What is behind the curtains of the scholarly publishing?
Some Figures and Facts....

- Do these reflect concentration in a few hands (oligopoly)?
- Do these reflect a cross-services dependency?
- Does one size fit all?
Percentage of Natural and Medical Sciences (left panel) and Social Sciences and Humanities (right panel) papers published by the top 5 publishers, 1973–2013.

https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0127502
Percentage of papers published by the five major publishers, by discipline in the Natural and Medical Sciences, 1973–2013.

https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0127502
https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0127502
https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0127502
Operating profits (million USD) and profit margin of Reed-Elsevier as a whole (A) and of its Scientific, Technical & Medical division (B), 1991–2013.

https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0127502

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Publisher</th>
<th>Absolute</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elsevier</td>
<td>97,580</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springer Nature</td>
<td>55,332</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wiley</td>
<td>36,875</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor &amp; Francis</td>
<td>22,610</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACS</td>
<td>7,930</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>220,327</strong></td>
<td><strong>56.3%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
<td>170,693</td>
<td>43.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>391,020</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Data from 2017**
391,020 journal articles 26 European countries 220,000 from the five large publishers In 2016: 613,000 journal articles produced by European Union (source: National Science Foundation)

Subscriptions paid to all publishers in the 26 surveyed countries is €597. Of those €451 million are spent on subscriptions to Elsevier, Springer Nature, Wiley, Taylor & Francis and ACS – roughly equivalent to 75% of the total volume
Agreements vary widely between publishers and between countries in terms of the relative price per article.

Subscription price and publication output are strongly correlated at national level.
From “pay to read” to “pay to publish”? 

- APCs? Are Cost and quality linked?
- Do journals with higher APCs attract more citations?
- Are more expensive journals more reputable? If so
- Will be able to afford less wealthy institutions to pay them?

European Universities. APCs Expenditures Year 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Publisher</th>
<th>APCs</th>
<th>Journals</th>
<th>APCs</th>
<th>Journals</th>
<th>APCs</th>
<th>Journals</th>
<th>APCs</th>
<th>Journals</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elsevier BV</td>
<td>€5,087,800</td>
<td>1691</td>
<td>€3,009</td>
<td>1235</td>
<td>19.84%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springer Nature</td>
<td>€4,879,031</td>
<td>2518</td>
<td>€1,938</td>
<td>860</td>
<td>19.02%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frontiers Media SA</td>
<td>€2,582,418</td>
<td>1348</td>
<td>€1,916</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>10.07%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

https://treemaps.intact-project.org/
Source: ESAC https://esac-initiative.org/about/apcmarket/
Source: Open APC as of November 16, 2018 • select for hybrid "false" or "true" at Open APC

Source: Open APC as of October 14, 2018; please select hybrid "true" or "false" on Open APC
Portfolio overview Imprints, open access gold and hybrid shares by the number of articles

Source: Crossref

Source: Crossref and Elsevier BV. Year 2017

https://esac-initiative.org/about/apcmarket/elsevier/
Number of journals changing from small to big publishers, and big to small publishers per year of change in the Natural and Medical Sciences and Social Sciences & Humanities.

https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0127502
https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0127502
Vertical Integration in Academic Publishing Implications for Knowledge Inequality.

Vertical Integration in Academic Publishing Implications for Knowledge Inequality.

George Chen, Alejandro Posada et Leslie Chan.

https://books.openedition.org/oep/9068
Secondary effects …..

• Dependency
• Lack of Transparency
• Influence decision making
• Reduce diversity in the “scientific ecology”
• Cross-service integration encourages the collective use of service
Another type of dependency....
6.3 Additional charges
In all instances (other than where a Waiver is granted or a Submission is covered by a Payment Plan), Submitters will be charged excess data fees for Datasets greater than 50 Gigabytes (GB): $50 for each additional 10GB, or part thereof. (Datasets between 50 and 60GB = $50, between 60 and 70GB = $100, and so on). These fees are subject to change as posted to https://datadryad.org
Submitters also are responsible for paying any third-party costs associated with Submission of the Content (e.g. fee to use a large file transfer service external to Dryad).
https://datadryad.org/stash/terms#content
That can also encourage....

New ways
New ideas
New ecosystems
Evolution?
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....................................

....................................

....................................

Other Worlds
Cynefin Model. Source: Strategic Innovation lab
https://strategicinnovationlab.com/navigating-complexity/

A conceptual framework to aid decision-making

Maintain the status quo

Does one size fit all?

Encourage Innovation and new environments

Does one size fit all?
Cooperatives are based on the values of self-help, self-responsibility, democracy, equality, equity, and solidarity. In the tradition of their founders, cooperative members believe in the ethical values of honesty, openness, social responsibility and caring for others” (International Co-operative Alliance. https://www.ica.coop/en/cooperatives/cooperative-identity)

Would/Will the Academia evolve in a more cooperative system?
“The first set of challenges, around sustainable funding for a non-profit infrastructure, has a viable answer: **the key is to redirect the billions** – even a fraction of those billions – **that libraries currently spend on subscriptions to the new, scholar-run platforms. These dollars are crucial, too, to underwrite an OA future for the university presses and scholarly societies**”
There is more than one world
Principles and Values

1. Scientific knowledge generated with public funds is a common good and access to it is a universal right.

2. The open academy-owned non-profit non-subordinated sustainable and with responsible metrics publishing model ought to be strengthened.

3. Open Access has neither future nor meaning unless research assessment systems evolve.

4. Open Access consolidation demands the transition to digital scientific communication.

5. Financial investment in Open Access ought to be in line with its benefit for society.

6. Open Access sustainability by means of cooperative work schemes and a horizontal distribution to cover costs.

7. Diversity of scientific journals is necessary, hence pressure to homogenise them ought to be stopped.

8. Journals ought to allow authors to retain their copyright and remove their embargo policies.

9. Science's social impact is the foundation of Open Access' existence.

10. The various dynamics to generate and circulate knowledge per field ought to be respected, especially, Social Sciences and Humanities.
The role of preprints. Plan U

“By decoupling the dissemination of manuscripts from the much slower process of evaluation and certification by journals, preprints also significantly accelerate the pace of research itself by allowing other researchers to begin building on new results immediately. If all funding agencies were to mandate posting of preprints by grantees—an approach we term Plan U (for “universal”)—free access to the world’s scientific output for everyone would be achieved with minimal effort. Moreover, the existence of all articles as preprints would create a fertile environment for experimentation with new peer review and research evaluation initiatives, which would benefit from a reduced barrier to entry because hosting and archiving costs were already covered.”

Plan U - A win for Researchers, Publishers and Funders - A win for Academia
https://figshare.com/blog/Plan_U_-_A_win_for_Researchers_Publishers_and_Funders_-_A_win_for_Academia/509

http://www.knowledge-exchange.info/event/preprints

https://cos.io/blog/preprints-what-why-how/
Thank you!
Gràcies!
¡Gracias!