**Appendix 3 – Free text responses**

**CORNELL**

**Overall, do you have any opinions or feelings about the model of Open Access publishing that supports journals by the model of charging contributors author fees?**

Until funding agencies truly support it and don't ding proposals that are more expensive because of including such funding (usually only the total amount of the proposal is looked at when considering if it is "too expensive") I don't see how authors can move forward with this.

It is a very good model if the cost does not have to come from research funds, which are getting more difficult to obtain.

I WANT to publish Open Access. But invariably the paper is published after the termination of the external funds. In a real-world case that troubles me this very week, I do not have a cash source to cover the $1200 assessed by a Journal that offers Open Access option, if and only if I also pay all the mandatory and voluntary pages charges (which total another >$2000). Were it not for lacking funds, I would always publish open access. Given reality of funding, I do not.

OA journals are still developing in my field (orthopedics) and are not the most prestigious, but I support them in general

I have strong opinions. I find the fees charged by Springer to allow Open Access to be exorbitant, and feel strongly that we should not pay them. Fortunately, we have many OA journals in CS that do not charge author fees. I am not opposed to \*reasonable\* author fees, although there is clearly a debate as to what constitutes "reasonable".

The idea is good in principle, but we should be careful not to lose the funding stream currently contributed to scientific publishing by libraries. Also, Astronomical Journal (AJ) and Astrophysical Journal (ApJ) are not technically open access, but they have hefty page charges and make their content open access after two years; I would have answered "yes" to most questions on this survey if AJ and ApJ were under discussion.

no. It sounds good, as long as the fees aren't too high.

I prefer it. It simply isn't the dominant paradigm in Astronomy yet. Of greater concern is that the journals are run BY astronomers, instead of the many fly-by-night open access publishers which have sprung up like mushrooms.

no opinion

What remains to be seen is if we receive the same kind of credentialing from such publications. Given that tensure review committees even look at impact factors and the level of reputation of the journal, I think open access publication would be a waste of time with no career benefit..,

The Open Access articles I have read have been quite poor. I think this is indicative of a poor refereeing process and low quality standards. If you're willing to pay, these journals will publish anything, and I am quite negative about them.

I am not convinced by the vertues of that model

I mostly publish in open access journals that do not charge fees to anyone, and I post all of my articles to arxiv.org making a lot of this irrelevant.

I think there are a lot of strong arguments for this approach.

In its current state in mathematics it is dreadful.

No

Sounds great

As currently runnning not going to be sucesful as too many auhtors have no source of funds.

I do not like it. I try to publish on journals that are both open (freely available electronically) and do not charge author fees. There are a few if those in mathematics.

In the instance of mathematics, where Forum of Mathematics is the first top-class journal to try this, it seems a thoughtful attempt to address the problem of journal costs. It is controversial, but I think it's worth a try.

Two problems: (1) No agency that I know of has increased average grant size to accommodate OA fees--thus I either do less work or publish in traditional journals. (2) The market model where the provider pays for the product to be distributed has a negative quality incentive.

nice idea if the costs are not too high

I don't like that model

Open Access publishing is irrelevant in my field since everyone also puts their papers on arXiv.

I support full open access journals that rely on author fees but not a journal that still has subscription fees and requires authors to pay to make an article open access.

I like the model, but ultimately make decisions about where to send work based more on the scope and appropriateness of the journal.

I prefer the NIH policy whereby journals are required to allow access to articles free within 12 months of publication. It is silly for authors to be charged so much for a publication process that they largely have to complete themselves AND must serve as peer reviewers of. That being said, the business model of open access journals appears to be to accumulate as many manuscript publication fees as possible, thus clouding the impact of the journal.

Everyone charges fees anyway

I don't particularly like most of them---I feel that the review process in many of them is not up to the level i would like to see--it seems to me a process like a politician buying votes and driven by trying to obtain the highest citation index withopiut regard to real quality or lasting influence

I think the traditional publishing model, which splits the costs is more fair. However, open access may be good for teaching institutions that primarily read research rather than creating it.

I am uncomfortable with the model. The stress should be on journals accepting and printing articles their readers want to see, not articles that the authors are willing to pay to have published.

Understandable

It is a good idea; wider readership.

That is one direction. Another would be for the publishing society to pay the fees.

Yes, it is a dissapointing and horrible model. You say in the explanation for "Open Access" - "Many authors are attracted to this model of publication, even though it means added costs for them, because it makes their work accessible to others for free." This is just not true, since we can make the work accessible just by placing them on arXiv (which is also supported by the Cornell library). It is very discriminating and ridiculous that the same researchers who are toiling day and night are also made to pay for their own articles, especially in the current funds crunch situation with sequestration etc., when it is they who are adding value to the system. Open Access is not a viable model. How can you forget individual paper authors who do not have grants? How will they pay for Open Access? The journal publication model is skewed, especially when the most important part, that of peer review, is free and voluntary. Also, Open Access model is leading to innumerable fraudulent journals whose emails spam my inbox everyday. These unscrupulous journals would die naturally if the OA model was abolished.

I would support it if I could be sure of having the funds, either through Cornell or my own grants

for me it really depends more on the ranking of the journal rather than the fees.

research funds are hard to get these days; the cost of open access detracts from other more necessary expenses, such as student support and lab equipment.

It transfers the cost of publication from the readers to the writers. Major universities will bear the costs. I'm concerned that these fees will not support this access for the long term. This concern transfers to all electronic-only outlets.

**Would you recommend publication in Open Access journals to a colleague and/or student? If so or if not, for what reasons?**

Depends on the journal and who pays.

yes

I recommend for all reasons except financial feasibility. Literally it may mean paying these fees out of one's own personal bank account, if NSF or my employer does not have funds available to offer me AFTER a project terminates.

Key advantage: the student might get more citations because the article is OA; key disadvantage: no OA journals in my field are very prestigious

I believe in OA. Whether it makes sense depends on what is available in the subarea of CS where my colleague may want to publish.

Currently, none of the high-impact journals in my field are fully Open Access. Aiming for high-impact journals means that the answer to this question is "no," but not for any reason that is specifically about Open Access.

Yes. Open access is a clear advantage. If the fees were too high though, then it would be prohibitive.

Yes -- when ones become available that are organized and controlled by astronomers instead of a for-profit publishing house.

don't know

Yes

See previous answer

I would not. I think the incentives are all wrong for the authors and the publishers, and I think this model will collapse.

no

Neither. If the journal is good and charges reasonable fees that's the way a particular field works.

Yes.

No. At present all of the journals are not ver good. Also, the arrive dramatically reduces the value of having your work freely available.

Many factors impact a decision on where to publish a paper; Open Access is just one.

Yes, it's the right way to promulgate science

No as above.

No. Authors do all the work of writing, editing and refereeing. It is outrageous that we are asked to pay for publishing on top.

Yes. See my response to the last question.

If an OA journal is of high quality, then I would be happy to publish there!

see above.

No

Open access journals are irrelevant in view of arXiv.

Yes if the journal was inline with their area of research. I believe freely available articles will receive more readership.

Yes, if the journal is a good fit for the work in terms of scope and quality. The free access for the open access journal is a bonus. The page charges for subscription journals are sometimes higher than for open access, so the cost is not really the issue.

No, usually for the cost and the alternative of NIH supported open access.

Yes

Sure.

Reluctant to do so.

Yes

Yes...but this is highly dependent on the journal and their editorial board.

No. The reasons are detailed in my previous reply. Researchers already have a tough funding situation due to sequestration and budget cuts, and why would a researcher pay for publishing his own articles, especially when peer review is completely voluntary and free? Just ban journals like Elsevier and Springer-Verlag.

yes

depends on journal ranking

I would not recommend it for the reason given in the answer to the previous question.

No, especially for students. I don't think these outlets will stand the test of time.

**SYRACUSE**

**Overall, do you have any opinions or feelings about the model of Open Access publishing that supports journals by the model of charging contributors author fees?**

I don't know enough details of how much is paid for standard journal access. Overall is Open Access cheaper to a department? All of my papers are available on ArXiv.org as well as a pay-access journal.

I will not publish in, review for, or otherwise cooperate with journals that charge author fees.

They would not work well for Mathematics. To maintain quality refereeing process and being very selective are important.

no

The authors should never pay any fees for their work. Publishers make money, so should pay, and publish only good results.

I do not support this

The great advantage is that the work is available to anyone

No I don't have a clear idea

Mathematicians look upon such things very skeptically. We think of our discipline as independent of money -- no page fees, no consulting fees.

If the journal is peer-reviewed, this is not that different from page fees that have long been charged by traditional subscription journals

no

Open access is an effective and fast communication of new findings. However, charge of $3000 or more is ridiculous. It should be free.

Since preprints of published papers in my field are almost universally available through arXiv.org, Open Access publishing is not so significant

Like everything else, it has both advantages and disadvantages; it all comesdown to the impact factor. If a journal like science starts to charge author fees, I am sure almost all of us will we willing to pay up.

Probably a bad idea.

It really depends on the journal. Some of the Open Access journals are more exploitive than many traditional publishers.

At this moment, I do not have any intention to publish articles in journals that charge a fee. I may be wrong, but my fieeling is such journals are usually less reputable.

I think it's an interesting and different model from the current. I'm not sure of the scale these fees run at, but if it weren't prohibitive, I like the idea that I can pay the fee once and then anyone can access my paper.

No

I am opposed to charging contributors author fees.

no

It is no good, reducing science to be a commerical product, when many significance science do not assciate with low end immediate applications.

Open access journals like PLoS One have a place in that they get controversial data into the public domain when other journals may not be as receptive. It is unfortunate that we, as authors, have to pay to get our data published.

I dont like it.

It will reduce the quality of scientific work. I do not like the idea.

I am OK with the model as long as the fee is within a reasonable range.

It's a research expense that should be covered by the funding agency or, if that is impossible, by the Department or the University.

The fact is that in a time of declining funding there is no chance that grants will be increased to cover this. Furthermore, most of the oppen access journals that solicit for papers are clerarly of low quality and are only interested in making a profit from this model. My own resaarch is already available for free to the public on the arXiv so there is rationale for mocving away from the traditional funding model for publishing

Journals that offer Open Access often are not top quality journals

I did submit articles to OA journals but the fees were optional and I did not pay them. Between OA journals and closed access journals, both charging fees, I would still choose OA.

no

no

I think a moderate fee is OK.

I thing open access is very good. I often have difficulty navigating through non open access literature.

It's quite reasonable - in a way it's like the old AIP model, which we were able to cope with for journals like Journal of Chemical Physics.

In Physics, reputable professional societies keep strong journals going at a low cost to authors. Articles are effectively open access, as physicists post their work on arXiv.org and can post pdf's of your own published papers on your own web page.

Worry about credibility of these journals, especially those that ask for fees - can anyone publish anything there if they pay the fee? Same concern with susbsciption journals that have a page fee.

Would you recommend publication in Open Access journals to junior colleagues and/or students? If so or if not, for what reasons?

Not at the moment. In my field there is no Open Access journal with sufficient impact factor. The exception is physical review X, but there you must demonstrate inter-disciplinary work.

No. If the journal charges author fees, their commercial interest dictates accepting papers of whatever quality. Publication in such a journal would not be of much benefit to the career of a student, or of a junior mathematician.

No, for the above metioned reasons.

no

No. Sudents and young scholars are able to produce good enough results to be published (without fee), publishers benefit from them as well.

yes this is the way of the future

It is probably not well advised to publish only in open access journals as many of them have still low impact factors

I would recommend based on the merits of the published article

No, since they are prohibitively expensive, there are other, better, options, and the ArXiv lets us post our preprints freely anyway.

Yes, because the greatest value of publishing is for your work to be known by as many people as possible. Open Access promises the greatest accessiblity to readers.

No, why pay high price for the benefits of the publishers when we have no-fee alternative.

While Open Access is laudable, given the arXiv I would advise junior colleagues against paying Open Access fees

It again depends on the Journal's impact factor.

As a start it might help them, but eventually they should published in profesionally refereed journals

It would depend on the journal.

Not at the moment because (1) it portrays the notion that only the rich can publish, and (2) all reputable journals in my field that I know of are not open access journals.

Perhaps. It would depend on the fee scale, the journal ranking/reputation, other opportunities for publishing, etc.

No

Not if they have to pay to publish.

Not sure

No, there are many journals out there already. Many old journals should be fine. The new journals are often political products to promote the editors or commerical products to make money.

It depends on the nature of the study and funds available. Many journals give you the choice, open or not. Open requires a substantial fee that with all thing being equal I will not pay. If money was available from SU or elsewhere, I would publish open access. But where is that money going to come from?

No.

Not sure

Yes because papers in open access journals can reach more reach more readers, which usually means more citations and higher impact

Depends on the journal...

no. see my last comments.

no

We go with the flow in our field. Recently this has been OA journals.

no. As far as I know, most open access journals in chemistry do not rank very highly in prestige/impact.

It depends upon the journal.

Yes. these open access journals will have you and your research heard. Also, they give a chance for people who do not have luxury access of many paid journals.

Yes.

Yes

yes - assuming the refereeing was of good quality and the jourjnal was widely read

No. Good low cost options are available that are effectively open access.

No. Lack credibility. I see them as a last resort to get a paper published.