals may not be working well”, as was pointed out in a report from the [U.K.] Office of Fair Trading [1]. We have a situation, which is well known to the readers of this e-publication, where libraries have the role of middlemen between publishers and readers. So the consumers do not have a direct customer relationship with the producers (or their sales agents).

This business model creates a local market for the readers where the goods (STM articles) are free. In such a market microeconomic processes do not work; there is nothing to control demand, and libraries are under pressure to provide “everything”. We know, however, from studies of journal use that many STM articles are unread.

It can be interesting to speculate about how a real consumer market for STM articles would work; that is a market where the consumer makes the individual decision to buy an article. A more careful assessment of the likely value of an article will probably be made. Can such an assessment be made without seeing the whole article? Research on relevance judgement indicates that a pretty good judgement can be made on the basis of “document

surrogates", i.e. bibliographic records. Relevance judgments become more accurate if there is an abstract presented. Here we can see a potential dilemma for the producer: to increase the chance of a sale the abstract should give a good picture of the content, but not so good that it replaces the article.

To become paying customers the readers must have their own acquisition budget, and even though some readers will have access to plentiful funds there will still be a need to economize. The result can well be that a number of abstracts will be read without leading to a purchase of the article. These abstracts are then part of the background research for the work at hand, and can be part of the listing of sources. We can see "Abstracts" as a new type of source next to, for example, "Articles" and "Monographs". The acceptance of this new type of source will not be immediate, but as the microeconomic forces work over time it seems plausible.

The pricing of STM-articles can follow several models. "Value for money" is always a crucial factor for consumer goods. Hence a "good" article can merit a higher price than a mediocre article. The difficulty with this model is that the value of an article will depend on the context of use.

If the price is not differentiated and all articles have the same price there is a risk that the price will be too high (for the value) since a relatively small percentage of articles will have to generate the revenue to the producer.

"What the market will bear" is a frequently used pricing strategy. Since both producers and consumers in this new STM-article market lack reference models the likely pricing will be based on some cost level that looks familiar; something between the copyright clearing cost and the cost for an inter-library loan (ILL) copy might be acceptable

The consumer market model for individual articles threatens one of the three pillars for the power of the commercial publishers: that of bundling [2]. The producer surplus will be reduced, but there is no guarantee for a consumer surplus.

The model would totally redefine the role of libraries, and it would put a lot of new work and responsibilities on the readers. The magnitude of the change will probably make the transition very slow. But a continued economic pressure on the libraries will make them leave the "big deals", and this will increase ILL-traffic which can be seen as a step towards a consumer market.

Most of the economic battles in STM-publishing concern new information: The selling of new articles (actually new journal

issues) is the primary business of commercial STM publishers. To respond to pressures demanding online availability without losing the profits from new information publishers introduce delays in alternate channels in the form of "embargos" or "moving walls". These "value subtracted services" (the opposite of value added services) have a much lower price, but are unreliable since journal titles can be removed from the packages at publishers' will.

However, for science permanence is of essence. In fact, permanent access is a requirement for an electronic work to qualify as part of the record of science [3].

The economic interest in back files of articles is much less than for new articles. Demand is very scattered over time, and since the percentage of demanded articles is low it is difficult to make money on this material. Some publishers have made agreement with publicly funded institutions to guarantee long term availability of articles.

Public institutions can sometimes offer services free, but a large scale archival database of scientific articles will have high costs for technology. In addition there is a need to build an infrastructure of "trusted repositories" [4] and this will add to the cost. So it can be expected that the repositories will have to do some cost recovery from access fees. If these fees are cost-based the consumer marked forces will drive the cost down so that it corresponds to the market value. The way to achieve lower cost is to adjust the service level. Consumer power in the market for archival articles is potentially stronger that in the market for new articles.

These speculations about a consumer market for STM articles can be made irrelevant, at least for new articles, if the Open Archives Initiative continues to grow. The OAI community offers readers the freedom of selection and free access to articles. With the development of formalized quality indicators all three pillars for producers' power are within the scholarly community.

[1] Office of Fair Trading (2002), "The market for scientific, technical and medical journals - A statement by the OFT", OFT396, September 2002. Available at:

<http://www.oft.gov.uk>

[enter search for STM; verified 2004-08-10]

[2] The other two pillars are the intellectual property rights and the quality stamp from peer review.

[3] Frankel, M. S. et al., "Defining and Certifying Electronic

*Publication in Science", Learned Publishing (ISSN 0953-1513), vol. 13, nr. 4, (October 2000), pp. 251-258. Also available at:*  
<http://www.aaas.org/spp/sfml/projects/epub/define.shtml>  
*[verified 2004-08-30]*

*[4] Research Libraries Group (2002), "Trusted Digital Repositories: Attributes and Responsibilities," Final Report, May 2002. Available at:*  
<http://www.rlg.org/longterm/repositories.pdf>  
*[verified 2004-08-30]*

## **Svensk sammanfattning**

En ökad kommersialisering har medfört att en stor del av den vetenskapliga kommunikationen nu styrs av relativt okontrollerade marknadskrafter. Vi har en situation, välkänd för denna e-publikations läsare, där bibliotekarierna är mellanhänder mellan förlag och läsare och konsumenten saknar direkt kundrelation med producenten (eller dennes försäljningsagent). Det kan vara av intresse att spekulera i hur en konsumentmarknad för STM-artiklar skulle kunna fungera, d.v.s. en marknad där konsumenterna kan fatta individuella beslut om köp av enstaka artiklar. Då skulle man sannolikt före köpet göra en mer noggrann bedömning av en artikels troliga värde. Kan abstractet ge tillräcklig information för ett sådant inköpsbeslut och vilka faktorer skall avgöra artikelpriset?



## Improving access to published research - the INASP initiatives

### Pippa Smart

International Network for the Availability of Scientific Publications (INASP), Oxford, UK

Web: [www.inasp.info](http://www.inasp.info)

Email: [psmart@inasp.info](mailto:psmart@inasp.info)



The International Network for the Availability of Scientific Publications (INASP) was established by ICSU (the International Council of Science) in 1992 to provide support for networking between information providers and users, particularly to bridge the information divide between the developed and developing world. INASP currently operates a range of programmes to support researchers, health workers and rural outreach workers with access to relevant information.

To support access to scientific and other research information, INASP launched the Programme for the Enhancement of Research Information (PERI) in 2002 after a 2-year pilot project. PERI comprises several different components, as below:

1. Access to international research
2. Access to local and regional research
3. Training support for effective use of online resources
4. Training support for local and regional publishers
5. Support for country collaboration
6. Research and development

To support access to international research, INASP negotiates low-cost or no-cost access to international online published resources from major publishers (such as Blackwell, Oxford University Press, etc.). These are then provided to the developing countries who

have requested them, and payment is either made by the country or from external funding. It is important to note that access is free to the researchers ("at point of use"), since any payment comes from the library, institutional, governmental or international development agency funds. To assist efficient use of these resources, INASP provides training support in using and managing online resources, both to researchers and the library community. Over 1000 individuals from more than 200 institutions have received some training during the last two years.

The full list of resources made available through this programme, and the countries eligible to receive this support can be found on the INASP website. (The site also provides information about other free online resources which researchers anywhere in the world can access with no charge.)

To assist access to national and regional published research, INASP provides support for promoting awareness and access to national and regional journals and other scholarly works. In particular support is provided for promoting and publishing these resources online to ensure visibility among the international online published resources. An example of this type of work is the African Journals OnLine (AJOL) initiative, which hosts tables of contents, abstracts and publication information for over 200 African-published journals. To assist national and regional journals to become more sustainable and visible to researchers worldwide, INASP provides training and resources for journal publishers and editors, and also supports workshops initiated in-country. Over 100 publications have been represented at the training workshops over the past two years.

To build sustainability into this programme, INASP are working with colleagues and partners around the world to assist the development of country collaboration and partnerships. To this end support is being provided to train in negotiation and consortia skills, and to assist with partnerships worldwide. INASP also undertakes research projects to assist access and management of online resources: an example of this is a study in maximising bandwidth usage, which has resulted in a published report (free on the INASP website), and the development of training courses with the support of the Flemish InterUniversity Council (VLIR). Another example is the recent partnership with Lund University Libraries to jointly develop the Electronic Library Information Navigator (ELIN@) for low bandwidth environments.

INASP are not alone in working to enable greater access to research information worldwide, and are very conscious of the importance of working closely with the different organisations to avoid duplication of effort, and to ensure that researchers in developing countries are able to make informed decisions about

their choice of research materials. For example, PERI provides access to a wide range of disciplines, whereas HINARI concentrate on biomedical literature, and AGORA on agricultural (and related) subjects, so recipient institutions may be best served by selecting only one of the initiatives.

Equally, other organisations are also working to build visibility to developing world research, for example the Bioline initiative which provides a platform for full text journals, and Open Journals System (from the Public Knowledge Project in Canada) which provides software support for a fully online publishing system. It is important that the different initiatives work cooperatively so that developing country publishers are able to select the most appropriate project to enable their publications to thrive.

The worldwide scholarly publishing community is currently in a state of great change, with the potentials offered by online delivery of content contributing to discussions over access. Within this environment, INASP work with partners to ensure the maximum access to relevant information is provided to the developing and transitional countries, and that their own research and publishing communities are aware of the debates and questions being raised around the world so that they can participate in the debates, and contribute their own experiences and opinions.

## References

AGORA: <http://www.aginternetwork.org/>

AJOL: <http://www.ajol.info>

Bioline: <http://www.bioline.org.br>

Elin@: <http://www.lub.lu.se/headoffice/elininfo.shtml>

HINARI: <http://www.healthinternetwork.org/>

ICSU: <http://www.icsu.org>

INASP training resources: <http://www.inasp.info/training>

Open Journals Systems: <http://www.pkp.ubc.ca/ojs>

PERI: <http://www.inasp.info/peri>

VLIR: <http://www.vlir.be/>

## Svensk sammanfattning

En av de svåraste utmaningarna för forskare i låg-och medelinkomstländer är att få tillgång till internationella forskningspublikationer. Kostnaderna för att prenumerera på tidskrifter och andra informationsresurser samt bristen på utbildning i att använda dem är nyckelproblem. Det finns ett antal initiativ (på lokal, nationell och internationell nivå) för att erbjuda olika typer av gynnsamma rabatter alternativt helt fri tillgång för forsknings- och utbildningsinstitutioner i dessa länder. Förutom att ge stöd till utbildning och träning är The International Network for the Availability of Scientific Publications (INASP) också en av de

organisationer som är involverade i ett sådant initiativ - the Programme for the Enhancement of Research Information (PERI). Artikeln ger en kort översikt över de olika initiativen och över INASP och PERI-programmen.

## Accommodating Open Access Publishing: funding issues from a university (library) perspective

**Lars Bjørnshauge**

Director of Libraries, Lund University

[Lars.Bjornshauge@lub.lu.se](mailto:Lars.Bjornshauge@lub.lu.se)



During the recent years there has been increasing attention towards open access to scholarly content. In the open access community there is agreement on the distinction between the two roads towards open access. On the one hand the self archiving road [1], where authors archive a version of their articles published in scientific journals on a publicly accessible server at their institution, often referred to as an institutional repository. The other road towards open access is publishing in an open access journal.

This article will deal with issues related to publishing in Open Access Journals only. The number of open access journals (OA-journals) has grown significantly [2] and the same accounts for the impact of OA-journals [3]. While the overall majority of open access publishers are relatively small in terms of number of journals and relatively fragile in terms of management and financial and technical sustainability some big players have entered the open access publishing scene.

The first and still most important OA-publisher BioMed Central [4] began its OA-publishing activities during 2002. Since then the output and number of journals have been continuously growing. The second important OA-publisher is Public Library of Science (PLoS) [5], who launched its first journal PLoS Biology during 2003.

## **The growing attention and support to the issue of open access to scholarly content**

Librarians, library organizations, researchers, learned societies, universities and research institutions have during the latest years published statements in support of open access to scholarly content.

One of the first of such statements was the Budapest Open Access Initiative (BOAI) [6] followed by the Bethesda statement [7]. Lately the Berlin declaration [8] signed by a number of important research institutions and research councils has gained attention. Major research funders such as the Wellcome Trust [9] have declared support for open access as well. Initiatives like these bear witness about important and widespread commitment to the case of open access.

The emerging open access movement is in open competition with the established and often commercial scholarly publishers. The practice inherent in the dominant model is that authors do not pay for the dissemination of the research, but the readers do, often by means of subscriptions paid by the university, research institutions etc., normally through library subscriptions.

In the open access model the reader does not pay, but of course someone else will have to pay for the costs associated with quality control, dissemination etc.

### **Basic OA business models – Funding the two roads towards open access**

While the subscription based publishing model has well established financial and administrative routines both on the part of the publishers and on the part of the subscribers (libraries) OA-journals do not have such routines.

OA-journal publishing still has to find sustainable business models. While the overall majority of open access journals are operating on the basis of funding provided by government, university, research institutions, departments, as well as on voluntarily, "con amore" work, important attempts to try out business models based on author publication charges and as well as on institutional membership are tested these years.

The most well known example is BioMed Central (BMC). When BMC launched their ambitious OA-publishing venture two payment models were offered. There was a general author publication charge at \$500 per article. As an alternative institutions could sign up for an institutional membership for a fixed fee and in that case

author page charges from authors belonging to a membership institution were waived.

Based on the initial experience BMC has been considering a new model to be introduced in 2005 whereby the institutional membership fee will be related to the number of articles published by authors belonging to a membership institution.

PLoS has by the launch of the first journals also chosen the institutional membership fee concept in combination with author publication charges, although here from the start relatively advanced, meaning that institutions can sign up for different levels of support and thus gain different discounts on the author publication charge.

Regardless whether we have to deal with institutional membership or author publication charges and even article submitting fees [10] a number of questions arise.

Who should pay for an institutional membership – the university, the department or maybe the library??

Who should pay the author publication charge – the author, the institution, the university or maybe the library.

And in addition to that, how can we, if we want to promote open access to scholarly information, free the author from coping with the payment issues and in general remove obstacles to open access publishing.

### **Present sources for funding access to scholarly content within universities**

Currently university spending on access to scholarly content (books, databases, journals) in general is channelled through library budgets. In particular the developments of the last decade with license agreements with large publishers and aggregators have caused a trend towards centralization of funding of e-media often administered by the libraries. Subscriptions to journals or databases taken by individual researchers or research groups have decreased significantly.

In turn library funding is usually generated from the main sources of income in universities – funding for education and funding for research – whether the funds are directly from government or from research grants, tuition fees, library expenses can be considered a part of the operational expenses of universities, often labelled as overhead.

So far consequently access to scholarly content by means of book purchase, subscription to databases and journals etc. has been funded as a combination of government funds, tuition fees and overheads generated from research grants. When then the way of acquiring access to scholarly content is beginning to change – from payment for reading to payment for publishing – it is a straightforward logic that the same sources of income should pay for OA-publishing – and that the unit that up till now have had the responsibility to facilitate access to scholarly content – the library – should administer the handling of economic resources associated with OA-publishing as well.

However things are of course not that simple. First of all, the gradual shift that has taken place during the last decade when it comes to the handling of journal subscriptions, from individual, departmental subscriptions to print journals to the current set-up with centralized and even inter-institutional (consortia) license agreements has to a large extent changed the subscription handling business to a macro business. The number of invoices has decreased significantly and the handling costs associated with journals as well.

When we then consider the author publishing charge model we encounter a totally different environment. Economic transactions at document level, article processing fees, article submitting fees etc [11] are at least so far inherent in the economics of OA-journals.

My point is that if the library community and the research community want to promote open access publishing two things are important: first of all and most important is that incentives are in place for authors who publish in open access and secondly that no obstacles exist, that will make it more difficult or more troublesome for authors to deal with OA-publishing. I will not deal with the incentives. Much of the discussion and debate around open access has focussed on this issue, with all right. This is all about reward systems, improved visibility, more readers, more citations, more recognition etc. Not much discussion has concentrated on the micro obstacles, such as administrative problems, and financial issues related to publication charges.

Michael R Leach has initiated discussions about the issue of handling publication charges in the OA-model [12]: "Should a library handle the transactions for the OA author 'page/article charges' in addition to paying for the 'fee'?"

My spontaneous answer to this question is yes.

If we consider expenses related to publishing in OA-journals, institutional membership fees and author publication charges associated with OA-journals should in principle be considered as



expenses related to access to scholarly information. These expenses should accordingly be allocated within the library budget.

As of today this standpoint will probably generate a lot of discussion and several objections. And indeed some issues instantly come to mind.

One of these issues is that expenses are difficult to predict. Whereas the library community for years has been complaining over the often 2-digit percentage price increases from journal publishers and database providers, at least prices were known beforehand and prices could be calculated in the preparation for next years budget. Especially in the case of author publication charges in OA-journals no solid experience exists as to the publishing activities of a specific institution in specific journals. Accordingly it will be difficult to predict the expenses needed to cover publication charges [13]. On the other hand it is fair to say that the volume of OA-journals and OA-publishing of articles is still marginal and will probably not in the foreseeable future exceed 10% of articles published.

### **Possible improvements in OA publishing models**

As mentioned earlier a significant proportion of current OA-journals are funded in such a way that they do not so far need to charge authors or generate funding by other means than for instance institutional membership. There is no doubt that if we want OA-publishing to reach a significant proportion of the most reputable publishing, OA-publishers cannot rely on up front funding from government, institutions etc. but must somehow generate funding from publication charges and/or some kind of support from the research communities, that is the reader communities. Institutional membership is one example of this kind of support.

All publishers need financial liquidity. It is interesting to note that the scholarly publishing business probably is one of the few industries where customers (libraries/universities/research institutions) pay for the goods in advance. Payments for subscriptions to print journals, access to databases, and licenses to electronic journals in consortia are paid in advance giving the publishers a lot of money to work with.

It is not a surprise that OA-publishers need the same conditions. Sticking to an author publication charge model will not give the necessary financial security. That is probably why the institutional membership model has been introduced by the two leading OA-publishers.

From a university library point of view I find it quite difficult to "sell" an institutional membership to a specific faculty or to fund it

directly from a library budget without having a clue as to how many articles the university would be likely to publish within a given year. A well proven model from the library community should be tested here. Libraries all over the world have for years been in the business of delivering articles by interlibrary loan as photocopies for a handling fee. Instead of bothering with endless numbers of invoices of very small amounts it has been the custom to offer frequent customers a deposit account, where the customer deposits a fixed amount, which in turn is depreciated according to delivery of documents.

In order to speed up the process of gaining support for OA-publishing and give the publishers finances to work with I would recommend the same solution for OA-publishers. Introduce a model operating with institutional deposit accounts where the size of the amount deposited will qualify for reduced article processing fees.

This would give OA-publishers money to work with, it would make it legitimate for libraries to deposit funds and make it easy for libraries to administer article processing fees on behalf of the authors.

In the existing subscription based model the library pays on behalf of the reader. Readers should be aware of that, but should not have to bother. In the Open Access model the library should pay on behalf of the author. Authors should be aware of that, but should not have to bother.

## Notes and links

[1] Although the term archiving can generate different associations – i.e. archiving meaning preservation – nevertheless self archiving is the dominating term so far for describing authors publishing pre- or postprints of their works via institutional repositories.

[2] Directory of Open Access Journals – <http://www.doaj.org>

[3] The Impact of Open Access Journals. Thomson ISI - <http://www.isinet.com/media/presentrep/acropdf/impact-oa-journals.pdf>

[4] BioMed Central - <http://www.biomedcentral.com/>

[5] PLoS - <http://www.publiclibraryofscience.org/>

[6] BOAI - <http://www.soros.org/openaccess/>

[7] Bethesda Statement on Open Access Publishing - <http://www.earlham.edu/~peters/fos/bethesda.htm>

[8] Berlin Declaration on Open Access to Knowledge in the Sciences and Humanities - <http://www.zim.mpg.de/openaccess-berlin/berlindeclaration.html>

[9] Scientific publishing - A position statement by the Wellcome Trust in support of open access publishing - <http://www.wellcome.ac.uk/en/1/awtvispolpub.html>

[10] Open Access journals have as well to recover costs of the work done associated with rejected papers.

[11] Author charges is not a new thing. Payment for color, graphics etc have been in place a long time.

[12] Michael R. Leach: The Library as Open-Access "Fiscal Aggregator", posting to the Lib-License List ([liblicense-l@lists.yale.edu](mailto:liblicense-l@lists.yale.edu)), March 30th 2004

### **Svensk sammanfattning**

Open access rörelsen har enats om att särskilja två vägar till OA: egenarkivering respektive publicering i Open Access tidskrifter. Denna artikel diskuterar bara frågor som rör det senare alternativet. OA-publicering behöver fortfarande finna hållbara affärsmodeller. Vare sig vi talar om institutionella medlemskap, publiceringsavgifter, och/eller "submission fees" för författare uppstår många frågor.

Vem skall betala för ett institutionellt medlemskap – universitetet, institutionen eller kanske biblioteket?

Vem skall betala författarens publiceringsavgifter – författaren, institutionen, universitetet eller kanske biblioteket?

Vill vi främja Open Access till vetenskaplig information måste vi fråga oss vad vi kan göra för att befria författarna från att behöva hantera olika typer av betalningar och för att generellt undanröja hinder för OA-publicering.

Lund Virtual Medical  
Journal – en elektronisk  
tidskrift med många  
syften

**Yvonne Hultman Özek**

Ansvarig redaktör, Lund Virtual  
Medical Journal (LVMJ)  
Medicinska fakulteten, Lunds  
universitet

**Yvonne.**

**[Hultman\\_Ozek@kanslim.lu.se](mailto:Hultman_Ozek@kanslim.lu.se)**



Foto: Martin Lekvall

Medicinska fakulteten vid Lunds universitet startade år 2002 den månatliga virtuella tidskriften, Lund Virtual Medical Journal. Det huvudsakliga syftet med tidskriften är att öka synligheten och spridningen av fakultetens kvalitetsgranskade och publicerade forskningsresultat, och att öka tillgången till artiklarna i fulltext i LVMJ. LVMJ har en redaktion bestående av forskare från det prekliniska, kliniska samt hälsovetenskapliga forskningsområdet. Den ansvarige redaktören har det övergripande uppdraget att administrera redaktionsarbetet samt att driva den vidare utvecklingen av LVMJ.

**Bakgrund**

Medicinska fakultetens informationskommittee, InfoKom, fick år 2002 i uppdrag av dekanus att ta ett samlat grepp kring synliggörandet av fakultetens publiceringsverksamhet. Information om fakultetens publicering existerade naturligtvis redan, men kunde för den utomstående besökaren uppfattas som fragmenterad och svårtillgänglig, då den var spridd på institutionernas hemsidor. Visionen uppstod om en egen vetenskaplig fakultetstidskrift som på ett överskådligt sätt kunde återge fakultetens forskningsaktiviteter. Samtidigt hade Biblioteksdirektionen vid Lunds universitet påbörjat arbetet med publikationsdatabasen LU:research, det institutionella elektroniska arkivet för Lunds universitets publicerade material. Tanken med LU:research är att universitetets forskare själva ska registrera sina publicerade artiklar i databasen eller egenarkivera.

Utifrån LU:research utvecklades idén att använda informationen i publikationsdatabasen för en virtuell tidskrift. InfoKom och Biblioteksdirektionen påbörjade ett intensivt samarbete. Forskare, webbdesigner, programmerare samt bibliotekarier från båda enheterna arbetade i projektet och LVMJ är ett gott exempel på gränsöverskridande samarbete där allas kompetenser tas tillvara.

## **Redaktion**

Redaktionens samarbete och sammansättning syftar till att överbrygga de tre stora forskningsområdena, klinisk, preklinisk samt hälsovetenskaplig forskning.

Medicinska fakulteten vill visa upp mer än listor på bibliografiska referenser och därför väljer redaktionen varje månad ut en artikel av vetenskapligt intresse som belyser forskning av god kvalitet och som reflekterar forskningsbredden vid fakulteten. Redaktionen skriver också en "editorial comment" till den utvalda artikeln. Även en frilansjournalist och en språkgranskare är knuten till det redaktionella arbetet. En populärvetenskaplig sammanfattning av den utvalda artikeln publiceras regelbundet.

## **LVMJs funktioner, innehåll och upphovsrättsliga frågor**

Det är enkelt att navigera och leta efter information i LVMJ. Man kan snabbt få överskådlig information om publicerade artiklar på institutionsnivå eller på författare.

## **Hur fungerar arbetsflödet i publiceringen av den bibliografiska informationen i LVMJ?**

Eftersom PubMed är den huvudsakliga bibliografiska databasen inom medicin och dessutom fritt tillgänglig kan vi varje månad söka fram informationen och importera den direkt till LU:research. Personal vid medicinska fakultetens bibliotek redigerar den bibliografiska informationen innan den publiceras i LVMJ.

Ett viktigt mål är att de publicerade artiklarna görs fritt tillgängliga via LVMJ. För upphovsrättsliga frågor använder medicinska fakultetens bibliotek rutinmässigt "SHERPA, publishers copyright & self-archiving policies" [1]. I detta register finns information om förlagens policy angående s.k. egenarkivering [2] av postprints. Med postprint menas här artikeln i den version som godkänts för publicering. Finns inte ett officiellt deklarerat tillstånd, kontaktar vi utgivaren efter godkännande av författaren. Författarna har ställt sig mycket positiva till detta initiativ, eftersom LVMJ ger dem en möjlighet att presentera sina publicerade forskningsresultat med global sökbarhet och tillgänglighet.

Forskarnas information registreras i LVMJ utan att de själva behöver delta i den praktiska processen. Om fakulteten införde en regel för författarna att egenarkivera artikeln när förlag och tidskrifter tillåter detta skulle arbetsflödet effektiviseras ytterligare och författarens

artikel skulle spridas vid ett betydligt tidigare tillfälle via LVMJ än vad den gör idag.

## **Hur ser framtiden för LU-forskarnas upphovsrätt till sina egna artiklar?**

Representanter från Juridiska enheten, Biblioteksdirektionen och Juridiska fakulteten har tagit fram förslag till avtalsmallar. Avtalen syftar till att LU-forskarna skall behålla upphovsrätten och kunna publicera sina arbeten i LU:research. I väntan på godkännande av universitetsstyrelsen och att avtalen börjar användas kan man förutse de positiva konsekvenserna för LVMJ: fakultetens forskningsresultat sprids effektivare och snabbare, fulltexterna ökar och blir fritt tillgängliga för omvärlden. Sist men inte minst sprids LVMJs kännemärke, månadens artikel med redaktionens kommentarer och därtill en regelbundet publicerad populärvetenskaplig version – allt för att lyfta fram, belysa och sprida de forskningsaktiviteter av god kvalitet som pågår vid medicinska fakulteten.

[1] Hubbard, B., *SHERPA and Institutional Repositories*. *Serials*, 2003. 16

(3 November): p. 243

[2] Harnad, S., *The self-archiving initiative*. *Nature*, 2001. 410 (6832):

p. 1024-5

### **Länkar:**

Lund Virtual Medical Journal (LVMJ) (<http://lvmj.medfak.lu.se>)

LVMJ redaktion (<http://lvmj.medfak.lu.se/contact.html>)

Månadens artikel LVMJ (<http://lvmj.medfak.lu.se/text.html>)

"Editorial comment" ([http://www.medfak.lu.se/search\\_medfak/html/monthly.php?show\\_issue=153](http://www.medfak.lu.se/search_medfak/html/monthly.php?show_issue=153))

Information om publicerade artiklar (<http://lvmj.medfak.lu.se/view/department/>)

SHERPA (<http://www.sherpa.ac.uk/romeo.php>)

LUs förslag till avtalsmallar (<http://www.lu.se/jurenh/INTERN/avtal.html>)

LU:research (<http://lu-research.lub.lu.se/>)

### **English abstract**

The monthly electronic publication, Lund Virtual Medical Journal, started as a response to meet the need to increase the visibility of ongoing research at the Faculty of Medicine at Lund university. The journal has an editorial group which each month highlights an article of scientific interest. The organisation of the bibliographic information and the Open Access full text articles in the journal is based on bibliographic registration and self archiving in the institutional electronic archive for Lund university, LU:research.

Att publicera  
hos BioMed Central  
<http://www.biomedcentral.com/>

**Christina Gummesson**, lektor vid Avdelningen för Sjukgymnastik, Lunds universitet, och **Åke Svensson**, docent och överläkare på hudkliniken i Malmö, delar med sig av sina erfarenheter av att publicera hos BioMed Central

Lunds universitet gick in som första europeiska medlem i BioMed Central (BMC) i februari 2002, dvs vi deltog nästan från starten. Orsaken var att vi tidigt börjat analysera den vetenskapliga kommunikationsmarknaden och dragit slutsatsen att den på många sätt var dysfunktionell och behövde förändras.

BioMed Centrals ledning visade upp en gedigen erfarenhet av publicering, även online, och erbjöd effektiva system för peer-review och online manushantering. Alla originalartiklar blev omedelbart och permanent fritt tillgängliga och ökade därigenom den globala synligheten av lundaproducerad forskning

BMC använder öppen peer-review för alla sina medicinska tidskrifter. En prepubliceringshistorik presenteras i samband med varje artikel (insänd version, referenternas rapporter, författarnas svar). Författarna behåller sin copyright.

Mot att universitetet betalar en årlig medlemsavgift får Lunds forskare möjlighet att publicera sig utan att behöva erlägga de separata artikelavgifter som BMC annars tar ut för att finansiera utgivningen.

Här följer ett par lundaforskares erfarenheter av att publicera hos BMC.

**Christina Gummesson** arbetar som lektor vid Avdelningen för Sjukgymnastik och forskar inom områdena muskuloskeletala besvär och utvärderingsmetodik. Hon har publicerat tre artiklar i

BMC-tidskrifter och ett antal artiklar i traditionella tidskrifter.

**Åke Svensson** är docent och överläkare på hudkliniken i Malmö och har publicerat ca 55 artiklar varav en i BMC. Han forskar inom områdena eksem och dermatoepidemiologi.

## **Sex frågor om att publicera i BioMed Central's Open Access-tidskrifter**

*1. Vad fick dig att skicka in ditt manus till en BMC Open Access tidskrift?*

**CG:** Jag kände till att det var en snabbare process än de flesta andra tidskrifter, samt att man behåller copyright. Dessa faktorer var väsentliga för att jag skulle fundera på publicering där. Men det var också avgörande att Lunds universitet stöttade BMC.

**ÅS:** Passade innehållsmässigt. Lättillgänglig för inte enbart en snäv specialistgrupp. Snabb.

*2. Hur bedömer du deras manushanteringssystem?*

**CG:** Manushanteringssystemet är bra upplagt men vid varje publicering har tyvärr något krånglat. Dock har det varit lätt att få snabb kontakt med BMC och hjälp. Det var också bra att man kunde följa manuskriptet hela tiden, se när manuskriptet skickats till reviewer, se när det sen kommit tillbaka mm.

**ÅS:** Bra.

*3. Vilka är dina erfarenheter av deras peer-reviewprocess?*

**CG:** Det är bra att de har en målsättning att reviewer har mycket begränsad tid. Jag har haft otur och processen har varit längre än vad de utlovat. Trots det är review-processen väsentligt snabbare än de flesta andra tidskrifter. För övrigt tycker jag processen med öppen review är enbart positiv.

**ÅS:** Review av hög klass. Reviewer var offentliga. Det är möjligt att läsa såväl vår ursprungliga text, reviewsynpunkterna som slutversionen. Detta bra ur vetenskaplig synpunkt.

*4. Vad anser du att du vinner på att publicera i en Open Access tidskrift?*

**CG:** Tillgänglighet – Alla som är intresserade kan läsa fulltext gratis från dagen när artikeln accepteras. Resultaten känns nya och aktuella när de publiceras.



Tid - Att det inte tar så lång tid från att manuskriptet är inskickat till beslut om publicering.

Kontakt - Jag haft mycket mer kontakt med läsare (via e-post) än när jag publicerat i andra tidskrifter.

**ÅS:** Snabb. Lättillgänglig.

*5. Övriga BMC tjänster du haft glädje av? Ett exempel är möjligheten att kunna logga in och se hur många som tittat på/laddat ner din artikel?*

**CG:** Ja den tjänsten har varit mycket värdefull. Här ser man direkt hur många som läser/laddar ned artikeln redan första dagen och kan se att den fortfarande läses långt senare. Detta känns väldigt värdefullt och gör att jag verkligen rekommenderar andra doktorander att publicera i BMC!

**ÅS:** Kan vara av intresse.

*6. Vad anser du om finansieringen av Open Access-tidskrifter med publiceringsavgifter, t ex via forskningsanslag?*

**CG:** Så fungerar det väl nu för dem som inte tillhör ett universitet som är anslutet. Jag är inte insatt i frågan, men jag skulle inte själv välja att försöka publicera i en tidskrift där jag måste betala. Att söka medel för att få forska och även söka medel för att publicera resultaten tycker jag inte låter rimligt.

**ÅS:** Viktigt att det inte ligger på forskningsanslagen vilket kan leda till att publikationerna styrs efter ekonomi.

**Christina.Gummesson@sjukgym.lu.se**

**Ake.Svensson@derm.mas.lu.se**