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PREDATORY PUBLISHING
You may have heard...

Who's Afraid of Peer Review?
John Bohannon

A spoof paper concocted by Science reveals little or no scrutiny at many open-access journals.

On 4 July, good news arrived in the inbox of Ocorrafoo Cobange, a biologist at the Wassee Institute of Medicine in Asmara. It was the official letter of acceptance for a paper he had submitted 2 months earlier to the Journal of Natural Pharmaceuticals, describing the anticancer properties of a chemical that Cobange had extracted from a lichen.

In fact, it should have been promptly rejected. Any reviewer with more than a high-school knowledge of chemistry and the ability to understand a basic data plot should have spotted the paper's chart coming immediately to any expert's notice.
The pot calling the kettle black?

I confess, I wrote the Arsenic DNA paper to expose flaws in peer-review at subscription-based journals

By MICHAEL EISEN | Published: OCTOBER 3, 2013

In 2011, after having read several really bad papers in the journal Science, I decided to explore just how slipshod their peer-review process is. I knew that their business depends on publishing “sexy” papers. So I created a manuscript that claimed something extraordinary - that I’d discovered a species of bacteria that uses arsenic in its DNA instead of phosphorus. But I made the science so egregiously bad that no competent peer reviewer would accept it. The approach was deeply flawed – there were poor or absent controls in every figure. I used ludicrously elaborate experiments where simple ones would have done. And I failed to include a simple, obvious experiment that would have definitively shown that arsenic was really in the bacteria’s DNA. I then submitted the paper to Science, punching up the impact the work would have on our understanding of extraterrestrials and the origins of life on Earth in the cover letter. And what do you know? They accepted it!

My sting exposed the seedy underside of “subscription-based” scholarly publishing, where some journals routinely lower their standards – in this case by sending the paper to reviewers they knew would be sympathetic - in order to pump up their impact factor and increase subscription revenue. Maybe there are journals out there who do subscription-based publishing right – but my experience should serve as a warning to people thinking about submitting their work to Science and other journals like it.

OK – this isn’t exactly what happened. I didn’t actually write the paper. Far more frighteningly, it was a real paper that contained all of the flaws described above that was actually accepted, and ultimately published, by Science.

http://www.michaeleisen.org/blog/?p=1439
The pot calling the kettle black?

Elsevier published 6 fake journals

Scientific publishing giant Elsevier put out a total of six publications between 2000 and 2005 that were sponsored by unnamed pharmaceutical companies and looked like peer reviewed medical journals, but did not disclose sponsorship, the company has admitted. Elsevier is conducting an "internal review" of its publishing practices after allegations came to light that the company produced a pharmaceutical company-funded publication in the early 2000s without disclosing that the "journal" was corporate sponsored. The allegations involve the __Australian Journal of Bone and Joint Medicine__, a publication paid for by pharmaceutical companies.
• Majority of Gold OA journals do not charge authors
Identifying Predatory Publishers

“All scholars will need to develop a new skill we might call "scholarly publishing literacy."

Identifying Predatory Publishers

Criteria for Determining Predatory Open-Access Publishers

By Jeffrey Beall
2nd edition / December 1, 2012

For a current list of predatory publishers and journals, please visit: http://scholarlyoa.com. The author wishes to thank Bill Cohen and Dr. Michael W. Firmin for their valuable help in preparing this document.

Identifying Predatory Publishers

• No academic information is provided regarding the editor, editorial staff, and/or review board members (e.g., institutional affiliation).

• Same editorial board for more than one journal.
Identifying Predatory Publishers

• Begins with a large fleet of journals, often using a template to quickly create each journal’s home page.

• Provides insufficient information or hides information about author fees, offering to publish an author’s paper and later sending a previously-undisclosed invoice.
Identifying Predatory Publishers

• The name of a journal is does not truthfully reflect its origin

• The journal falsely claims to have an impact factor

• The publisher sends spam requests for peer reviews to scholars unqualified to review submitted manuscripts.
Identifying Predatory Publishers

Other clues

• Publish papers already published in other venues
• Use language claiming to be a “leading publisher” even though the publisher may only be a startup or a novice organization.
• Operate in a Western country chiefly for the purpose of functioning as a vanity press for scholars in a developing country.
• Do minimal or no copyediting.
• Publish papers that are obvious pseudo-science.
• Have a “contact us” page that only includes a web form, and the publisher hides or does not reveal its location

.......see website for full list of criteria
The future

Today's publication silos will be replaced by a set of decentralized, interoperable services that are built on a core infrastructure of open data and evolving standards — like the Web itself (see 'Reconstructing publishing'). This 'decoupled journal'\textsuperscript{3, 4} publishes promiscuously, then subjects products to rigorous review through the aggregated judgements of expert communities, supporting both rapid, fine-grained filtering and consistent, meaningful evaluation.
Another big year

NEWS IN THE OA SPACE
Wiley backflip

• Standard position: No to green unless there is a ‘separate agreement’
• As of last week: offer explicit support [Green] for the NHMRC and ARC dissemination policies.
  – “ARC and NHMRC funded authors may self-archive the author accepted version of their paper (authors manuscript) after a 12-month embargo period from publication in an open access institutional repository. If articles are made open access following payment of an article publication fee, it is not necessary to archive the author’s manuscript, but the metadata must be available in the institutional repository with a link to the published article of record on Wiley Online Library.”
  
  http://olabout.wiley.com/WileyCDA/Section/id-406074.html
Open Access is on the world agenda

- Canada's tricouncil funding agencies draft OA policy (15 October 2013)
  - Comments due by 13 December
- Indian Council of Agricultural Research OA policy (13 September 2013)
  - Each institute needs to set up an IR - a central harvester
- Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE) announced plans to make publicly-funded research more freely available (16 July 2013)
  - only work that is deposited in a repository on acceptance would be eligible for consideration in the post-2014 Research Excellence Framework (REF).
- G8 Ministers of Science statement (13 June 2013)
- Global Research Council (27 May 2013)
- UNESCO announces open access policy (13 May 2013)
- Research Councils of UK’s open access policy in effect (1 April 2013)
- Obama Administration new policy (22 February 2013)
  - U.S. Federal agencies spending over $100 million in research and development have to have a plan to “support increased public access to the results of research funded by the Federal Government” within 12 months.
- The European Commission (2012)
  - Under their Research & Innovation funding programme, all articles produced with funding from Horizon 2020. €80-billion (US$98-billion) research-funding programme for 2014–20 will have to be accessible as of 2014.

UK – Finch & RCUK

• Finch Report (June 2012) recommended gold OA for all UK research
  – Initially UK govt said no extra $, then said £10 million
• RCUK policy in place 1 April
  – Publishers (esp Emerald) have changed their policies – extending or introducing embargoes
  – Affects everyone – including Australians
• BIS report published 10 Sept, said focus on gold is wrong.
  – Actually it says most of the Finch report is wrong
  – Finch meeting Sept ‘to review progress in the implementation of its recommendations’
US – Obama govt directive

• February 22 - Obama Administration released policy “Increasing access to the results of federally funded scientific research”
  – within 12 m agencies spend over $100million have to have an OA plan
• Plans to assist the process
  – CHORUS – publishers deposit metadata of funded papers Users look via CHORUS or through the funding agency site, & view the paper through a link back to the publishers site.
  – SHARE - federate existing university-based digital repositories, obviating the need for central repositories.
• Not much information on what agencies have been doing
Around the corner...

• “Assessing Research Impact” govt discussion paper
  – AOASG recommended that making work OA and download counts be used as a measure

• Australian Law Reform Commission – Copyright and the Digital Economy
  – discussion on the proposal paper closed July 2013
  – May change the rules about orphan works (allowing legacy theses to be made OA)

• Govt policy on open access to all govt funded research (publications and data)
  – Supposed to be released for discussion pre-election
  – Unknown whether it will remain in the same form
Training – ALIA & TAFE

Catching the Third Wave
local resources, digital repositories and metadata

COURSE OVERVIEW
This unit will provide you with skills to manage digital repositories.
- Defining the scope of the coverage of a digital repository
- Selecting resources to add to the digital repository
- Using relevant software applications and equipment to create objects for the repository
- Creating and editing descriptive, technical and administrative metadata to provide access

This unit covers content within CEGOMOSIA Maintain Digital Repositories in the National Training Package. Participants will receive a Statement of Completion of this unit. This unit would be recognised for RPL (Recognition of Prior Learning) purposes.

COURSE DATES
29 October – 4 December
Register by 15 October

COURSE PRESENTER
Sydney TAFE

DELIVERY METHOD
Online (teacher-led)
The course can be completed in 6 weeks but at its own pace. It can be finished earlier or later depending on your learning styles and needs.

FEE
Members $350 inc GST
$150 inc GST
Non-Members $525 inc GST

AOASG
Australian Open Access Support Group
Catching the Third Wave - maintaining digital repositories

- Defining the scope of the coverage of a digital repository
- Selecting resources to add to the digital repository
- Using relevant software applications and equipment to create objects for the repository
- Creating and editing descriptive, technical and administrative metadata to provide access
- This unit covers content within CULICM501A Maintain Digital Repositories in the National Training Package. Participants will receive a TAFENSW statement of completion of this unit. This unit would be recognised for RPL (recognition of prior learning) purposes.

- Tuesday 29 October 2013 (All day) to Friday 06 December 2013 (All day)
- “The course has been developed by Syd TAFE staff - delivered via Moodle web interface, led by 1-2 teachers”
- Members $350 inc GST Partner Org’s $438 inc GST Non-Members $525 inc GST
Continuing on the tradition

PUBLISHER PUSH-BACK
Depends on the ‘prism’ you look through
2012 proposed law that affects scholarly publishing

• Research Works Act (RWA)
  – US House Bill 3699 introduced 16 December 2011
• It would be illegal for government funding body to make OA publication a condition of funding
• Put forward by two congress people
  – Found to both have accepted large donations from Elsevier in previous financial year
• Major blogging campaign & Elsevier boycott – petition started by Tim Gowers
• Elsevier withdrew support for Bill - pulled 28 February 2012
Creation of mega journals

- PLOS ONE phenomenally successful
- Now other publishers doing the same thing:
  - Sage OPEN – APC of $99
  - BMJ Open
  - Scientific Reports (Nature)
  - AIP Advances (Am Inst Physics)
  - G3 (Genetics Soc of America)
  - Biology Open (Company of Biologists)
  - Physical Review X (Am Physical society)
  - Open Biology (Royal Society)
  - Cell Reports (Elsevier, Cell Press)
Membership model

• Full (cover all costs) or partial (cover a % of APC)
• BioMed Central & PLOS have been doing it for years
• Now – Many hybrid publishers offering ‘membership’ model
  – Wiley Open Access - Institutional & funder accounts
  – Royal Society Membership Programme
  – Springer Open Access Membership Programme (with BMC)
  – Taylor & Francis - Open Access Partnership
• These lock institutions in to certain publishers
Charging more for CC-BY

- Many mandates require CC-BY on OA articles.
- Nature press release November 2012
  - "NPG expands Creative Commons Attribution license options"
  - [http://www.nature.com/press_releases/cc-licenses.html](http://www.nature.com/press_releases/cc-licenses.html)
- If the author (paying for hybrid) wants the less restrictive CC-BY license it will cost between GBP100 to GBP400 MORE than if they take the more restrictive CC -BY-NC-ND or CC-BY-NC-SA
The biggest challenge for OA advocacy

- Publishers send acceptance emails to authors offering paid OA option as a way to ‘meet funder mandates’.
- This is hugely effective and hard for us to counter
OPEN ACCESS AND BOOK PUBLISHING
OA Scholarly Monographs

1588 Academic peer-reviewed books from 54 publishers

http://www.doabooks.org/
Why?

http://www.wellcome.ac.uk/News/Media-office/Press-releases/2013/WTP052746.htm

Wellcome Trust extends open access policy to include scholarly monographs and book chapters

30 May 2013

http://www.arc.gov.au/applicants/open_access.htm
OA Monograph Business Models

- Collaborative underwriting
  - eg Knowledge Unlatched

- Dual editions
  - eg ANU ePress

- Institutional subsidies
  - eg Purdue ePubs

- Liberation
  - eg Unglue it

- Freemium/
  Value-added services
  - Eg Open Edition

- Publication fees
  - eg Springer Open Books

http://oad.simmons.edu/oadwiki/OA_book_business_models
Collaborative underwriting

Knowledge Unlatched

Process

Publishers
- Offer Titles
- Set Title Fee
- Post Open Book
- Sell Premium Versions

KU
- Negotiates with Publishers
- Collates Titles
- Handles Payments
- Preservation

Libraries
- Select Titles
- Order Titles
- Pay Title Fee

Pay Publishers
Pay KU

http://www.knowledgeunlatched.org/about/how-it-works/
**Knowledge Unlatched**

**Publishers**
- Offer titles to Knowledge Unlatched 9-15 months before publication
- Recommend a Title Fee within KU guide lines
- Metadata in ONIX form
  (Additional metadata welcomed e.g. MARC21+)
- KU confirmation of library commitment sent to publishers

**Member Libraries**
- Pay Knowledge Unlatched - quarterly as titles are published (KU then pays the publisher)
- Select premium versions at any time and purchase through designated vendors or direct from publishers – with discounts
- Receive credits/cash backs if more than minimum number of libraries unlatch a title
- Costs to libraries will reduce as KU grows in membership and titles
MediaObject is a book series that is focused on publications from researchers and artists exploring and documenting practice based projects not based primarily in text.
The death of the academic book and the path to Open Access

Roxanne Missingham
University Librarian at Australian National University

Issues

• Handling OA books may be more costly for libraries than profile-driven ordering
• What will be the role of subject librarians?
• Will OA publishers accept book *proposals* or want to see a finished draft?
• How will impact be assessed?
OA Books - Resources

http://www.openoasis.org

http://www.oapen.org/home


https://www.jisc-collections.ac.uk/Reports/oabooksreport

http://oad.simmons.edu/oadwiki/OA_book_business_models
Some new players, and other older ones have gone...

OPEN ACCESS & SOCIAL MEDIA
Social Media and OA

• "if you want people to read your papers, make them open access, and let the community know (via blogs, twitter, etc.) where to get them.. Not rocket science. But worth spending time doing.

Social media & staff profile pages
QUT academics tweeting links to their OA pubs in QUT ePrints
April 12th tweet links to open access copy in QUT ePrints
You can see the impact of the tweet on downloads
OA & Social Media Platforms

- Google Scholar
- Academia.edu
- ResearchGate
- Mendeley
Free & simple - Google citations

Dr Danny Kingsley
Visiting Fellow - CPAS & EO Australian Open Access Support Group
open access - scholarly communication - repositories - publication - authorship
Verified email at anu.edu.au

Title: The journal is dead, long live the journal
Authors: Danny Kingsley
Publication date: 2007/10/2
Journal name: On the horizon
Volume: 15
Issue: 4
Pages: 211-221
Publisher: Emerald Group Publishing Limited
Description: Purpose: The purpose of this paper is to argue that the traditional scholarly journal system is outdated and in need of revamp, and new internet technologies provide opportunities for...
ResearchGate

- Social networking site for academics
- Supported through private backing (eg: Bill Gates foundation)
- Place to put publications, collaborate, engage in conversations with colleagues
- Is a repository (retains a copy of work, rather than pointing to it)
- Dilutes IR downloads
Easy to add work

What type of research do you want to add?

To add your research to your profile, please select a category below. Anything you add will be given its own page so that others can cite, interact with, and share your work. Learn more

Peer-reviewed
Add your peer-reviewed research, such as articles and conference proceedings, to your profile.

Supplementary resources
Add resources such as datasets and negative results to your existing publications.

Non-peer-reviewed
Publish your non-peer-reviewed research to get feedback on it from other researchers.
How does this compare to your repository deposit process?
Constant emails

Danny, your weekly update now includes stats about your department.
Take a look below to gauge the impact of your department's research output over time.

DANNY KINGSLEY STATS

1.70
Your RG Score

Publication views
9 LAST WEEK
48 TOTAL

Profile views
4 LAST WEEK
44 TOTAL

See your score

See your stats

See views by country
Academia.edu

• “a place to share and follow research”
• Raised $11.1 million in a second round of funding – 26 Sept 2013
• Published 1.6 million papers since its launch in 2008
Gives a home page – profile etc
Mendeley

• Founded 2008
• free reference manager and academic social network that can help you organize your research, collaborate with others online, and discover the latest research
• Bought by Elsevier 12 April 2013
Mendeley

The profits of free books: an experiment to measure the impact of open access publishing
Ronald Snijder in Learned Publishing (2010)
This article describes an experiment to measure the impact of open access (OA) publishing of academic books. During a period of nine months, three sets of 100 books were...

AUPress: A Comparison of an Open Access University Press with Traditional Presses
This study is a comparison of AUPress with three other traditional (non-open access) Canadian university presses. The analysis is based on the rankings that are correlated with book sales

1 million + users
Sharing over 60 million research papers

http://www.mendeley.com
Connotea

- Built by Nature Publishing Group 2004
- A del.icio.us for academia
- Discontinued 12 March 2013
Perils of relying on social media sites

The effect of open access and downloads ('hits') on citation impact: a bibliography of studies

Latest articles on OA impact

This update service is no longer available following the closure of Connotea. It may be resumed if a suitable alternative service is found.
That was the year that was...

AUSTRALIAN OPEN ACCESS SUPPORT GROUP
aoasg.org.au

• Website includes:
  – Australian-specific OA lists
  – Information about mandates
  – Downloadable resources for OA advocacy
  – Blogs explaining OA news events
  – Blogs including commentary and observation
The numbers have it

- 440 Twitter followers - @openaccess_oz
- 222 members on discussion list
  - 72% libraries, 9% researchers, 5% government, 5% uni admin
- 27,457 visits to webpage. Most popular pages:
  - About the AOASG
  - So you want people to read your thesis?
  - Journal editors take note – you have the power
  - Australian OA journals
  - Walking in quicksand - keeping up with copyright agreements
  - Comparison of ARC & NHMRC policies

(As at 26 October 2013)
Media interest

• ABC radio - AM radio program
• The Project (TV)
• The Australian
• The Guardian (UK)
• Featured in blogs overseas
• The Conversation:
  – UKs OA policies have global consequences
    17 September - 1335 reads
  – Busting the top 5 myths about open access
    11 July - 5116 reads
  – What is open access and why should we care?
    15 January - 3863 reads
Presentations

• History Editor’s meeting – Feb, ANU
• Information Online 2013 – Feb, Brisbane
• CPA Researcher summit - June, Sydney
• National Scholarly Communication Forum – May, ANU
• ARMS conference – Sept, Adelaide
• AAMRI – Oct, Canberra
• CAIRSS – Oct, Brisbane
• Open Access Research conference – Oct, Brisbane
• Towards Research Excellence – Dec, Sydney
  – Plus visits to: CSU, Macquarie, ECU, WAGUL & Victoria (next week)
Expert advice

• Feature article for the Dept of Innovation 2013 *Australian Innovation System Report*

• Submission to the “Assessing Research Impact” govt discussion paper

• ARC using the AOASG decision tree on their website

• Working with AAMRI on issues

• Organised event – ARC & NHMRC discuss policies (on YouTube)
Broader impact?

http://svpow.com/2013/05/11/the-sv-pow-open-access-decision-tree/
Broader impact? - Blogs

• Journal editors take note – you have the power
  – T&F indefinitely extended their trial LIS articles fully green. Reblogged & translated into Italian

• Walking in quicksand – keeping up with copyright agreements
  – Richard Poynder followed up with both Springer & Emerald. In turn these were quoted in UK House of Commons BIS Committee report

• Accessibility is more than making the paper OA
  – Huge response, reblogged in LSE Impact of Social Science blog

• So you want people to read your thesis
  – Biggest single day of visitors to site ^12 – thanks Thesis Whisperer!

• Shall we sing in CHORUS or just SHARE?
  – Feedback from a company director in US – thank you for effort to look at both initiatives without prejudice
Questions?

Australian Open Access Support Group

w: http://aoasg.org.au

e: eo@aoasg.org.au

p: 02 6125 6839

t: @openaccess_oz