

# **< APE 2008**

The International Conference “Academic Publishing in Europe”

## **QUALITY & PUBLISHING**

Under the Auspices of the EU Research Directorate-General

### **A SHORT CONFERENCE REPORT**

by

**Dr. Svenja Hagenhoff and Dr. Chris Armbruster**

22 - 23 January 2008

Berlin-Brandenburg Academy of Sciences

## APE 2008 Academic Publishing in Europe Quality & Publishing 22-23 January 2008, Berlin

### Pre-Conference Day for Younger Academic Publishers: "The Purpose of Publishing" 21 January 2008

An International Conference, organised under the auspices and with the support of the European Commission, Research Directorate-General and sponsored by Akademische Verlagsgesellschaft Aka GmbH, The Electronic Publishing Working Group (AKEP), ALPSP, ARIES, German Association of Publishers and Booksellers (Börsenverein), German Association of Information Theory and Practice (DGI), Ebsco Information Services, Elsevier, Federation of European Publishers (FEP), Frankfurt Book Fair, International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions (IFLA), IOS Press, IPA, Klopotek & Partners, Lightning Source, MetaPress - Electronic Content Management and Hosting, Royal Brill, Springer Science + Business Media, The International Association of Scientific, Technical and Medical Publishers (STM), Swets, Taylor & Francis Group.

#### Welcome and Opening Addresses

Dr. Einar Fredriksson (Director of IOS Press) opened the third conference Academic Publishing in Europe 2008 on "Quality & Publishing". He thanked the organisers and sponsors. Dr. Fredriksson highlighted the mission of APE, ensuring that all voices are represented and heard. Consequently, APE 2008 features a wide variety of speakers from publishers, libraries, information providers, research organisations, civil society and politics. Particular emphasis is placed on projects seeking to enhance the quality of publishing.

Dr. Karl-Peter Winters (member of the Board of the German Association of Publishers and Booksellers) welcomed all participants on behalf of the Börsenverein. He praised APE for the Education and Training Course for Younger Academic Publishers: "The Purpose of Publishing". Dr. Winters addressed the legal challenges currently facing publishers. Both at the European and national level policy was being made with regard to digital publishing and with an eye to works that are orphaned or out-of-print. The emergence of digital libraries was part of the context. Dr. Winters emphasised that publishers need a policy that reduces risks in a digital future, e.g. by reserving rights for publishers for as of yet unknown future digital uses.

In the **Opening Keynote**, Prof. Dr. Rolf-Dieter Heuer (Research Director, DESY Hamburg, Director-General elect, CERN, Geneva) stressed the traditional importance of preprints in High-Energy Physics since the 1960s, with online circulation beginning in 1991. In a community in which the authors are the readers and vice versa, repositories have become the vehicle of scholarly communication as researchers need full access to text, data and all kinds of ancillary objects (e.g. conference slides). Journals serve as evaluation agencies and keepers of the record. CERN and the Helmholtz Alliance have committed themselves to establish open access as the publishing solution for HEP by redirecting subscription money to pay for publishing. The Sponsoring Consortium for Open Access Publishing in Particle Physics (SCOAP3) estimates that EUR10M is needed annually to fund the

publishing of about 5,000 articles. Nearly half the sum for SCOAP3 has already been pledged by major European players and efforts are underway in North America and East Asia. Prof. Heuer clarified that he sees HEP OA publishing as an ideal test-bed for scientific OA publishing more generally - in order to get the costs for peer review and publication controlled in the long run.

In the **second keynote** Dr. Arne Richter (Executive Secretary, European Geosciences Union) gave a visionary presentation of the future confluence of the internet and open access. Any scientific community may organise itself to publish the best journal in the field, strive for the highest impact factor and comprehensively enable re-use by adopting a Creative Commons Attribution License. Rent-seeking publishers would be unable to stop this trend because of the complementary nature of open access and the internet, which favours open content that may be searched, mined, downloaded, re-used and so on. Moreover, digital publishing technology and software has advanced to the point at which much of the publishing process may be automated, enabling a business model based largely on service charges for authors in need of support with preparing an article for publication.

In the **third keynote** Michael A. Mabe (CEO International Association of STM Publishers) talked about the known Knowns and the known Unknowns in STM publishing. Most striking was how the internet, in less than two decades, had made available a wealth of information about journals, authors, readers and publishers. For example, there is reliable data about the linear growth of scientific publishing at 3% p.a. (new journals, more articles) and one may infer that growth is primarily correlated to the worldwide expansion of research and higher education. Moreover, a wealth of metrics has become available to evaluate research and publishing by downloads, citations or linking. As scientific publishing is author-driven, it is important to know their preferences. Authors are looking for quality and speed in a journal and publish to further their career, obtain funding, gain peer recognition and establish precedence (in that

order, disregarding the obvious primary motive of disseminating results). STM publishers are confident about the known Knowns and about their persistence despite technological or political change. In this sense, the known Unknowns relate only to delivery in the face of networked research practice in mobile friendly environments (technology) and the future sustainability of business models under OA mandates (politics).

The session **Peer Review and Quality**, chaired by Mayur Amin (Senior Vice President Research & Academic Relations, Elsevier), focussed on experiments to improve peer review as well as current views held by scholars on the peer review system.

Dr. Ulrich Pöschl (Max Planck Institute for Chemistry, Mainz) demonstrated how open access journals may reinforce their mission and standing by adopting a collaborative peer review process by having public peer review and an interactive discussion (e.g. the journal *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*). Public means that the peer reviews are fully citable may be read and commented upon by registered users (the community, readers of the journal) before a final decision on publication is taken by the editor. The identity of the author is known, while reviewers may choose to remain anonymous. Some of the benefits that accrue are that authors submit higher quality manuscripts, the community is involved in improving manuscripts, peer reviewers receive credit, and more eyes scrutinise submissions for errors as well as any serious offence like plagiarism. Overall, ACP outperforms rival journals on the impact factor while having a lower rejection rate. The potential trade-off between speed of publication and quality assurance is muted by making accepted manuscripts available online immediately while reserving plenty of time for peer review and community comment.

Dr. Catriona MacCallum (Public Library of Science) reported on PLoS ONE, a new journal format for high-volume publishing that aims to contribute to the process of scholarly communication and the progress of science, particularly by facilitating publication of negative results and replicatory studies. Initial peer review at PLoS ONE evaluates the methodological soundness and technical accuracy of submissions. Substantial peer review occurs after publication through the community by means of comments, ratings and journal clubs. Uptake of post-publication peer review has been promising and extensive. Also, PLoS ONE has proven to be commercially viable within a year, despite the lower publication fee of USD1,250, due to high volume and efficiency gains.

Dr. Linda J. Miller (Nature) reported on Nature's trial run with post-publication commentary (open, participatory). Traditional, confidential peer review is valued for the integrity it provides to the scientific record and the sorting and ranking of contributions. Editors rely on peer review for selection and quality assurance. Yet, the peer review system suffers as the volume and complexity of submissions increases relentlessly. A possible response is to seek to increase participation in the peer review process. NPG ran a trail with open post-publication commentary but found this to be inconclusive on account of limited uptake

and usefulness. Nevertheless, NPG is investing heavily in online tools that make for more public and interactive peer review, the most important being the launch of Nature Precedings (sharing results, with commentary) and Nature Protocols (sharing techniques, with commentary).

Mark Ware (Mark Ware Consulting) reported survey results on peer review undertaken on behalf of the Publishing Research Consortium. 3,040 respondents answered 120 questions in November 2007. It emerged that most authors would prefer double-blind peer review but reported that their papers were more likely to have gone through single-blind peer review. The crucial expectation of authors is that peer review is completed in no more than 30 days – if this is not the case, authors are likely to be dissatisfied. On the other hand, there seems to exist a cohort of active reviewers that handle about 80% of the peer review load (on average more than one manuscript per month) and who are, consequently, overloaded. In sum, authors prefer speed and anonymity, but the bottle-neck would seem to be a lack of qualified and active peer reviewers (who do not already know the author of any given manuscript). The study noted some willingness of authors to allow and engage with post-publication comments.

The session **All about Money** was chaired by Gertraud Griepke (Springer).

Alexis Walckiers (European Centre for Advanced Research in Economics and Statistics, Université Libre de Bruxelles) talked about "What means rich in publishing? Competition between for-profit and not-for-profit publishers from an economist's point of view". He presented the results of a study of the economical and technological evolution of scientific publishing in Europe. He started by presenting early findings which show that journals of for-profit publishers (FPP) are two to three times more expensive than journals of not-for profit publishers (NFPP), and that journals of NFPP are more cited. Also highly cited journals are more expensive than others, and journals of FPP are more expensive per citation. But there are large differences across the fields. Alexis Walckiers then presented results of his study. He found out that there is a positive correlation between price and market concentration. Although the market for scholarly journals is not concentrated in general, there are high concentration ratios in specific fields. He also stressed that the market in its structure is quite unusual, and that there are natural and strategic barriers to market entry. Concerning scientific associations he argued that they can often overcome strategic barriers due to their contact to the scientific community. But the scientific communities are also more conservative than FPP concerning developing and establishing new journals, because often this is not the aim of those associations.

Thomas Connertz and Guido F. Herrmann (Thieme) elaborated on the value chain of a scientific publishing house. They examined as crucial factors people, technology, time and cost that went into building value from the conceptualising of a new journal through peer review, production, online dissemination, marketing and customer services. Notable was that they estimated the cost of setting

up a new journal at EUR150T, with payback after 5 years. They also estimated marketing and dissemination activities to amount to 25-40% of cost. On the whole, they were confident that the value created at every stage of the process warranted the current prices.

Deirdre Furlong (Policy Officer, European Commission) clarified that the European Commission was committed to making the best possible use of digital technologies and that there was room for improvement. As a research funder, the Commission is concerned about access and preservation. In its capacity as a policy maker, it is interested in the dissemination of the full scientific information comprising of research publications and data. In sum, the concern is efficiency of investment, research excellence and benefits for innovation and competitiveness (Lisbon agenda). Major activities of the Commission fall into the areas of digital libraries, e-content and science and society. DG Research has earlier commissioned a study on scientific publishing in Europe and is now looking to fund more work on improving the scientific publishing system in Europe (SIS-2008-1.3.1.1). The position of the Commission might be summed up as "knowledge must circulate without barriers throughout the whole society" and "knowledge transfer must improve in order to accelerate the exploitation of research and the development of new products and services".

The second conference day started with two panel discussions. The panel discussion named **What Matters? The Future Role of Libraries in Science and Society: Swallowed by OA repositories, turned into University Presses or kept as Book Museums?** was chaired by Prof. Dr. Michael Seadle (Institute for Library and Information Sciences, Humboldt University).

Nol Verhagen (Amsterdam University Library) emphasised that the three main functions of the library would be to organise knowledge (incoming, e.g. in a digital catalogue), provide information (to users, on demand) and collect metadata (outgoing publications, usage). Moreover, AUL has become a producer of information, utilising the Dutch network of repositories (DARE, soon SHARE) to publish.

Ann Okerson (Yale University Library) spoke of the mission of libraries as providing targeted and vital information to users where and when they needed it, even if urgently. She highlighted that any libraries' users were increasingly distributed globally. Libraries are becoming more inclusive and the 21st century will be marked by having more women (than men) as seekers and users of high-quality scientific information. Ms. Okerson also spoke about the needs of university libraries to cooperate with each other, especially for long-term preservation, but also to support the branding and strategy of the individual institution.

Dr. Wolfram Neubauer (ETH Libraries, Zürich) was worried about the current position of libraries because STM dominance reduces funds available for book collections, while publishers are developing digital strategies that reduce the library to a conduit or by-pass it altogether. Moreover, libraries suffer from the audit culture as the value of their

service is not readily quantifiable. In relation to publishers, open access and digital repositories, Dr. Neubauer saw libraries stuck in a win-lose game, fighting against the odds.

The panel **Visible or Invisible? What Tools do Academics Need?** was chaired by Ehrhardt F. Heinold (Heinold + Spilller).

Tamara Pianos (German National Library of economics, Kiel) presented a comparison of information portals for academics in Germany. Based on a survey conducted in 2007 she reported which search tools researchers use and what they want concerning portals. Researchers mostly use Google for searching, followed by OPAC and Wikipedia. Rarely do they use specific collections. In the case of portals researchers do not accept registration, but prefer easy to use search fields and only one result list instead of different lists sorted by database. They would not pay for meta data and abstracts, and for full texts they want reasonable prices.

Thijs Willems (Product Manager Scopus and 2Collab, Elsevier) gave a presentation about enhancing researchers' productivity. As current trends in scientific research he named interdisciplinary work, pressure to show returns on research spending, collaboration, and the fact that more time is spent on finding information than on analyzing it. To give back time to researchers, search processes need to be more efficient. Mr. Willems therefore explained 2Collab as a tool for collaboration, and Scopus as an abstract and citation database.

Vanessa Proudman (NEEO/Economics Online) talked about making the research results of economists much more visible. Exemplarily, she presented the result of different search possibilities, which shows how the number of hits differ from tool to tool. Therefore, the NEREUS network of European libraries started the EU-founded NEEO project (Network of European Economists Online). Its aim is to make research results in economy visible and accessible without any copyright restrictions.

Wilma Mossink (SURF Foundation) presented Knowledge Exchange. The aim of Knowledge Exchange is to improve the digital infrastructure for information and communication technology as it relates to the research and university library sectors. The goals that have been set to achieve that vision include building an integrated repository infrastructure, exploring new developments in the future of publishing, facilitating integrated management services within education and research institutions, and supporting the European digital libraries agenda. Knowledge Exchange is founded on an agreement between Denmark's Electronic Research Library, German Research Foundation (DFG), Joint Information Systems Committee in the United Kingdom, and SURF Foundation in the Netherlands

The next session was about **Innovation & Enabling Technologies**. It was chaired by Drs. Eefke Smit (Director STM Standards & Technology).

The first presenter was Prof. Dr. Erhardt Rahm (University of Leipzig, Germany). In his presentation named "Comparing the Scientific Impact of Conferences and Journal Publications in Computer Science", he talked about how to measure the impact of conferences. He explained that in the field of Computer Science it is usual and completely accepted to publish in conference proceedings instead of using journals for communication. He underlines that statement by presenting some statistics about the number of articles published in proceedings versus in journals, and their number of citations. While JCS impact factors are limited to journals, it is necessary to consider citations from conferences. For his analysis Prof. Rahm used 5 venues (2 conference series, 3 journals) and the Google scholar tool. One main result of the citation analysis is that conference proceedings maintain a higher impact than journals. Another finding is that the numbers of citing are highly skewed within venues. For this an individual (per author/organization) impact analysis is more reasonable than per conference. One challenge in citation analysis is the data integration on heterogeneous data sources. To handle that challenge citation analysis software was developed at Leipzig University.

After that Peter Murray-Rust (Unilever Centre for Molecular Sciences Informatics, University of Cambridge) gave a speech about semantic markup in scientific publishing. He started by stressing that a lot of founded research is thrown away or decays because the data is often worth more than the full texts, but typically the data is presented in a way that cannot be used for further research, especially if it is not machine-readable. Mr. Murray-Rust requests everybody not to deliver research results in PDF anymore, but to use MS Word instead. He presents the OSCAR tool, which can extract data out of a word-based full text and, for example, present it in a well structured table. He also presents the tool 'CrystalEye' which transforms chemical data into graphs and models.

Jens Bammel (International Publishers Association) talked about the Automated Content Access Protocol (ACAP). ACAP is a permissions tool to disburden the management of licensing electronic resources and to support the relationship between copyright holders and any online intermediary like providers of search engines, portals or libraries. The protocol provides possibilities for the owner of the content to define use and access policies. Electronic tools like search engines can interpret these policies and present the policies to the end-user.

Fiona Bennett & Brian Green (Oxford University Press) gave a presentation to the same topic, which was called Electronic Expression of Licensing Terms. They presented the ONIX-LT standard (Online Information eXchange License Terms). In general, ONIX is a XML-based standard to exchange bibliographic data between publishers, bookseller, libraries and other players in the media supply chain. ONIX-LT is a format to communicate licence information to the user. Like ACAP, ONIX allows content owners to express permissions for access and use for interpretation by machines.

**The Round Table: University Presses and Books in the HSS in a digital future** was chaired by Eelco Ferwerda (Amsterdam University Press), who pointed to the rising importance of digital book publishing.

Marianne Alenius (Museum Tusulanum Press) pointed out that MTP publishes about 60 titles a year and has a backlist of over 1,300 titles, including books in 20 languages. In recent years MTP has begun to offer digital books and e-licenses. Recently, MTP has engaged in Nordic and international projects on digital and open access publishing and is a founding member of OAPEN – Open Access Publishing in European Networks, a publishing project for Humanities monographs.

Gerard Wormser (on behalf of Presse Universitaire de Lyon) spoke about how PUL was embedded in local networks that encompassed not only library and information professionals but also a general-interest public. At the same time PUL is connecting to European networks such as OAPEN in a drive not just to facilitate trans-national scholarly communication, but also to increase public visibility.

Patrizia Cotoneschi (Firenze University Press) said that five years after its founding in 2003, FUP was already breaking even with its publication of 22 journals and 350 books. While Ms. Cotoneschi saw FUP author-orientedness and hybrid publishing models as a strength, she also pointed out that University presses in Italy are currently restricted in their impact due to a lack of co-operation nationally and internationally.

Dr. Birgit Schmidt (Göttingen University Press) emphasised that GUP was pro-actively pursuing an open access publishing strategy, relying on a repository and connecting to DRIVER – the Digital Repository Infrastructure Vision for European Research. Up to 40% of GUP publications are in STM.

The session **New Content, New Models, New Roles** was chaired by Dirk Lens (Swets Executive Board).

Stefan Geißler (TEMIS) presented new methods to access scientific content, beyond the current focus on documents. Principally, users are not looking for documents, but for information. E-Content and natural language processing offer new ways to deliver scientific information. For example, documents may automatically be enriched with metadata allowing the detection of new expressions, interrelations between documents and document categories. Mr. Geißler presented four case studies: Thomson Scientific (large scale automatic indexing), Elsevier (automatic fact extraction from text), Springer Science+Business Media (enriching journal content with hyperlinks into reference works) and Lexis-Nexis (automatic mapping). This demonstrated the potential of these new methods and also the variety of applications.

Laurent Romary (Max Planck Digital Library) introduced 'Living Sources', a concept for a new type of data journal seeking to entice scientists to share their data by rewarding them with recognition. The first journal will publish lexical data. Emphasis is not only on the deposit of data, but

also upon their validation and contextualisation. Scientists must elaborate on the data presented by, for example, sharing model and method. On the other hand, there is a peer review process that allows reviewers to examine data, authors to respond and the community to comment post-publication. Sources are live in the sense of becoming publicly available; of being updated and expended and being commented upon in future by the community.

Roland Schild (MVB, German Association of Publishers and Booksellers) presented Libreka - Liber (Latin, book) and Eureka (Greek, "I have found it!"), which is a collaborative venture of publishers with the aim to provide full text books on the Internet. Publishers, however, fully control access rights and may opt to adjust this at any level, including from page to page. 360 publishing houses have sent more than 60,000 titles to Libreka for inclusion and Libreka aims to be the leading internet platform for the German digital book market. Book contents are fully searchable, but not necessarily accessible.

Dr. Thomas Kahlisch (German Central Library for the Blind) presented DAISY (Digitally Accessible Information System), which is an XML-based format for digital talking books. It allows users to navigate audio content from chapter to chapter or page to page or, even, from footnote to footnote. 200,000 DAISY titles are available worldwide already. Microsoft has begun supporting DAISY by developing open source software to increase functionality. Dr. Kahlisch pointed out the potential of DAISY by stating that it serves not only the blind, but also the visually impaired and, more generally, the rapidly growing number of elderly citizens worldwide that find it easier to listen than to read.

In the **closing keynote**, Prof. Dr. Rudi Schmiede (Darmstadt University of Technology) highlighted how the social shapes technology, but also how technology shapes social relations. In this vein he highlighted that present-day infrastructures are geared towards providing information on science and scholarship, but much less towards information services for scientists and scholars. Information infrastructures add to information overload, the intensification of work and the accountability mania without being an aid for scientific decision-making and scholarly judgement. He warned that the real issue might not be access (is it in a search engine?) but truth; that is, the truth-value of scientific information. On a pragmatic note, the speaker called for "embedded librarians" in faculty

and laboratories and the development of research information services.

The **closing panel Information in Science and Society** was chaired by Arnoud de Kemp (Electronic Publishing Working Group in Börsenverein). The panel consisted of Barbara Casalini (Managing Partner, Casalini Libri, Fiesole), Gary Coker (Director of R&D, MetaPress, Birmingham (USA)), Dr. Annette Holtkamp (Scientific Information Specialist, DESY, Hamburg), Dr. Elisabeth A.L. Mol (Editorial Director, Springer Science+Business Media, Dordrecht), Prof. Dr. Rudi Schmiede (Darmstadt University of Technology) and Dr. Ing. Herman P. Spruijt (Vice-President, International Publishers Association, Geneva). Firstly, panellists gave their impressions, noting the presence of the Humanities alongside STM, voicing the conviction that OA was here to stay, encouraging further dialogue between the proponents of subscription-based and open access business models and highlighting that preservation costs are gaining more attention. Secondly, in line with the idea that a good way of predicting the future is to shape, panellists stated that for APE 2009 they would like to see more emphasis on universities as players as well as a greater diversity of communities (e.g. chemists alongside physicists or economists alongside humanities scholars and junior scholars as well as undergraduate students). Of importance to the panellists was also the question of standards and interoperability, including the integration of resources into texts and repositories. Finally, a desire was expressed to investigate the consequences of top-level green mandates by funders such as NIH and the ERC.

Berlin, Göttingen, Heidelberg February/May 2008

---

Full Proceedings of the Conference APE 2008 will be published as a Special Open Access Issue of the Journal "Information Services & Use", IOS Press, Amsterdam. Almost all presentations can be downloaded from: [www.ape2008.eu](http://www.ape2008.eu)

Rapporteurs: Dr. Svenja Hagenhoff and Chris Armbruster

Coordination: Arnoud de Kemp, AKEP, Frankfurt am Main and digiprimo, Heidelberg

For correspondence: [info@ape2008.eu](mailto:info@ape2008.eu)



















**APE 2009** will be held 20-21 January 2009 in the Berlin-Brandenburg Academy of Sciences.

# < APE 2008

The International Conference “Academic Publishing in Europe”

## QUALITY & PUBLISHING

### Sponsors

European Commission, Research Directorate-General	
Akademische Verlagsgesellschaft Aka GmbH	
The Electronic Publishing Working Group (AKEP)	
ALPSP	
ARIES	
German Association of Publishers and Booksellers (Börsenverein)	
German Association of Information Theory and Practice (DGI)	
Ebsco Information Services	
Elsevier	
Federation of European Publishers (FEP)	
Frankfurt Book Fair	
International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions (IFLA)	
IOS Press	
IPA	
Klopotek & Partners	
Lightning Source	
MetaPress - Electronic Content Management and Hosting	
Royal Brill	
Springer Science + Business Media	
The International Association of Scientific, Technical and Medical Publishers (STM)	
Swets	
Taylor & Francis Group	