

NOTES

Preface

1. See the continually updated bibliography of my articles on open access.

<http://www.earlham.edu/~peters/fos/oawritings.htm>

Also see Charles W. Bailey Jr., "Transforming Scholarly Publishing through Open Access: A Bibliography," Digital Scholarship, 2010.

<http://digital-scholarship.org/tsp/w/tsp.html>

Chapter 1

1. Budapest Open Access Initiative, February 14, 2002 (disclosure: I was the principal drafter).

<http://www.soros.org/openaccess>

Bethesda Statement on Open Access Publishing, June 20, 2003.

http://dash.harvard.edu/bitstream/handle/1/4725199/suber_bethesda.htm?sequence=1

Berlin Declaration on Open Access to Knowledge in the Sciences and Humanities, October 22, 2003.

<http://oa.mpg.de/lang/en-uk/berlin-prozess/berliner-erklarung>

2. On the growth of OA over the past decade, see my annual reviews of OA progress, starting in 2003:

http://dash.harvard.edu/bitstream/handle/1/4736588/suber_oa2010.htm?sequence=1

http://dash.harvard.edu/bitstream/handle/1/4322584/suber_oa2009.html?sequence=1

http://dash.harvard.edu/bitstream/handle/1/4322588/suber_oa2008.html?sequence=1

http://dash.harvard.edu/bitstream/handle/1/4322582/suber_oa2007.html?sequence=1

http://dash.harvard.edu/bitstream/handle/1/4729246/suber_oa2006.htm?sequence=1

http://dash.harvard.edu/bitstream/handle/1/4729244/suber_oa2005.htm?sequence=1

http://dash.harvard.edu/bitstream/handle/1/4729243/suber_oa2004.htm?sequence=1

http://dash.harvard.edu/bitstream/handle/1/4729242/suber_0a2003.htm?sequence=1

3. This section borrows from several of my previous publications: “Open Access Overview.”

http://dash.harvard.edu/bitstream/handle/1/4729737/suber_0aoverview.htm?sequence=1

“Creating an Intellectual Commons through Open Access,” in Charlotte Hess and Elinor Ostrom (eds.), *Understanding Knowledge as a Commons: From Theory to Practice*, MIT Press, 2006.

http://dash.harvard.edu/bitstream/handle/1/4552055/suber_intellectcommons.pdf?sequence=1

“Six things that researchers need to know about open access,” *SPARC Open Access Newsletter*, February 2, 2006.

http://dash.harvard.edu/bitstream/handle/1/4739013/suber_sixresearchers.htm?sequence=1

My answers to Richard Poynder’s interview questions in “The Basement Interviews: Peter Suber,” October 19, 2007.

<http://poynder.blogspot.com/2007/10/basement-interviews-peter-suber.html>

4. On the origin of scholarly journals, see Jean-Claude Guéron, “In Oldenburg’s Long Shadow: Librarians, Research Scientists, Publishers, and the Control of Scientific Publishing,” Association of Research Libraries, 2001.

<http://www.arl.org/resources/pubs/mmproceedings/138gueron.shtml>

Some authors are paid for journal articles. On some of these exceptions, see: “Open access when authors are paid,” *SPARC Open Access Newsletter*, December 2, 2003.

http://dash.harvard.edu/bitstream/handle/1/4552040/suber_paid.htm?sequence=1

Also see Jufang Shao and Huiyun Shen, “The Outflow of Academic Papers from China,” *Learned Publishing* 24, no. 2 (April 2011).

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1087/20110203>

5. For more, see “Open access, markets, and missions,” *SPARC Open Access Newsletter*, March 2, 2010.

http://dash.harvard.edu/bitstream/handle/1/4322590/suber_0amarkets.html?sequence=1

6. See Steve Hitchcock, “The Effect of Open Access and Downloads (‘Hits’) on Citation Impact: A Bibliography of Studies,” the Open Citation Project, continually updated.

<http://opcit.eprints.org/oacitation-biblio.html>

Also see Alma Swan's technical report, which includes summary findings of all the major studies from 2001 to 2010:

"Open Access Citation Advantage: Studies and Results to Date," Technical Report, School of Electronics & Computer Science, University of Southampton, August 2010.

<http://eprints.ecs.soton.ac.uk/18516>

Also see Ben Wagner's "Open Access Citation Advantage: An Annotated Bibliography," *Issues in Science and Technology Librarianship*, Winter 2010.

<http://www.istl.org/10-winter/article2.html>

Excerpt:

Though [the explanation for the correlation] is not settled, the bibliography cites a number of studies designed to test the hypothesis of confounding extraneous causes. It is clear that open access articles are downloaded far more than toll access articles. Studies indicate this download advantage is easily 100% over toll access articles. It seems unlikely such a large download advantage would not to some degree eventually influence the number of citations. . . . Publication in an open access journal (Gold OA) apparently is not required to get a significant OA citation advantage.

Among the continuing controversies is how far to attribute the correlation to self-selection, or decisions by authors to deposit their best work in OA repositories. Tending to deny the OA citation advantage, a December 2010 study by Philip Davis tried to rule out self-selection bias by randomly making some articles OA and others toll access. The OA articles were downloaded more often but not cited more often than the toll-access articles. Tending to confirm the OA citation advantage, an October 2010 study by Yassine Gargouri, Stevan Harnad, and colleagues tried to rule out self-selection bias by showing that the OA citation advantage was just as high for mandated OA archiving as it was for voluntary OA archiving. See Philip M. Davis, "Does Open Access Lead to Increased Readership and Citations? A Randomized Controlled Trial of Articles Published in APS [American Physiological Society] Journals," *The Physiologist*, 53 (6), December 2010.

http://www.the-aps.org/publications/tphys/2010html/December/open_access.htm

Also see Yassine Gargouri et al., "Self-Selected or Mandated, Open Access Increases Citation Impact for Higher Quality Research," *PLoS ONE* [Public Library of Science], October 18, 2010.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0013636>

7. See Harnad's use of this analogy in this March 2007 discussion thread from the American Scientist Open Access Forum.

<http://users.ecs.soton.ac.uk/harnad/Hypermail/Amsci/6199.html>

8. Tim O'Reilly, "Piracy is Progressive Taxation, and Other Thoughts on the Evolution of Online Distribution," *O'Reilly P2P*, December 11, 2002.

<http://openp2p.com/lpt/a/3015>

9. Budapest Open Access Initiative, February 14, 2002.

<http://www.soros.org/openaccess/read.shtml>

10. This section borrows from two of my previous publications:

"Open Access Overview."

http://dash.harvard.edu/bitstream/handle/1/4729737/suber_oaoverview.htm?sequence=1

"A field guide to misunderstandings about open access," *SPARC Open Access Newsletter*, April 2, 2009.

http://dash.harvard.edu/bitstream/handle/1/4322571/suber_fieldguide.html?sequence=1

11. This section borrows from two of my previous publications:

"Open access and quality," *SPARC Open Access Newsletter*, October 2, 2006.

http://dash.harvard.edu/bitstream/handle/1/4552042/suber_oaquality.htm?sequence=1

"Balancing author and publisher rights," *SPARC Open Access Newsletter*, June 2, 2007.

http://dash.harvard.edu/bitstream/handle/1/4391158/suber_balancing.htm?sequence=1

12. In a December 2010 speech, Neelie Kroes, Vice-President of the European Commission for the Digital Agenda, remarked that "the beauty of open access is that it is not against anybody. It is for the free movement of knowledge."

<http://europa.eu/rapid/pressReleasesAction.do?reference=SPEECH/10/716&format=HTML&aged=0&language=EN&guiLanguage=en>

Chapter 2

1. This section borrows from several of my previous publications:

"Removing the Barriers to Research: An Introduction to Open Access for Librarians," *College & Research Libraries News*, 64 (February 2003), pp. 92–94, 113.

http://dash.harvard.edu/bitstream/handle/1/3715477/suber_crln.html?sequence=5

“The scaling argument,” *SPARC Open Access Newsletter*, March 2, 2004.

http://dash.harvard.edu/bitstream/handle/1/4723859/suber_scaling.htm?sequence=1

“Problems and opportunities (blizzards and beauty),” *SPARC Open Access Newsletter*, July 2, 2007.

http://dash.harvard.edu/bitstream/handle/1/4727450/suber_problem_sopps.htm?sequence=1

“A bill to overturn the NIH policy,” *SPARC Open Access Newsletter*, October 2, 2008.

http://dash.harvard.edu/bitstream/handle/1/4322592/suber_nihbill.html?sequence=1

2. For the two decades, from the mid-1980s to the mid-2000s, the price of toll-access journals rose more than 2.5 times faster than inflation. Association for Research Libraries, *Monograph and Serial Expenditures in ARL Libraries, 1986–2004*.

<http://www.arl.org/bm~doc/monser04.pdf>

In June 2010, Mark Bauerlein and four co-authors reported that “[f]rom 1978 to 2001, libraries at the University of California at Los Angeles . . . saw their subscription costs alone climb by 1,300 percent.”

<http://chronicle.com/article/We-Must-Stop-the-Avalanche-of/65890>

Between 1986 and 1999, “serial costs increased at 9% a year [while] library materials budgets increased at only 6.7% a year.” During the same period, the unit price of journals increased by 207%, while the cost of health care increased by only 107%. See the Scholarly Communication FAQ from the University of California’s Office of Systemwide Library Planning, February 29, 2003.

<http://www.ucop.edu/copyright/2003-02-27/faq.html>

For prices of individual journals, see MIT’s Expensive Journals List: Current MIT subscriptions costing more than \$5,000/year (last updated 7/16/09).

<http://web.archive.org/web/20101030035020/http://libraries.mit.edu/about/scholarly/expensive-titles.html>

For the latest survey of journal prices and the average prices by field, see Stephen Bosch, Kittie Henderson, & Heather Klusendorf, “Periodicals Price Survey 2011: Under Pressure, Times Are Changing,” *Library Journal*, April 14, 2011. It shows journal prices continuing to rise faster than inflation, and library serials budgets actually declining, not merely growing more slowly than inflation.

http://www.libraryjournal.com/lj/home/890009-264/periodicals_price_survey_2011_under.html.csp

3. Directory of Open Access Journals.

<http://www.doaj.org>

Most observers estimate that there are about 25,000 peer-reviewed journals in all fields and languages, making the OA portion about 26 percent of the total. There's some evidence that the average OA journal publishes fewer articles/year than the average toll-access journal, making the OA portion (by articles rather than journals) even smaller than 26 percent. If we supplement the number of peer-reviewed articles published by OA journals with the number of peer-reviewed OA articles published by toll-access journals but disseminated with permission by OA repositories, the portion goes up again.

4. "Overcoming Barriers: Access to Research Information Content," Research Information Network, December 2009.

<http://www.rin.ac.uk/our-work/using-and-accessing-information-resources/overcoming-barriers-access-research-information>

5. See Robin Peek, "Harvard Faculty Mandates OA," *Information Today*, April 1, 2008.

<http://www.allbusiness.com/legal/contracts-law/licensing-agreements/8957081-1.html>

Here's the full quotation from Stuart Shieber: "At Harvard, serials duplication has been all but eliminated and serious cancellation efforts have been initiated. Monograph collecting has been substantially affected as well. In total, our faculty have seen qualitative reductions in access to the literature."

http://dash.harvard.edu/bitstream/handle/1/4322590/suber_oamarkets.html?sequence=1

The Harvard University library is the largest academic library in the world and has the largest annual budget. But see "Libraries on the Edge," *Harvard Magazine*, Jan–Feb 2010: "[B]udgetary pressures that have been building during the past decade, and intensified in the past year, threaten the ability of the world's largest private library to collect works as broadly as it has in the past. . . ." Library Directory Robert Darnton said acquisitions fell "precipitously" the previous year and described the situation as "a crisis."

<http://harvardmagazine.com/2010/01/harvard-libraries-under-pressure>

6. The numbers I quote are based on personal communications with librarians. Unfortunately it's hard to get data on subscriptions to peer-reviewed journals alone rather than subscriptions to the larger category of serials.

7. As a result of bundling, the number of titles to which academic libraries in North America subscribed rose by 42 percent in the from the mid-1980s to

the mid-2000s, but library expenditures for those titles rose by 273 percent or nearly four times faster than inflation. Association for Research Libraries, *Monograph and Serial Expenditures in ARL Libraries, 1986–2004*.

<http://www.arl.org/bm~doc/monser04.pdf>

Also see Kittie S. Henderson and Stephen Bosch, “Seeking the New Normal: Periodicals Price Survey 2010,” *Library Journal*, April 15, 2010: “Libraries are aware . . . that the top journals in a bundle continue to generate the majority of use while the low-use journals still account for a large portion of the cost.”

<http://www.libraryjournal.com/article/CA6725256.html>

In November 2010, the Research Libraries UK announced that “it would not support future journal big deals unless they showed real price reductions.”

<http://www.rluk.ac.uk/content/rluk-calls-journal-pricing-restraint>

8. See Elsevier’s financial summary for 2010. On revenues of £2,026 million (about \$3,290 million), it earned profits of £724 million (about \$1,180 million), or 36 percent.

http://reports.reedelsevier.com/ar10/business_review/financial_summary.htm

In 2010, ExxonMobil earned revenues of \$383,221 million and profits of \$107,827 million, or 28.1 percent.

<http://moneycentral.msn.com/investor/invsub/results/statemnt.aspx?symbol=us%3AXOM>

Journal publishing is more profitable at Elsevier than entertainment is at Disney (17.7 percent).

<http://moneycentral.msn.com/investor/invsub/results/statemnt.aspx?symbol=DIS>

9. See the Big Deal Contract Project from Ted Bergstrom, Paul Courant, and Preston McAfee.

<http://www.econ.ucsb.edu/~tedb/Journals/BundleContracts.html>

For details on Elsevier’s attempt to block the release of its big-deal contract with Washington State, see the June 2009 press release from the Association Research Libraries (ARL).

<http://www.arl.org/news/pr/elsevier-wsu-23jun09.shtml>

10. See James McPherson, “A Crisis in Scholarly Publishing,” *Perspectives*, October 2003. Also see Association for Research Libraries, *Monograph and Serial Expenditures in ARL Libraries, 1986–2004*.

<http://www.arl.org/bm~doc/monser04.pdf>

The number of books purchased by the ARL libraries from the mid-1980s to the mid-2000s dropped by nearly 10 percent, and the expenditure for books rose more slowly than the inflation rate.

11. For more on the permissions crisis, see my article “Removing the Barriers to Research: An Introduction to Open Access for Librarians,” *College & Research Libraries News*, 64 (February 2003), pp. 92–94, 113.

http://dash.harvard.edu/bitstream/handle/1/3715477/suber_crln.html?sequence=5

12. In March 2011, the International Association of Scientific, Technical & Medical Publishers estimated that 96 percent of journals in the STM fields had online editions. Of course, most were toll access.

http://www.stm-assoc.org/2011_04_19_STM_statement_on_licensing_and_authors_rights.pdf

13. In 2008, the Research Information Network calculated that researchers worldwide donate to journal publishers £1.9 billion/year (about \$3 billion/year) in time spent on performing peer review.

<http://www.timeshighereducation.co.uk/story.asp?sectioncode=26&storycode=402189>

14. For more on publisher objections that OA initiatives interfere with the market, see “Will open access undermine peer review?” *SPARC Open Access Newsletter*, September 2, 2007.

http://dash.harvard.edu/bitstream/handle/1/4322578/suber_peer.html?sequence=1

“Open access, markets, and missions,” *SPARC Open Access Newsletter*, March 2, 2010.

http://dash.harvard.edu/bitstream/handle/1/4322590/suber_oamarkets.html?sequence=1

15. Theodore and Carl Bergstrom have shown that toll-access journal prices are either unrelated to quality or inversely related to it. Their analysis shows that “libraries typically must pay 4 to 6 times as much per page for journals owned by commercial publishers as for journals owned by non-profit societies. These differences in price do not reflect differences in the quality of the journals. In fact the commercial journals are on average less cited than the non-profits and the average cost per citation of commercial journals ranges from 5 to 15 times as high as that of their non-profit counterparts.” See Theodore and Carl Bergstrom, “Can ‘author pays’ journals compete with ‘reader pays’?” *Nature*, May 20, 2004.

<http://www.nature.com/nature/focus/accessdebate/22.html>

Theodore Bergstrom and Preston McAfee maintain the Journal Cost Effectiveness calculator, which computes the cost per article and cost per citation for a given journal.

<http://www.journalprices.com>

For a summary of their data, showing that for-profit publishers charge more per article and per citation, see their statistical summary from April 2011.

<http://www.mcafee.cc/Journal/Summary.pdf>

<http://www.mcafee.cc/Journal/explanation2010.html>

On quality, in 2005 Sally Morris summarized the studies to date: "All the evidence shows that non-profit journals are on average both less expensive and of higher quality. . . ." See Sally Morris, "The true costs of scholarly journal publishing," *Learned Publishing* 18 (2, April 2005), 115–126.

<http://www.ingentaeselect.com/rpsv/cgi-bin/cgi?ini=xref&body=linker&reqdoi=10.1087/0953151053584975>

16. See Roger Clarke, "The cost profiles of alternative approaches to journal publishing," *First Monday*, December 3, 2007.

<http://firstmonday.org/htbin/cgiwrap/bin/ojs/index.php/fm/article/view/2048>

17. See the Credit Suisse First Boston financial analysis of the STM journal industry, April 6, 2004. This report is not online, but I summarized it in the *SPARC Open Access Newsletter* for May 3, 2004.

http://dash.harvard.edu/bitstream/handle/1/3997172/suber_news73.html?sequence=2

Toll-access publishers don't dispute this, but they claim that the same economics apply to fee-based OA journals. For five reasons why they don't, see my article, "Open access and quality," *SPARC Open Access Newsletter*, October 2, 2006.

http://dash.harvard.edu/bitstream/handle/1/4552042/suber_oaquality.htm?sequence=1

18. Jan Velterop, "Institutional Journal Costs in an Open Access Environment," *LibLicense*, April 26, 2006.

<http://www.library.yale.edu/~llicense/ListArchives/0604/msg00117.html>

On the on the moral hazard, see Stuart Shieber's article-length blog posts from March 1, 2011, and July 31, 2010.

<http://blogs.law.harvard.edu/pamphlet/2011/03/01/institutional-memberships-for-open-access-publishers-considered-harmful>
<http://blogs.law.harvard.edu/pamphlet/2010/07/31/will-open-access-publication-fees-grow-out-of-control>

19. While all OA initiatives help researchers, only some help libraries by reducing prices or enabling cancellations. For more, see “Helping scholars and helping libraries,” *SPARC Open Access Newsletter*, April 2, 2005.

http://dash.harvard.edu/bitstream/handle/1/4552051/suber_helping.htm?sequence=1

20. I first used the Croesus example in an interview with Richard Poynder, “Suber: Leader of a Leaderless Revolution,” *Information Today*, July 1, 2011.

<http://www.infotoday.com/it/jul11/Suber-Leader-of-a-Leaderless-Revolution.shtml>

Also see “The scaling argument,” *SPARC Open Access Newsletter*, March 2, 2004.

http://dash.harvard.edu/bitstream/handle/1/4723859/suber_scaling.htm?sequence=1

21. Crispin Davis, “Science books are vanishing from reach,” *The Guardian*, February 19, 2005.

<http://education.guardian.co.uk/higher/research/story/0,9865,1418097,00.html>

The charitable reading of Davis’s argument is that he believes the serials crisis is a library budget problem, not a journal pricing problem. This position overlooks that (1) not even the University of Croesus can keep pace with the growing volume of the literature, and (2) no real library anywhere, not even Harvard, has kept pace with decades of hyperinflationary price increases.

22. Lawrence H. Pitts, Chair of University of California Academic Senate, an open letter to the University of California faculty, January 7, 2004.

http://libraries.universityofcalifornia.edu/news/facmemoscholcomm_010704.pdf

23. This section borrows from several of my previous publications:

“The scaling argument,” *SPARC Open Access Newsletter*, March 2, 2004.

http://dash.harvard.edu/bitstream/handle/1/4723859/suber_scaling.htm?sequence=1

“Problems and opportunities (blizzards and beauty),” *SPARC Open Access Newsletter*, July 2, 2007.

http://dash.harvard.edu/bitstream/handle/1/4727450/suber_problem_sopps.htm?sequence=1

“Open access and the last-mile problem for knowledge,” *SPARC Open Access Newsletter*, July 2, 2008.

http://dash.harvard.edu/bitstream/handle/1/4322587/suber_lastmile.html?sequence=1

“Open access, markets, and missions,” *SPARC Open Access Newsletter*, March 2, 2010.

http://dash.harvard.edu/bitstream/handle/1/4322590/suber_omar_kets.html?sequence=1

24. See H. A. Washington, ed., *The Writings of Thomas Jefferson*, printed by the United States Congress, 1853–54, vol. VI, 180.

25. At the launch of *PLoS Medicine* in May 2004, Nobel laureate and PLoS co-founder Harold Varmus said, “Thanks to the Internet and new strategies for financing publication costs, it is now possible to share the results of medical research with anyone, anywhere, who could benefit from it. How could we not do it?”

<http://www.library.yale.edu/~llicense/ListArchives/0405/msg00038.html>

Chapter 3

1. This section borrows from several of my previous publications:

“Open Access Overview.”

http://dash.harvard.edu/bitstream/handle/1/4729737/suber_oaoverview.htm?sequence=1

“Thinking about prestige, quality, and open access,” *SPARC Open Access Newsletter*, September 2, 2008.

http://dash.harvard.edu/bitstream/handle/1/4322577/suber_oaquality.html?sequence=1

“A field guide to misunderstandings about open access,” *SPARC Open Access Newsletter*, April 2, 2009.

http://dash.harvard.edu/bitstream/handle/1/4322571/suber_fieldguide.html?sequence=1

2. See Marie E. McVeigh, “Open Access Journals in the ISI Citation Databases: Analysis of Impact Factors and Citation Patterns Thomson Scientific,” Thomson Scientific, October 2004.

<http://science.thomsonreuters.com/m/pdfs/openaccesscitations2.pdf>

3. The first peer-reviewed OA journals were launched in the 1980s. See the list of “Early OA journals” at the Open Access Directory.

http://oad.simmons.edu/oadwiki/Early_OA_journals

While some OA journals are now fairly old, the average age of OA journals is far lower than the average age of toll-access journals. On the disadvantages

that arise from being new, see my article “Thinking about prestige, quality, and open access,” *SPARC Open Access Newsletter*, September 2, 2008.

http://dash.harvard.edu/bitstream/handle/1/4322577/suber_oaquality.html?sequence=1

4. For current data on how many toll-access publishers and journals give blanket permission for green OA, see the SHERPA statistics page.

<http://www.sherpa.ac.uk/romeo/statistics.php>

For toll-access journal and publisher policies on green OA, see SHERPA’s Rights METadata for Open archiving database (RoMEO).

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

For evidence that toll-access publishers permitting green OA approach 100 percent when authors are subject to green OA mandates, see the Open Access Directory list of publisher policies on NIH-funded authors.

http://oad.simmons.edu/oadwiki/Publisher_policies_on_NIH-funded_authors

<http://www.arl.org/sparc/media/blog/publishers-accommodate-nih-funded-authors.shtml>

5. See the Open Archives Initiative.

<http://www.openarchives.org>

Also see my article, “The case for OAI in the age of Google,” *SPARC Open Access Newsletter*, May 3, 2004.

6. For institutional repositories, see the Registry of Open Access Repositories (ROAR) and the Directory of Open Access Repositories (OpenDOAR).

<http://roar.eprints.org>

<http://www.andoar.org>

For disciplinary repositories organized by field, see the wiki-based list at the Open Access Directory.

http://oad.simmons.edu/oadwiki/Disciplinary_repositories

7. See arXiv.

<http://arxiv.org>

See PubMed Central.

<http://www.pubmedcentral.gov>

8. See the data collected by Arthur Sale in a series of publications from 2005 and 2006.

<http://fcms.its.utas.edu.au/scieng/comp/project.asp?ProjectId=1830>

9. See Muluken Wubayehu Alemayehu, “Researchers’ attitude to using institutional repositories: A case study of the Oslo University Institutional Repository,” Master’s thesis at Oslo University College, 2010. Surveyed authors had “a low level awareness of the Institutional repository” at the same time as “a positive attitude towards providing free access to scholarly research results. . .”

<https://oda.hio.no/jspui/handle/10642/426>

Also see a SURFShare survey of Dutch faculty from the Fall of 2010. “Almost 90% of the lectors [“associate professors who carry out research and organise knowledge networks”] at Dutch universities of applied sciences are in favor of making their research results freely available. . . . They also say they need to know just what Open Access publication actually involves.”

http://www.openaccess.nl/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=232:majority-of-lectors-favour-open-access-publication&catid=1:news-archive

For a thorough review of the literature up to 2009, showing low levels of author opposition and high levels of unfamiliarity, see Jenny Fry et al., “PEER Behavioural Research: Authors and Users vis-à-vis Journals and Repositories: Baseline report,” PEER Project, September 2009, especially pp. 15–17.

http://www.peerproject.eu/fileadmin/media/reports/Final_revision_-_behavioural_baseline_report_-_20_01_10.pdf

10. This section borrows from two of my previous publications: “Eleventh hour for SCOAP3,” *SPARC Open Access Newsletter*, December 2, 2010.

http://dash.harvard.edu/bitstream/handle/1/4736587/suber_scoop3.htm?sequence=1

My answers to Richard Poynder’s interview questions in “The Basement Interviews: Peter Suber,” October 19, 2007.

<http://poynder.blogspot.com/2007/10/basement-interviews-peter-suber.html>

11. I discuss this kind of decoupling in “Eleventh hour for SCOAP3,” *SPARC Open Access Newsletter*, December 2, 2010.

http://dash.harvard.edu/bitstream/handle/1/4736587/suber_scoop3.htm?sequence=1

12. This section borrows from several of my previous publications: “Open Access Overview”

http://dash.harvard.edu/bitstream/handle/1/4729737/suber_oaoverview.htm?sequence=1

My answers to Richard Poynder's interview questions in "The Basement Interviews: Peter Suber," October 19, 2007.

<http://poynder.blogspot.com/2007/10/basement-interviews-peter-suber.html>

"Gratis and libre open access," *SPARC Open Access Newsletter*, August 2, 2008.

http://dash.harvard.edu/bitstream/handle/1/4322580/suber_oagratism.html?sequence=1

"Open access policy options for funding agencies and universities," *SPARC Open Access Newsletter*, February 2, 2009.

http://dash.harvard.edu/bitstream/handle/1/4322589/suber_oaoptions.html?sequence=1

"Ten challenges for open-access journals," *SPARC Open Access Newsletter*, October 2, 2009.

http://dash.harvard.edu/bitstream/handle/1/4316131/suber_10challenges.html?sequence=2

13. For the fair use section of the U.S. copyright statute, see 17 USC 107. The statute makes the boundary between fair and unfair use slightly less fuzzy by listing four factors for determining whether a use is fair. But all four factors have their own fuzz, and it's very hard to know how they will be weighed in a given case without going to court.

<http://www.copyright.gov/title17>

14. For the distinction in the world of software, see the Wikipedia article "Gratis versus libre."

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Gratis_versus_Libre

15. For detail on how these two distinctions intersect, see the table I posted to *Open Access News*, August 2, 2008.

<http://www.earlham.edu/~peters/fos/2008/08/greengold-oa-and-gratislibre-oa.html>

16. See Creative Commons.

<http://creativecommons.org>

17. The public domain is one way to solve the permission problem for OA. But if public-domain works are not yet digital and online, they are not yet OA. This is a nontrivial gap, and around the world institutions and governments are devoting enormous amounts of money and energy to digitizing works in the public domain in order to put them online and make them OA.

18. Open Access Scholarly Publishers Association (OASPA).

<http://www.oaspa.org>

SPARC Europe Seal of Approval program for OA journals.

<https://mx2.arl.org/Lists/SPARC-OAForum/Message/4329.html>

<http://www.doaj.org/doaj?func=loadTempl&templ=faq#seal>

19. For details on the long, difficult struggle to enact and strengthen the gratis OA policy at the NIH, see my eighteen articles on the process from 2004 to 2009.

<https://mx2.arl.org/Lists/SPARC-OAForum/Message/5637.html>

For university OA policies adopted by unanimous faculty votes, see the list of unanimous faculty votes at the Open Access Directory.

http://oad.simmons.edu/oadwiki/Unanimous_faculty_votes

20. As of May 12, 2011: 1,370 out of 6,497 journals in the DOAJ, or 21.1 percent, use some kind of CC license.

<http://www.doaj.org/?func=licensedJournals>

As of the same date, 723 (11.1 percent) have the SPARC Europe Seal of Approval (requiring CC-BY).

<http://www.doaj.org/?func=sealedJournals>

The DOAJ doesn't actually count journals with CC-BY licenses. It counts journals with the SPARC Europe Seal, which requires CC-BY licenses. But the seal also requires journals to share metadata in a certain way. Hence, it's possible for many journals to use CC-BY and fail to earn the seal because they don't share their metadata appropriately. In that case the SPARC Seal tally would undercount the journals using CC-BY. But in fact, many more DOAJ journals share their metadata than use CC-BY, making the seal tally a good approximation to a CC-BY tally. Thanks to Lars Björnshauge for the latter detail.

21. See "Clipping Our Own Wings Copyright and Creativity in Communication Research," a report from the Ad Hoc Committee on Fair Use and Academic Freedom, International Communication Association, March 2010. A survey of scholars in the field of communications found that a third avoided topics raising copyright issues, a fifth faced publisher resistance to scholarly use of copyrighted work, and a fifth abandoned research in progress because of copyright problems. Many are told to obtain permission to discuss or criticize copyrighted works.

<http://www.centerforsocialmedia.org/fair-use/related-materials/documents/clipping-our-own-wings-copyright-and-creativity-communication-r>

Chapter 4

1. This section borrows from several of my previous publications:
“Open access policy options for funding agencies and universities,” *SPARC Open Access Newsletter*, February 2, 2009.
http://dash.harvard.edu/bitstream/handle/1/4322589/suber_oaoptions.html?sequence=1
“Three principles for university open access policies,” *SPARC Open Access Newsletter*, April 2, 2008.
http://dash.harvard.edu/bitstream/handle/1/4317659/suber_3principles.html?sequence=2
“The Primacy of Authors in Achieving Open Access,” *Nature*, June 10, 2004.
<http://www.nature.com/nature/focus/accessdebate/24.html>
“Open access to electronic theses and dissertations (ETDs),” *SPARC Open Access Newsletter*, July 2, 2006.
http://dash.harvard.edu/bitstream/handle/1/4727443/suber_theses.htm?sequence=1
2. The best list of funder and university OA policies is Registry of Open Access Repository Material Archiving Policies (ROARMAP).
<http://roarmap.eprints.org>
For case studies of OA policies at universities, see the “oa.case.policies.universities” tag library at the Open Access Tracking Project.
<http://www.connotea.org/tag/oa.case.policies.universities>
For case studies of OA policies at funding agencies, see the “oa.case.policies.funders” tag library.
<http://www.connotea.org/tag/oa.case.policies.funders>
3. Universities with request or encouragement policies include Germany’s University of Bielefeld (June 2005), Canada’s University of Athabasca (November 2006), Carnegie Mellon University (November 2007), Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences (February 2008), University of Oregon (February 2008), University of Washington (April 2009), University of Utrecht (April 2009), Finland’s University of Tampere (August 2009), University of Virginia (September 2009), the librarians and archivists at York University (October 2009), Italy’s University of Sassari (January 2010), San Jose State University (April 2010), the librarians and archivists at Queen’s University (April 2010), the librarians at Arizona State University (October 2010), and Emory University (March 2011).
4. See Alma Swan’s chart of new green OA mandates from 2002 to 2010.

http://www.openscholarship.org/jcms/c_6226/open-access-policies-for-universities-and-research-institutions?hlText=policies

Also see the smaller chart on the front page of ROARMAP, automatically updated as new policies are registered with ROARMAP.

<http://roarmap.eprints.org>

On the principle that university policies must respect faculty freedom to submit their work to the journals of their choice, see “Three principles for university open access policies,” *SPARC Open Access Newsletter*, April 2, 2008.

http://dash.harvard.edu/bitstream/handle/1/4317659/suber_3principles.html?sequence=2

For the same reason that a gold OA mandate would be bad policy today, it's a bad idea to propose a green OA mandate to a population unclear on the green/gold distinction and likely to construe the proposal as a gold OA mandate. See “Lessons from Maryland,” *SPARC Open Access Newsletter*, June 2, 2009.

http://dash.harvard.edu/bitstream/handle/1/4322585/suber_maryland.html?sequence=1

5. Universities with loophole mandates include the University of Zurich (July 2005), Macquarie University (August 2008), University College London (October 2008), University of Westminster (July 2009), Edith Cowan University (September 2009), University of Strathclyde (October 2009), Dublin Institute of Technology (December 2009), Brunel University (January 2010), University of Ghent (January 2010), Concordia University (April 2010), Karlsruhe Institut für Technologie (May 2010), V.N. Karazin Kharkiv National University (August 2010), College of Mount Saint Vincent (October 2010), Malmö University (December 2010).

6. The deposit mandate was pioneered by Southampton University's Department of Electronics and Computer Science, February 5, 2003. It was the first university OA mandate anywhere.

<http://roarmap.eprints.org/1>

Southampton later adopted a university-wide version of the same type of policy on April 4, 2008.

<http://roarmap.eprints.org/8>

Stevan Harnad, who favors this model, calls it “immediate deposit / optional access” (IDOA).

<http://openaccess.eprints.org/index.php?/archives/71-guid.html>

Universities with Southampton-style deposit mandates include Queensland University of Technology (initially September 2003 and strengthened since), University of Minho (initially December 2004 and strengthened since), Uni-

versity of Liège (initially March 2007 and strengthened since), University of Pretoria (May 2009), University of Northern Colorado Libraries (December 2009), University of Salford (January 2010), and University of Hong Kong (April 2010).

7. The Harvard Faculty of Arts and Sciences adopted this policy by a unanimous vote in February 2008.

<http://osc.hul.harvard.edu/hfaspolicy>

http://dash.harvard.edu/bitstream/handle/1/4322574/suber_harvard.html?sequence=1

Today, seven of Harvard's nine schools operate under similar policies.

<http://osc.hul.harvard.edu>

Universities with rights-retention mandates along the lines of the Harvard Faculty of Arts and Sciences include Harvard University Law School (May 2008), Stanford University School of Education (June 2008), Harvard University Kennedy School of Government (March 2009), Massachusetts Institute of Technology (March 2009), University of Kansas (April 2009), University of Oregon Library Faculty (May 2009), University of Oregon Department of Romance Languages (May 2009), Harvard University Graduate School of Education (June 2009), Trinity University (October 2009), Oberlin College (November 2009), Wake Forest University Library Faculty (February 2010), Harvard University Business School (February 2010), Duke University (March 2010), University of Puerto Rico Law School (March 2010), Harvard University Divinity School (November 2010), the University of Hawaii-Manoa (December 2010), Strathmore University (February 2011), and the Harvard University Graduate School of Design (April 2011).

Also see Simon Frankel and Shannon Nestor, "How Faculty Authors Can Implement an Open Access Policy at Their Institutions," Covington and Burling, August 2010. In a legal analysis commissioned by SPARC and Science Commons, attorneys Frankel and Nestor recommended the rights-retention model used by Harvard and MIT for advancing OA and avoiding copyright pitfalls.

<http://sciencecommons.org/wp-content/uploads/Opening-the-Door.pdf>

8. The EPrints repository software from Southampton University introduced the email-request button in April 2006. Later the same week, a developer at Minho University released code for adding the feature to DSpace repositories.

http://www.eprints.org/news/features/request_button.php

<https://mx2.arl.org/Lists/SPARC-OAForum/Message/2931.html>

9. The Wellcome Trust OA mandate took effect on October 1, 2005.
<http://www.wellcome.ac.uk/About-us/Policy/Spotlight-issues/Open-access/Policy/index.htm>
- Also see my article on the policy, "The Wellcome Trust OA mandate takes effect," *SPARC Open Access Newsletter*, October 2, 2005.
http://dash.harvard.edu/bitstream/handle/1/4723858/suber_welcometrust.htm?sequence=1
- The NIH policy took effect as an encouragement policy on May 2, 2005, and as a mandate on April 7, 2008.
<http://publicaccess.nih.gov>
- Also see my eighteen articles on the NIH policy.
<https://mx2.arl.org/Lists/SPARC-OAForum/Message/5637.html>
- Among other funding agencies with no-waiver rights-retention policies are the Arthritis Research Campaign, Cancer Research UK, the UK Department of Health, the Howard Hughes Medical Institute, the UK Medical Research Council, and the Swedish Research Council.
- In a major report on the state of OA in the United Kingdom, the Centre for Research Communications recommended that that UK funders "to take a robust attitude to copyright and reserve copyright for OA archiving prior to any downstream agreement with publishers." See "Research Communication Strategy Quarterly Report," July 2010.
http://ie-repository.jisc.ac.uk/488/2/RCS_quarterly_report_July_2010_anonymised.pdf
10. On publisher accommodation of the NIH policy, see the Open Access Directory list of publisher policies on NIH-funded authors.
http://oad.simmons.edu/oadwiki/Publisher_policies_on_NIH-funded_authors
<http://www.arl.org/sparc/media/blog/publishers-accommodate-nih-funded-authors.shtml>
11. "Open access policy options for funding agencies and universities," *SPARC Open Access Newsletter*, February 2, 2009.
http://dash.harvard.edu/bitstream/handle/1/4322589/suber_oaoptions.html?sequence=1
12. For my arguments in support of OA mandates for theses and dissertations, see "Open access to electronic theses and dissertations (ETDs)," *SPARC Open Access Newsletter*, July 2, 2006.
http://dash.harvard.edu/bitstream/handle/1/4727443/suber_theses.htm?sequence=1

For a list of ETD mandates, see ROARMAP.

<http://roarmap.eprints.org>

The first universities in the world to limit the review of journal articles for promotion and tenure to those on deposit in the institutional review were Napier University (now called Edinburgh Napier University) and the University of Liège, both in 2008. They've since been followed, among others, by China's National Science Library, the University of Oregon Department of Romance Languages, India's International Center for Tropical Agriculture, and Canada's Institute for Research in Construction.

13. This section borrows from several of my previous publications:

"Open access to electronic theses and dissertations (ETDs)," *SPARC Open Access Newsletter*, July 2, 2006.

http://dash.harvard.edu/bitstream/handle/1/4727443/suber_theses.htm?sequence=1

My comments on the word "mandate" in dialog with Jan Velterop, March 4, 2007.

<http://theparachute.blogspot.com/2007/03/mandate-debate.html#9025093357099085662>

"A field guide to misunderstandings about open access," *SPARC Open Access Newsletter*, April 2, 2009.

http://dash.harvard.edu/bitstream/handle/1/4322571/suber_fieldguide.html?sequence=1

14. See Stuart Shieber on the word "mandate."

<http://blogs.law.harvard.edu/pamphlet/2009/06/30/university-open-access-policies-as-mandates>

15. Note that many funding agencies deliberately avoid the word "contract" for their funding agreements and prefer to consider them awards or gifts.

16. See Alma Swan and Sheridan Brown, "Authors and open access publishing," *Learned Publishing* 17 (3) 2004, pp. 219–224; and Swan and Brown, "Open access self-archiving: An author study," Departmental Technical Report, 2005.

<http://eprints.ecs.soton.ac.uk/11003>

<http://cogprints.org/4385>

Also see the summary of Swan and Brown's data at Enabling Open Scholarship.

http://www.openscholarship.org/jcms/c_6194/researchers-attitudes-towards-mandatory-open-access-policies

For more recent studies, showing even higher levels of support, see Kumiko Vézina (2008, 83 percent willingness) and Graham Stone (2010, 86 percent willingness).

<http://eprints.rclis.org/handle/10760/12731>
<http://eprints.hud.ac.uk/9257>

17. See my article “Unanimous faculty votes,” *SPARC Open Access Newsletter*, June 2, 2010.

http://dash.harvard.edu/bitstream/handle/1/4723857/suber_votes.htm?sequence=1

After my article appeared, I moved the list of unanimous faculty votes to the Open Access Directory, a wiki, where it has since been enlarged by the community.

http://oad.simmons.edu/oadwiki/Unanimous_faculty_votes

Note that many but not all the policies adopted by unanimous faculty votes are mandates.

18. This section borrows from several of my previous publications:

“The open access mandate at Harvard,” *SPARC Open Access Newsletter*, March 2, 2008.

http://dash.harvard.edu/bitstream/handle/1/4322574/suber_harvard.html?sequence=1

“Three principles for university open access policies,” *SPARC Open Access Newsletter*, April 2, 2008.

http://dash.harvard.edu/bitstream/handle/1/4317659/suber_3principles.html?sequence=2

“Open access policy options for funding agencies and universities,” *SPARC Open Access Newsletter*, February 2, 2009.

http://dash.harvard.edu/bitstream/handle/1/4322589/suber_oaoptions.html?sequence=1

“Open access in 2010,” *SPARC Open Access Newsletter*, January 2, 2011.

http://dash.harvard.edu/bitstream/handle/1/4736588/suber_oa2010.htm?sequence=1

19. This is why strong OA policies at large institutions are so important. The NIH is the largest funder of nonclassified research in the world. Publishers cannot afford to refuse to publish NIH-funded authors, and as a result publisher accommodation of the NIH’s OA mandate is 100 percent.

http://oad.simmons.edu/oadwiki/Publisher_policies_on_NIH-funded_authors

20. UK PubMed Central (UKPMC) reported that the percentage of annual deposits that are libre OA, and not merely gratis OA, rose from 7 percent in 2001 to 33 percent in 2009.

<http://ukpmc.blogspot.com/2011/04/increasing-amount-of-content-in-ukpmc.html>

In 2010 alone, seven green OA mandates required some degree of libre OA: those from the Library Faculty at Arizona State University, Australian National University, Harvard Business School, Harvard Divinity School, University of Sassari, Sweden's Royal Library, and the Washington State Board for Community and Technical Colleges (SBCTC) on behalf of thirty-four institutions. Whether we consider these to be seven policies (the number of enactments) or forty (the number of institutions covered), the number significantly surpasses the three libre green policies adopted in 2009.

http://dash.harvard.edu/bitstream/handle/1/4725027/suber_octmandates.htm?sequence=1

Going back farther, since 2007 the Wellcome Trust and UKPMC Funders Group have required green libre OA whenever they pay for publication and not just for the underlying research.

<http://www.wellcome.ac.uk/about-us/policy/spotlight-issues/Open-access/Guides/wtx041316.htm>

In 2009, the U.S. Institute of Medicine (IOM) convened a group of major public and private funding agencies, which called on funders of medical research to mandate green libre OA. The group includes the Gates Foundation, Burroughs Wellcome Fund, Merck Company Foundation, Rockefeller Foundation, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, U.S. Department of Homeland Security, and U.S. Department of State.

<http://www.earlham.edu/~peters/fos/2009/05/us-commitment-to-global-health-should.html>

In October 2010, a \$20 million funding program from the Gates Foundation, the Next Generation Learning Challenges, mandated libre OA for the results of funded projects.

<http://creativecommons.org/weblog/entry/23831>

In January 2011, the U.S. Department of Labor and Department of Education announced the Trade Adjustment Assistance Community College and Career Training (TAACCT), a four-year, \$2 billion funding program for open educational resources (OER) mandating libre OA under CC-BY licenses.

<http://www.whitehouse.gov/blog/2011/01/20/new-job-training-and-education-grants-program-launched>
http://dash.harvard.edu/bitstream/handle/1/4736319/suber_another_fed.htm?sequence=1

Libre green policies were recommended in the Berkman Center's Evaluation of Private Foundation Copyright Licensing Policies, Practices and Opportunities (August 2009) and in the Ghent Declaration (February 2011).

http://cyber.law.harvard.edu/sites/cyber.law.harvard.edu/files/OCL_for_Foundations_REPORT.pdf

http://www.openaire.eu/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=223:seizing-the-opportunity-for-open-access-to-european-research-ghent-declaration-published&catid=76:highlights&lang=en

Chapter 5

1. This section borrows from two of my previous publications:

“Open Access Overview”

http://dash.harvard.edu/bitstream/handle/1/4729737/suber_oaoverview.htm?sequence=1

“A field guide to misunderstandings about open access,” *SPARC Open Access Newsletter*, April 2, 2009.

http://dash.harvard.edu/bitstream/handle/1/4322571/suber_fieldguide.html?sequence=1

2. For some purposes we must distinguish two kinds of postprint: those that have been peer-reviewed but not copyedited and those that have been both peer-reviewed and copyedited. Some publishers allow authors to deposit the first kind but not the second in an OA repository.

3. This section borrows from my:

“Open access to electronic theses and dissertations (ETDs),” *SPARC Open Access Newsletter*, July 2, 2006.

http://dash.harvard.edu/bitstream/handle/1/4727443/suber_theses.htm?sequence=1

4. See Gail McMillan, “Do ETDs Deter Publishers? Does Web availability count as prior publication? A report on the 4th International Conference on Electronic Theses and Dissertations,” *College and Research Libraries News* 62 (6) (June 2001). “[T]he ready availability of ETDs on the Internet does not deter the vast majority of publishers from publishing articles derived from graduate research already available on the Internet.”

<http://scholar.lib.vt.edu/staff/gailmac/publications/pubrsETD2001.html>

The case is less certain for books. See Jennifer Howard, “The Road from Dissertation to Book Has a New Pothole: The Internet,” *Chronicle of Higher Education*, April 3, 2011, and the discussion it triggered on the LibLicense list.

<http://chronicle.com/article/The-Road-From-Dissertation-to/126977>
<http://www.library.yale.edu/~llicense/ListArchives/1104/msg00028.html>

5. This section borrows from several of my previous publications: “Promoting Open Access in the Humanities,” *Syllecta Classica*, 16 (2005) 231–246.

http://dash.harvard.edu/bitstream/handle/1/4729720/suber_promoting.htm?sequence=1

My answers to Richard Poynder’s interview questions in “The Basement Interviews: Peter Suber,” October 19, 2007.

<http://poynder.blogspot.com/2007/10/basement-interviews-peter-suber.html>

“Predictions for 2009,” *SPARC Open Access Newsletter*, December 2, 2008.

<http://www.earlham.edu/~peters/fos/newsletter/12-02-08.htm#predictions>

6. See the Open Access Directory list of publishers of OA books.

http://oad.simmons.edu/oadwiki/Publishers_of_OA_books

7. For a review of this and other business models for OA books, see Janneke Adema, “Overview of Open Access Models for eBooks in the Humanities and Social Sciences,” *Open Access Publishing in European Networks (OAPEN)*, March 2010.

<http://project.oapen.org/images/documents/openaccessmodels.pdf>

Also see the Open Access Directory list of OA book business models.

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

8. For some of the most careful empirical studies, see:

John Hilton III, “Freely ye have received, freely give’ (Matthew 10:8): how giving away religious digital books influences the print sales of those books,” Master’s thesis at Brigham Young University, 2010.

http://search.lib.byu.edu/byu/id:byu_unicorn4414980

John Hilton III, “Hard Numbers on Free Random House Books,” *Wide Open*, May 6, 2009.

<http://web.archive.org/web/20090510052632/http://www.johnhiltoniii.org/hard-numbers-on-free-random-house-books>

John Hilton III and David Wiley, “Free: Why Authors Are Giving Books Away on the Internet,” *Tech Trends* 54 (2), 2010.

<http://hdl.lib.byu.edu/1877/2154>
John Hilton III and David Wiley, "The Short-Term Influence of Free Digital Versions of Books on Print Sales," *Journal of Electronic Publishing* 13 (1), Winter 2010.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.3998/3336451.0013.101>
Brian O'Leary, "The impact of piracy," *Magellan Media*, June 8, 2009.
http://www.magellanmediapartners.com/index.php/mmpc/article/the_impact_of_piracy/

Oriental Institute Publications Office, "The Electronic Publications Initiative of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago," The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, April 6, 2009.

<http://oi.uchicago.edu/research/pubs/epi.html>
Springer Science+Business Media, "More than 29,000 titles now live in Google Book Search," press release, March 1, 2007.

<http://www.springer.com/librarians/e-content?SGWID=0-113-6-442110-0>
Tim O'Reilly, "Free Downloads vs. Sales: A Publishing Case Study," O'Reilly Radar, June 1, 2007.

<http://radar.oreilly.com/archives/2007/06/free-downloads.html>
"OAPEN-UK," an ongoing experiment from JISC, October 22, 2010.

<http://www.jisc-collections.ac.uk/News/OAPENUKITT>
Caren Milloy, "JISC national e-books observatory project: 2007–2010," Joint Information Systems Committee, 2010.

<http://www.jiscebooksproject.org/archives/211>
For a more comprehensive collection of studies and observations, see the "oa.books.sales" tag library from the Open Access Tracking Project.
<http://www.connotea.org/tag/oa.books.sales>

9. National Academies Press.

<http://www.nap.edu>
See Jensen's articles from 2001, 2005, and 2007.
<http://chronicle.com/article/Academic-Press-Gives-Away-Its/27430>
<http://chronicle.com/article/Presses-Have-Little-to-Fear/25775>
<http://dx.doi.org/10.3998/3336451.0010.206>

10. See the AAUP "Statement on Open Access," February 7, 2007.

<http://www.aaupnet.org/images/stories/documents/oastatement.pdf>
<http://www.earlham.edu/~peters/fos/2007/02/aaup-statement-on-open-access.html>

Also see its May 2011 Digital Book Publishing Survey.

<http://www.aaupnet.org/news-a-publications/news/421-aaup-digital-book-publishing-survey-report-released>

11. This section borrows from several of my previous publications: “Abridgment as added value,” *SPARC Open Access Newsletter*, November 2, 2009.
http://dash.harvard.edu/bitstream/handle/1/4317664/suber_abridgment.html?sequence=1
- “Promoting Open Access in the Humanities,” *Syllecta Classica*, 16 (2005) 231–246.
http://dash.harvard.edu/bitstream/handle/1/4729720/suber_promoting.htm?sequence=1
- “Discovery, rediscovery, and open access. Part 1,” *SPARC Open Access Newsletter*, August 2, 2010.
http://dash.harvard.edu/bitstream/handle/1/4455489/suber_discovery.htm?sequence=1
12. For more along these lines, see my article “Open access and the self-correction of knowledge,” *SPARC Open Access Newsletter*, June 2, 2008.
http://dash.harvard.edu/bitstream/handle/1/4391168/suber_selfcorrect.html?sequence=1
13. Ten months before a massive earthquake killed 70,000 people in China’s Sichuan Province (on May 12, 2008), an international team of scientists published a prediction of the quake with what *National Geographic* called “eerie” precision. However, *National Geographic* also notes that “there is little reason to believe Chinese officials were aware of the July 2007 study.” One of the prediction coauthors, Michael Ellis of the Center for Earthquake Research and Information at the University of Memphis, noted that the “information was effectively locked in an academic journal.”
<http://news.nationalgeographic.com/news/2008/05/080516-earthquake-predicted.html>
14. See my article “Knowledge as a public good,” *SPARC Open Access Newsletter*, November 2, 2009.
http://dash.harvard.edu/bitstream/handle/1/4391171/suber_public%20good.html?sequence=1
15. This section borrows from several of my previous publications: “The taxpayer argument for open access,” *SPARC Open Access Newsletter*, September 4, 2003.

http://dash.harvard.edu/bitstream/handle/1/4725013/suber_taxpayer.htm?sequence=1

“Follow-up on the Federal Research Public Access Act,” *SPARC Open Access Newsletter*, June 2, 2006.

http://dash.harvard.edu/bitstream/handle/1/3942944/suber_news98.html?sequence=2#frpaa

My answers to Richard Poynder’s interview questions in “The Basement Interviews: Peter Suber,” October 19, 2007.

<http://poynder.blogspot.com/2007/10/basement-interviews-peter-suber.html>

“A field guide to misunderstandings about open access,” *SPARC Open Access Newsletter*, April 2, 2009. See especially section 23.

http://dash.harvard.edu/bitstream/handle/1/4322571/suber_field_guide.html?sequence=1

16. When John Jarvis was the Managing Director of Wiley Europe, he testified before the UK Parliament’s House of Commons Select Committee on Science and Technology in March 2004. From his response to Question 19: “[T]here is some evidence that some of the support for open access is coming from outside the research community. . . . Without being pejorative or elitist, I think that is an issue that we should think about very, very carefully, because there are very few members of the public, and very few people in this room, who would want to read some of this scientific information, and in fact draw wrong conclusions from it. . . . I will say again; let us be careful because this rather enticing statement that everybody should be able to see everything could lead to chaos. Speak to people in the medical profession, and they will say the last thing they want are people who may have illnesses reading this information, marching into surgeries and asking things.”

<http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm200304/cmselect/cmsctech/uc399-i/uc39902.htm>

Larry Reynolds, editor in chief of the *Journal of Animal Science* argued in a March 2007 editorial that “because the public has no idea how to read, interpret, or put published science into context, immediate public access will lead to sensationalized use, or misuse, of science.”

http://www.asas.org/bulletin_article.asp?a=9&s=&r=3

In a May 2007 blog post, physician R. W. Donnell accused the *New England Journal of Medicine* of “tabloid based medicine” for providing OA to an editorial and peer-reviewed article on the drug Avandia. The problem seems to be that the two OA pieces triggered “millions of Google search queries for Avandia.”

<http://doctorrw.blogspot.com/2007/05/tabloid-based-medicine-trumps-evidence.html>

17. See Richard K. Johnson, "Will Research Sharing Keep Pace with the Internet?" *The Journal of Neuroscience* 26 (37) (September 13, 2006), pp. 9349–9351. "The large audience for freely accessible scientific knowledge may be surprising to many, but the hunger for it is apparent from experience of the National Library of Medicine (NLM). A few years ago, NLM transformed its fee-based index and abstracts of biomedical journal articles to free availability on the Web as PubMed. Use of the database increased 100-fold once it became freely available. The potential scope of this usage could never have been anticipated by looking solely at use of the controlled-access version. Who are these new readers? They surely include scientists around the globe at institutions that may not be able to afford needed journals. They also may be researchers in unexpected fields, search engine users who didn't realize previously they could use work in a seemingly unrelated field. They may be students, patients or their families, physicians, community health workers, or others from the general public: taxpayers who finance so much biomedical research."

<http://www.jneurosci.org/content/26/37/9349.full>

As early as 2004, Donald Lindberg, then-director of the National Library of Medicine, reported that the NLM's OA web site had more than one million visitors per day and "close to a billion a year. . . . A good, heavy part of that are consumers." Quoted in Gene Koprowski, "The Web: Patients heal themselves online," United Press International, August 14, 2004.

http://www.upi.com/Science_News/2004/08/04/The-Web-Patients-heal-themselves-online/UPI-96731091633186

18. For a good list of nonprofit disease advocacy organizations supporting OA for publicly-funded research in the United States, see the membership list of the Alliance for Taxpayer Access.

<http://www.taxpayeraccess.org/membership/index.shtml>

19. "Large Majorities of U.S. Adults Support Easy—and Free—Online Access to Federally-Funded Research Findings on Health Issues and Other Topics," *Harris Interactive*, May 31, 2006.

<http://www.harrisinteractive.com/vault/Harris-Interactive-Poll-Research-ATA-Statement-of-Support-2006-05.pdf>

20. If you believe that lay readers don't care to read peer-reviewed medical research and couldn't understand it if they tried, and if you only have time to read one eye-opening testimonial, read Sharon Terry's.

<http://crln.acrl.org/content/66/7/522.full.pdf>

21. For more on the possibility of providing OA to some, such as the citizens of one country, and denying it to others, see my article “The taxpayer argument for open access,” *SPARC Open Access Newsletter*, September 4, 2003.

http://dash.harvard.edu/bitstream/handle/1/4725013/suber_taxpayer.htm?sequence=1

22. This section borrows from several of my previous publications: “Thoughts on first and second-order scholarly judgments,” *SPARC Open Access Newsletter*, April 8, 2002.

http://dash.harvard.edu/bitstream/handle/1/4727447/suber_thoughts.htm?sequence=1

My answers to James Morrison’s interview questions in *The Technology Source*, September/October 2002.

http://www.technologysource.org/article/free_online_scholarship_movement

My answers to Cy Dillon’s interview questions in *Virginia Libraries* 54 (2) (April/May/June 2008), pp. 7–12.

http://dash.harvard.edu/bitstream/handle/1/4724180/suber_dilloninterview.htm?sequence=1

23. On the claim that information overload didn’t start with the internet, see Ann Blair, *Too Much to Know: Managing Scholarly Information Before the Modern Age*, Yale University Press, November 2010.

<http://yalepress.yale.edu/yupbooks/book.asp?isbn=9780300112511>

On the claim that the size of the internet and the power of search are both growing quickly, see “Can search tame the wild web? Can open access help?” *SPARC Open Access Newsletter*, December 2, 2005.

http://dash.harvard.edu/bitstream/handle/1/4727442/suber_wildweb.htm?sequence=1

24. Clay Shirky, “It’s Not Information Overload. It’s Filter Failure,” Web 2.0 Expo NY, September 16–19, 2008.

<http://web2expo.blip.tv/file/1277460>

25. Also see Clifford Lynch, “Open Computation: Beyond Human-Reader-Centric Views of Scholarly Literatures,” *Open Access: Key Strategic, Technical and Economic Aspects*, Neil Jacobs (ed.), Chandos Publishing, 2006, pp. 185–193. “Traditional open access is, in my view, a probable (but not certain) prerequisite

for the emergence of fully developed large-scale computational approaches to the scholarly literature.”

<http://www.cni.org/staff/cliffpubs/OpenComputation.htm>

Chapter 6

1. This section borrows from several of my previous publications:

“Open Access Overview.”

http://dash.harvard.edu/bitstream/handle/1/4729737/suber_oaoverview.htm?sequence=1

“The mandates of January,” *SPARC Open Access Newsletter*, February 2, 2008.

http://dash.harvard.edu/bitstream/handle/1/4322581/suber_january.html?sequence=1

“A bill to overturn the NIH policy,” *SPARC Open Access Newsletter*, October 2, 2008.

http://dash.harvard.edu/bitstream/handle/1/4322592/suber_nihbill.html?sequence=1

“A field guide to misunderstandings about open access,” *SPARC Open Access Newsletter*, April 2, 2009.

http://dash.harvard.edu/bitstream/handle/1/4322571/suber_fieldguide.html?sequence=1

2. See the OAD list of publisher policies on NIH-funded authors.

http://oad.simmons.edu/oadwiki/Publisher_policies_on_NIH-funded_authors

3. The bill was the so-called Fair Copyright in Research Works Act, introduced by Rep. John Conyers (D-MI) in September 2008 and again in the next session of Congress in February 2009. In both cases it died without a vote. See my articles on each introduction of the bill:

“A bill to overturn the NIH policy,” *SPARC Open Access Newsletter*, October 2, 2008.

http://dash.harvard.edu/bitstream/handle/1/4322592/suber_nihbill.html?sequence=1

“Re-introduction of the bill to kill the NIH policy,” *SPARC Open Access Newsletter*, March 2, 2009.

http://dash.harvard.edu/bitstream/handle/1/4391154/suber_reintro.html?sequence=1

4. However, as we've seen (in section 3.3 on gratis/libre) most OA journals still settle for gratis OA even though they could just as easily obtain the rights for libre OA.

5. See L. Ray Patterson, "A Response to Mr. Y'Barbo's Reply," *Journal of Intellectual Property Law* 5 (1997).

Chapter 7

1. This section borrows from several of my previous publications:

"No-fee open-access journals," *SPARC Open Access Newsletter*, November 2, 2006.

http://dash.harvard.edu/bitstream/handle/1/4552050/suber_nofee.htm?sequence=1

"Good facts, bad predictions," *SPARC Open Access Newsletter*, June 2, 2006.

http://dash.harvard.edu/bitstream/handle/1/4391309/suber_facts.htm?sequence=1

"Will open access undermine peer review?" *SPARC Open Access Newsletter*, September 2, 2007.

http://dash.harvard.edu/bitstream/handle/1/4322578/suber_peer.html?sequence=1

"Ten challenges for open-access journals," *SPARC Open Access Newsletter*, October 2, 2009.

http://dash.harvard.edu/bitstream/handle/1/4316131/suber_10challenges.html?sequence=2

2. See John Houghton and Peter Sheehan, "The Economic Impact of Enhanced Access to Research Findings," Centre for Strategic Economic Studies, Victoria University Working Paper No. 23, July 2006.

<http://www.cfses.com/documents/wp23.pdf>

John Houghton, Colin Steele, and Peter Sheehan, "Research Communication Costs in Australia: Emerging Opportunities and Benefits," Australia's Department of Education, Science and Training, September 2006.

http://www.dest.gov.au/NR/rdonlyres/0ACB271F-EA7D-4FAF-B3F7-0381F441B175/13935/DEST_Research_Communications_Cost_Report_Sept2006.pdf

Also see Alma Swan's February 2010 study, based on Houghton's model, of the costs and benefits of OA policies at universities.

<http://www.jisc.ac.uk/publications/programmerelated/2010/howtoopenaccess.aspx>

Also see Stevan Harnad's March 2010 article building on Houghton's finding that the economic benefits of green OA exceed the costs more than fortyfold.

<http://eprints.ecs.soton.ac.uk/18514>

For Houghton's other studies on the economic impact of OA policies, see the home page for his research project on the Economic Implications of Alternative Scholarly Publishing Models (EI-ASPM).

<http://www.cfses.com/EI-ASPM>

For the publisher critique of Houghton's research, see the two joint statements by the Publishers Association (PA), the Association of Learned and Professional Society Publishers (ALPSP), and the International Association of Scientific, Technical and Medical Publishers (STM), both dated February 2009.

http://www.publishers.org.uk/images/stories/AboutPA/Newsletters/pa-alpsp-stm_joint_statement.pdf

<http://www.fep-fee.be/documents/TAcommentsonH-OJISCreport-final.doc>

Also see the STM press release, with links to related documents, "STM challenges JISC over validity of latest open access advocacy," April 2010.

<http://web.archive.org/web/20100424033638/http://www.stm-assoc.org/news.php?id=294&PHPSESSID=08b2a9f56c8b6e7fec0eac997bd c0b3>

For the major replies to the publisher critiques, see the replies from JISC (undated but c. April 2009) and Houghton himself (January 2010).

<http://www.jisc.ac.uk/media/documents/publications/responseoneiaspmreport.pdf>

[http://www.cfses.com/EI-ASPM/Comments-on-Hall\(Houghton&Oppenheim\).pdf](http://www.cfses.com/EI-ASPM/Comments-on-Hall(Houghton&Oppenheim).pdf)

3. See "Heading for the Open Road: Costs and Benefits of Transitions in Scholarly Communications," Research Information Network, April 7, 2011.

<http://www.rin.ac.uk/our-work/communicating-and-disseminating-research/heading-open-road-costs-and-benefits-transitions-s>

4. Charles W. Bailey Jr., Karen Coombs, Jill Emery, Anne Mitchell, Chris Morris, Spencer Simons, and Robert Wright, "Institutional Repositories," ARL SPEC Kit 292, July, 2006. "Implementers [of repositories at ARL libraries] report a range of start-up costs from \$8,000 to \$1,800,000, with a mean of \$182,550 and a median of \$45,000. . . . The range for ongoing operations budgets for implementers is \$8,600 to \$500,000, with a mean of \$113,543 and median of \$41,750."

<http://www.arl.org/bm~doc/spec292web.pdf>

An informal 2005 survey by Rebecca Kemp found that the costs of setting up a repository ranged from \$5,770 (CILEA) to \$1,706,765 (Cambridge University) and that yearly maintenance ranged from \$36,000 (National University of Ireland) to \$285,000 (MIT).

<http://www.earlham.edu/~peters/fos/2005/11/costs-of-oa-repositories.html>

In 2001, Caltech reported that its set-up costs were less than \$1,000.

<http://web.archive.org/web/20041014190643/http://www.arl.org/sparc/pubs/enews/aug01.html#6>

5. For more on the “some pay for all” business models, see “Four analogies to clean energy,” *SPARC Open Access Newsletter*, February 2, 2010.

http://dash.harvard.edu/bitstream/handle/1/4315928/suber_4analogies.html?sequence=2

6. For details on the variety of business models for OA journals, see the Open Access Directory list of OA journal business models.

http://oad.simmons.edu/oadwiki/OA_journal_business_models

Also see Raym Crow, “Income Models for Supporting Open Access,” *SPARC*, October 2009.

<http://www.arl.org/sparc/publisher/incomemodels>

7. Suenje Dallmeier-Tiessen et al., “Highlights from the SOAP (Study of Open Access Publishing) project survey. What Scientists Think about Open Access Publishing,” arXiv, January 28, 2011. “In total 89% of published researchers answering to the survey thought that journals publishing open access articles were beneficial for their field. When analysed by discipline, this fraction was higher than 90% in most of the humanities and social sciences, and oscillating around 80% for Chemistry, Astronomy, Physics, Engineering and related disciplines.”

<http://arxiv.org/abs/1101.5260>

8. On the percentage of OA journals charging author-side fees, see Stuart Shieber, “What percentage of open-access journals charge publication fees?” *The Occasional Pamphlet*, May 29, 2009.

<http://blogs.law.harvard.edu/pamphlet/2009/05/29/what-percentage-of-open-access-journals-charge-publication-fees>

On the percentage of TA journals charging author-side fees, see Cara Kaufman and Alma Wills, “The Facts about Open Access,” Association of Learned and Professional Society Publishers, 2005.

http://www.alpsp.org/ngen_public/article.asp?id=200&did=47&aid=270&st=&oid=-1

On the percentage of authors paying fees out of pocket at fee-based OA journals, see Suenje Dallmeier-Tiessen et al., “Highlights from the SOAP project survey. What Scientists Think about Open Access Publishing,” a preprint on deposit in arXiv, January 28, 2011, p. 9, table 4.

<http://arxiv.org/abs/1101.5260>

Also see my two articles on no-fee OA journals:

“Good facts, bad predictions,” *SPARC Open Access Newsletter*, June 2, 2006.

http://dash.harvard.edu/bitstream/handle/1/4391309/suber_facts.htm?sequence=1

“No-fee open-access journals,” *SPARC Open Access Newsletter*, November 2, 2006.

http://dash.harvard.edu/bitstream/handle/1/4552050/suber_nofee.htm?sequence=1

9. See Anuar Bin Shafiei, “An exploratory study into an intermediary service organisation handling author fees on behalf of academic libraries,” *Pleiade Management & Consultancy*, October 15, 2010. See section 4.4. 100 percent of responding members of the Open Access Scholarly Publishers Association (OASPA) who published fee-based OA journals, surveyed in July-August 2010, offered some kind of fee waivers. 91 percent prevented editors from knowing about fee-waiver requests during peer review.

<http://www.pleiade.nl/Serviceorganisationauthorfees.pdf>

http://www.oaspa.org/docs/oa_fee_study.pdf

10. For a more detailed response to these calculations, see “Good facts, bad predictions,” *SPARC Open Access Newsletter*, June 2, 2006.

http://dash.harvard.edu/bitstream/handle/1/4391309/suber_facts.htm?sequence=1

Today, not only do 70 percent of OA journals charge no author-side fees (see Shieber in note 8), but 59 percent of fees paid at fee-based journals are paid by funding agencies and only 24 percent by universities (see Suenje Dallmeier-Tiessen et al. in note 7).

11. Many of the funds set up by universities to pay publication fees on behalf of faculty refuse to pay fees at double-dipping hybrid journals. For example, the fund at the University of Calgary will only pay fees at hybrid journals “that reduce subscription fees in response to the take-up of their Open Access programs. . . .”

<http://library.ucalgary.ca/services/for-faculty/open-access-authors-fund/open-access-authors-fund-frequently-asked-questions-faq#4>

Funds at many other institutions will not pay fees at any hybrid journals. For example, see Harvard's HOPE (Harvard Open-Access Publishing Equity) fund.
<http://osc.hul.harvard.edu/hope>

12. On the AAP/PSP figures, see John Tagler, "From the Executive Director's Desk," *Professional Scholarly Publishing Bulletin*, Spring 2011. Tagler notes that "the two largest open access publishers did not submit data on their publishing programs so the analysis covers open access patterns across a universe where paid circulation, rather than [an OA business model], is the principal source of revenue."

<http://www.pspcentral.org/documents/PSPWinter-Spring2011.pdf>

See the SHERPA list of hybrid journal publishers. When I checked it April 29, 2011, it listed 91 journal publishers, including all of the largest.

<http://www.sherpa.ac.uk/romeo/PaidOA.html>

"Report from the SOAP (Study of Open Access Publishing) Symposium," January 2011.

<http://project-soap.eu/report-from-the-soap-symposium>

13. See "Open access in 2006," *SPARC Open Access Newsletter*, January 2, 2007.
http://dash.harvard.edu/bitstream/handle/1/4729246/suber_0a2006.htm?sequence=1

The hybrid OA landscape hasn't changed much since January 2007, when I summarized the situation this way:

Some hybrid programs are good-faith, even optimistic experiments; some look grudging or cynical. Some charge low fees and let participating authors retain copyright; some charge high fees and still demand the copyright. Some provide OA to the full published edition, some only to an enfeebled truncation stripped of active links. Some reduce subscription prices in proportion to author uptake; some use a frank "double charge" business model. Some let authors deposit articles in repositories independent of the publisher; some allow free online access only from sites they control. Some don't try to meddle with author funding contracts; some charge authors who want to comply with prior funding obligations. Some continue to allow immediate self-archiving for non-participating authors; some impose embargoes or fees on self-archiving. The positive spin on this wide range of policies is that publishers are fully exploring the hybrid journal space for variations that satisfy their constraints. I do think that's good even if I also think some current models are cynical or useless. To make the same point without

the spin, some want to encourage author uptake and some don't seem to care as long as they have subscriptions.

Also see "Predictions for 2006," *SPARC Open Access Newsletter*, December 2, 2006. "The big question for [hybrid OA] publishers is whether they want author uptake badly enough to make it attractive. Will the existence of subscription revenue as a safety net kill the incentives to make the OA option succeed?"
http://dash.harvard.edu/bitstream/handle/1/4391164/suber_2006predict.htm?sequence=1

Also see "Nine questions for hybrid journal programs," *SPARC Open Access Newsletter*, September 2, 2006.
http://dash.harvard.edu/bitstream/handle/1/4552044/suber_hybrid_questions.htm?sequence=1

14. BioMed Central was acquired by Springer in 2008 and remains OA and profitable. It also has a membership program.
<http://www.biomedcentral.com>

The Public Library of Science publishes seven journals; some make surpluses and some don't. From a financial standpoint, PLoS ONE is most successful and has inspired imitations from a handful of predominantly TA publishers.
<http://www.plos.org>

See PLoS ONE and my article on its imitators.
<http://www.plosone.org>

"Recent watershed events," *SPARC Open Access Newsletter*, March 2, 2011.
http://dash.harvard.edu/bitstream/handle/1/4736559/suber_watershed.htm?sequence=1

MedKnow not only makes revenue from print editions but also from advertising, association memberships, and author reprints.
<http://www.medknow.com>

Another nonprofit OA journal making a surplus is *Optics Express* from the Optical Society of America. It routinely has one of the highest impact factors in its field and in 2006 was the most cited journal in optics.
<http://www.opticsexpress.org>
<http://www.photonicsonline.com/article.mvc/IOptics-ExpressI-Optics-LettersI-Top-Rated-J-0001>

15. On how open-source journal management software, and OJS in particular, reduces publication costs, see Brian D. Edgar and John Willinsky, "A Survey of Scholarly Journals Using Open Journal Systems," *Scholarly and Research Communication*, 1, 2 (April 2010). See especially table 14.
<http://journals.sfu.ca/src/index.php/src/article/view/24/41>

“Over 9000 OJS Installations,” Public Knowledge Project, April 6, 2011.

<http://pkp.sfu.ca/node/3695>

See the OAD list of Free and open-source journal management software.

http://oad.simmons.edu/oadwiki/Free_and_open-source_journal_management_software

16. John Houghton’s research from January 2009 estimates savings from gold OA, not just from green OA. “For UK higher education, these journal article cost differences would have amounted to savings of around £80 million per annum circa 2007 from a shift from subscription access to open access publishing. . . .”

<http://www.jisc.ac.uk/media/documents/publications/summary-economicoa.pdf>

<http://www.jisc.ac.uk/publications/reports/2009/economicpublishing-modelsfinalreport.aspx>

Also see Julian Fisher, “Scholarly Publishing Re-invented: Real Costs and Real Freedoms in the Journal of Electronic Publishing,” *Journal of Electronic Publishing*, Spring 2008. “Deploying newly available tools and approaches to article production in a collaborative manner offer dramatic reductions in cost, up to two orders of magnitude.”

<http://hdl.handle.net/2027/spo.3336451.0011.204>

Also see Brian Edgar and John Willinsky (April 2010), *ibid.*, table 15. Of surveyed OSJ-using journals, 29 percent claimed zero expenses, 20 percent claimed expenses between \$1 and \$1,000, and 31 percent claimed expenses between \$1,001 and \$10k. 44 percent operated on zero revenue, 16 percent on revenue between \$1 and \$1,000, and 24 percent on revenue between \$1,001 and \$10k.

<http://journals.sfu.ca/src/index.php/src/article/view/24/41>

17. Jan Velterop, post to the SSP-L discussion list August 6, 2003. Apparently the post is no longer online.

18. A March 2010 study by Donald King showed that if all toll-access journals converted to fee-based OA, and if the average fee was \$1,500, then the one-year cost of paying the fees for U.S. authors would be \$427.5 million (or 0.76 percent of the U.S. R&D budget). If the average fee was \$2,500, the cost would be \$712.5 million (or 1.27% of the US R&D budget). Heather Morrison used King’s data to calculate that the conversion could result in \$3.4 billion in savings in the United States alone. In a follow-up report, Morrison calculated that the more than \$2 billion profit earned by Elsevier and Lexis Nexis in 2009

would pay for a year's worth of all the peer-reviewed journal articles published around world at a per-article fee of \$1,383.

<http://www.dlib.org/dlib/march10/king/03king.html>

<http://poeticeconomics.blogspot.com/2010/03/us-systemic-savings-from-full-shift-to.html>

<http://poeticeconomics.blogspot.com/2010/04/elsevier-2009-2-billion-profits-could.html>

19. See the Open Access Directory list of OA journal funds.

http://oad.simmons.edu/oadwiki/OA_journal_funds

Also see the Compact for Open-Access Publishing Equity (COPE), a commitment to launch a fund and persuade other institutions to follow suit.

<http://www.oacompact.org>

20. See the SCOAP3 home page.

<http://www.scoap3.org>

Peter Suber, "Eleventh hour for SCOAP3," *SPARC Open Access Newsletter*, December 2, 2010.

http://dash.harvard.edu/bitstream/handle/1/4736587/suber_scoap3.htm?sequence=1

"SCOAP3 Global Partnership Meets and Decides to Move Forward!" SCOAP3 press release, April 12, 2011.

<http://www.scoap3.org/news/news85.html>

21. See "Flipping a journal to open access," *SPARC Open Access Newsletter*, October 2, 2007.

http://dash.harvard.edu/bitstream/handle/1/4322572/suber_flipping.html?sequence=1

Chapter 8

1. This chapter borrows from two of my previous publications:

"Will open access undermine peer review?" *SPARC Open Access Newsletter*, September 2, 2007.

http://dash.harvard.edu/bitstream/handle/1/4322578/suber_peer.html?sequence=1

"A bill to overturn the NIH policy," *SPARC Open Access Newsletter*, October 2, 2008.

http://dash.harvard.edu/bitstream/handle/1/4322592/suber_nihbill.html?sequence=1

2. arXiv.

<http://arxiv.org>

American Physical Society (APS).

<http://www.aps.org>

Institute of Physics (IOP).

<http://www.iop.org>

APS mirror of arXiv (launched December 1999).

<http://aps.arxiv.org>

IOP mirror of arXiv (launched September 2006).

<http://eprintweb.org>

See Alma Swan's interview with the APS and IOP, in which "both societies said they could not identify any losses of subscriptions" due to OA archiving.

<http://eprints.ecs.soton.ac.uk/11006>

3. "NIH research: Widening access, building collaboration," *The Lancet*, October 6, 2004.

[http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(04\)17232-2](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(04)17232-2)

4. One hearing was convened by Rep. John Conyers (D-MI) for the House Judiciary Committee Subcommittee on Courts, the Internet, and Intellectual Property (September 11, 2008), and the other by Rep. William Lacy Clay (D-MO) for the House Committee on Government Oversight and Reform Subcommittee on Information Policy, the Census, and National Archives (July 29, 2010).

Testimony from the 2008 hearing.

<http://judiciary.house.gov/hearings/printers/110th/44326.PDF>

Testimony from the 2010 hearing.

http://republicans.oversight.house.gov/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=922%3A07-29-2010-information-policy-qpublic-access-to-federally-funded-researchq&catid=14&Itemid

At the 2008 hearing, the executive director of the American Physiological Society (APS) was among the publisher-witnesses predicting that the NIH policy would cause cancellations. But the NIH policy allowed a twelve-month embargo, and the APS voluntarily made its own papers OA after a twelve-month embargo. In an interview a year later (October 2009), he conceded the lack of evidence. "We haven't had enough time to see an impact."

<http://www.the-scientist.com/blog/display/56046>

In addition to the natural experiments resulting from the funder and university green OA mandates, there is a large-scale study in progress, Publishing and the Ecology of European Research (PEER).

<http://www.peerproject.eu>

5. Steve Hitchcock, "The effect of open access and downloads ('hits') on citation impact: A bibliography of studies," Open Citation Project, continually updated.

<http://opcit.eprints.org/oacitation-biblio.html>

6. "NPG position statement on open access publishing and subscription business models," January 6, 2011.

http://www.nature.com/press_releases/statement.html

7. "Letter supporting NIH Proposal," Association of College and Research Libraries, November 16, 2004.

http://www.ala.org/ala/mgrps/divs/acrl/issues/washingtonwatch/ALA_print_layout_1_168551_168551.cfm

8. Chris Beckett and Simon Inger, "Self-Archiving and Journal Subscriptions: Co-existence or Competition? An International Survey of Librarians' Preferences," *Publishing Research Consortium*, October 26, 2006.

http://www.publishingresearch.net/documents/Self-archiving_report.pdf

Also see Steve Hitchcock's collection of other objections to the PRC study, with replies from Beckett and Inger.

<http://www.eprints.org/community/blog/index.php?/archives/163-Self-Archiving-and-Journal-Subscriptions-Co-existence-or-Competition.html>

9. "ALPSP survey of librarians on factors in journal cancellation," Association of Learned and Professional Society Publishers, March 30, 2006.

<http://www.alpssp.org/ForceDownload.asp?id=53>

10. On ASCB, see Jonathan B. Weitzman, "The Society Lady" (an interview with Elizabeth Marincola, then executive director of the ASCB), *Open Access Now*, October 6, 2003.

<http://www.biomedcentral.com/openaccess/archive/?page=features&issue=6>

On Medknow, see D. K. Sahu and Ramesh C. Parma, "Open Access in India," in Neil Jacobs (ed.) *Open Access: Key strategic, technical, and economic aspects*, Chandos Publishing Ltd, 2006.

http://openmed.nic.in/1599/01/Open_Access_in_India.pdf

11. See the Hindawi Publishing press release, "2009: A Year of Strong Growth for Hindawi," January 6, 2010.

<https://mx2.arl.org/lists/sparc-oaforum/Message/5326.html>

For the rise of submissions to Hindawi journals, see this series of company press releases from mid-2007 to early 2011.

<https://mx2.arl.org/Lists/SPARC-OAForum/Message/3793.html>

<https://mx2.arl.org/Lists/SPARC-OAForum/Message/4829.html>

<https://mx2.arl.org/lists/sparc-oaforum/Message/5326.html>

<https://mx2.arl.org/Lists/SPARC-OAForum/Message/5581.html>

<https://mx2.arl.org/Lists/SPARC-OAForum/Message/5715.html>

12. See the Springer press release on the purchase of BMC, October 7, 2008.

<https://mx2.arl.org/Lists/SPARC-OAForum/Message/4605.html>

Chapter 9

1. This section borrows from two of my previous publications:

“Reflections on OA/TA coexistence,” *SPARC Open Access Newsletter*, March 2, 2005.

http://dash.harvard.edu/bitstream/handle/1/4391157/suber_coexistence.htm?sequence=1

“Trends Favoring Open Access,” *CT Watch* 3 (3), Fall 2007.

<http://www.ctwatch.org/quarterly/print.php%3Fp=81.html>

2. On the dangers of thinking that if something is not free online, then it’s not worth reading, see “The Ellen Roche story” and “Comments on the Ellen Roche Story,” both in the *Free Online Scholarship Newsletter*, August 23, 2001.

http://dash.harvard.edu/bitstream/handle/1/4725003/suber_roche.htm?sequence=1

http://dash.harvard.edu/bitstream/handle/1/4725201/suber_rochecomments.htm?sequence=1

3. How can we reconcile unanimous faculty votes for strong OA policies with the evidence that faculty have been slow to pay attention to OA and understand it? See “Unanimous faculty votes,” *SPARC Open Access Newsletter*, June 2, 2010.

Campuses where faculty members vote unanimously for OA policies . . . are not random exceptions to this current trend. They are cultivated exceptions to this current trend. More, they are gradually reversing the trend itself. They are campuses where policy proponents have carefully educated their colleagues about the issues and patiently answered their questions, objections, and misunderstandings. . . . One lesson: If

your campus is considering an OA policy, be patient. Let the education process take as long as it takes. . . .

http://dash.harvard.edu/bitstream/handle/1/4723857/suber_vote_s.htm?sequence=1

Chapter 10

1. The Directory of Open Access Journals.
<http://www.doaj.org>
 2. See the Open Access Directory list of OA journal funds.
http://oad.simmons.edu/oadwiki/OA_journal_funds
 3. Open Access Scholarly Publishers Association (OASPA). See especially the OASPA membership list and code of conduct.
<http://www.oaspa.org>
<http://www.oaspa.org/members.php>
<http://www.oaspa.org/conduct.php>
 4. See the SHERPA RoMEO database.
<http://www.sherpa.ac.uk/romeo>
 5. See the Open Access Directory list of author addenda.
http://oad.simmons.edu/oadwiki/Author_addenda
 6. See the Registry of Open Access Repositories, the Directory of Open Access Repositories, and the Open Access Directory list of Disciplinary Repositories.
<http://roar.eprints.org>
<http://www.opendoar.org>
http://oad.simmons.edu/oadwiki/Disciplinary_repositories
 7. See OpenDepot, OpenAire, Academia, and Mendeley.
<http://opendepot.org>
<http://www.openaire.eu>
<http://www.academia.edu>
<http://www.mendeley.com>
 8. See the Open Access Directory list of data repositories.
http://oad.simmons.edu/oadwiki/Data_repositories
- Also see the list from DataCite, the British Library, BioMed Central, and the Digital Curation Centre.
<http://datacite.org/repolist>