



Working Group to assess publishing during Horizon Europe – Part II

Friday 3rd December 2021 (14:00-16:00 CEST)

Summary

Participants: Evelyn Granata Lubac (Observer), Egbert Westerhof, Egidijus Urbonavičius, Kinga Gal, Klaus Hesch, Paolo Ricci, Robert Wolf, Mihaela Ionescu-Bujor, Yevgen Kazakhov, Frédéric Imbeaux, Rolandas Urbonas, Silvano Tosti

K Gal shared the information she received since the last meeting:

1. Open Research Europe platform is not available for Euratom research and training program participants yet, only for Horizon 2020 and Horizon Europe participants. Euratom is not part, but only an associated program to Horizon 2020/Europe. E Granata Lubac has clarified this question within the EC and informed us, that the platform should be available for EUROfusion authors in middle of 2022.

2. K Gal has participated at [PSB Spotlight "Publishing & Open Science"](#) at a meeting organized by the ESFR librarians on open access. The executive director of Coalition S, Johan Rooryck, who was one of the guest of the meeting has suggested the authors to always ask the publishers to publish the articles under the CC-BY license. He claimed publishers allow this. K Gal asked about the experience with this licence and the answer she got was that the licence has been already used 500 times. This very little. Later on she clarified with Sophy Le Masurier (IAEA -NF) that this is not possible for IOP journals. This hints that the plan S requirements are not applicable for our community in their present form.

from Me to Everyone

Thank you. Do you have any statistics in how many cases is the cc by licence accepted by the publishers?

02:26

from Johan Rooryck to Everyone

"Thank you. Do you have any statistics in how many cases is the cc by licence accepted by the publishers?" We know that the RRS language with the CC BY statement has already been used 500x by authors. Like I said, the publishers rarely refuse the CC BY statement, they just put pressure on the authors to move to a journal with an APC, or force them to sign an additional contract that contradicts their funder agreement. This does not happen very often yet, though, and it is too early to have proper statistics. But we do monitor the situation closely, and are considering measures to reinforce the Rights Retention Strategy with CC BY claimed on the AAM.

02:38

3. As the first meeting of the working group revealed, Nuclear Fusion journal is extremely relevant for the community. This is a hybrid journal, but not a commercial one. The EC has suggested to split the journal in two, therefore K Gal connected Sophy Le Masurier, the NF responsible from IAEA side to asses this possibility. NF has assessed the possibility, but they do not favour it, because it is not plan S compliant and furthermore one of the journals would start



without impact factor and it would only slightly related to the old journal the authors are used to. NF is hoping to finish the transformative agreements up to end of next year and hoping to comply with the requirements of the EC. Furthermore, IAEA is open for discussion with the major stakeholders of the journal to solve this problem.

The meeting continued with the discussion of the long term publishing solution (short term solution was already proposed earlier.)

Following the suggestion of E. Westerhof the group assessed the journals one could publish in line with the [MGA, the Model Grant Agreement](#). Those are:

I. Journals accepted by the community:

- US journals (hybrid journals, green open access):
 - Physics of Plasmas (AIP)
 - Review of Scientific Instruments (AIP)
 - IEEE journals
- European journals (gold open access):
 - New journal of physics (IOP)
 - Nuclear materials and energy (Elsevier)
 - ?EPJ Web of Science (Free of charge)

The working group suggests to continue to publish in those journals.

II. Journals suspected to be “predatory” (gold open access):

- Mainly MDPI journals

The working group is not encouraging EUROfusion authors to publish in such journals because:

- they have a very aggressive policy in searching editors, reviewers (e.g. the standard and effort put into the selection of suitable experts as reviewers is not comparable to established journals)
- the editorial boards are misleading: high level experts are not involved in the publication process, they are only included in the editorial board to attract authors
- the editors are not prepared (they have difficulties to find referees, because they do not know the community)
- the time allocated for review is extremely short, only PhD students will accept such requests, which does not guarantee the quality

Note:

1) ORE is not available yet, therefore it was not assessed by the working group yet



2) Most American journals comply with MGA (AIP journals: Physics of Plasmas, Review of Scientific Instruments, IEEE journals); for PRL and other [APS](#) journals the situation is not fully clear authors can post the “printed version” of the papers on their website and in a free of charge institutional repository, but it is not clear when.

3) If an institute has funds, which allows to pay gold open access charges in hybrid journals, the beneficiary can comply with the 0 embargo, if he pays these gold open access charges. This is not a very good solution as it creates inequality between different beneficiaries and also costs can be very high. S. Tosti has drawn the attention that special care has to be taken that the grants include funds for gold open access.

Following a suggestion of R. Wolf the group analyzed the possibility of doing pioneering work by taking steps toward free of charge as well as embargo free open access. In order to take step in this direction, the funding agencies need to change their policy. The conclusion was that the fusion community is simply too small to play a decisive role in changing the mentality and grant awarding systems of the funders. However, national scientific societies such as the German Physical Society are also taking steps in this direction. F. Imbeaux noticed that the community is small, therefore it should be flexible and we should make use of this flexibility. In any case, a change of publication habits, procedures and policies will take time and, therefore cannot be relied on for providing short term solutions.

Owing the fact that the publishers and EC policy are contradicting at the moment we have two possibilities for hybrid journals (except NF). It is worth to mention here, that EUROfusion regularly collects the peer reviewed manuscripts in order to comply with the open access requirement. Those manuscripts are made public after the publisher’s embargo expired. In this light the two options are:

1. Despite the embargo requirement of the publisher we make open the works without embargo and take the risk. K. Gal has noted that in some countries the rights protecting intellectual property are so strong, that the publishers have a very weak position to take action in such cases. On the other hand, this would also mean that the risks for different beneficiaries are different. The risk assessment can only be done by IP right experts.
2. Convince the EC that our options to publish are quite limited, if we wish to respect the MGA and we will not be able to publish enough papers in journal accepted by the community and/or by the funders. This would be quite a large damage. In this light we



would ask the EC to acknowledge, that EUROfusion is only half way following the rules, in the sense that the peer reviewed manuscripts are collected regularly, not long after publication.

NOTE: During Horizon 2020 EC was planning to check the fulfilment of the open access requirements only at the end of the grant. If this the similar method is planned for Horizon Europe, then only the papers published in the last 2 years of the grant will not be out of embargo, which means, that in worst case scenario only 5/7 part of the papers will comply with the open access requirement at the end of the grant. Under those conditions, which do not mean compliance on publishing, but only at the end of the grant, EUROfusion can comply with the open access requirement at least ~70%. In reality this could even mean 85-90% compliance because many journals have shorter embargoes and some beneficiaries have special agreements with the publishers allowing them to follow the MGA requirements.

The working group discussed the option to set up our own publishing system/platform. The cost of this option should be assessed including manpower, IT etc. Y Kazakhov warned that the hidden costs could be so high, that it is not worth the effort. A certain amount of time is also necessary to establish a strong reputation of the platform, which is necessary to attract the publications from the community. An option could be to use ORE when it becomes available and set up a subsystem there.

In conclusion the Working Group suggests to the GA:

1) Short term solution:

As most of the papers include studies which contain results from FP8 and one can use FP8 funds to pay the papers –mainly NF page charges-, PMU should centrally pay the papers as previously. For open access EUROfusion should follow green open access as for FP8 papers. For solely FP9 papers one should handle the situation on case by case basis.

2) Long term solution:

Nuclear Fusion: the journal is very relevant for the community, therefore effort should be invested in order to keep the journal. This effort should be coordinated at the level of the EC and IAEA. Both institutions are open to trigger the discussions.



Hybrid journals, with non-zero embargo: the situation is quite difficult, and two far from ideal options are at hand:

- 1) Do not respect the embargo and comply with the requests of the EC, however this could be a high-risk option from a legal point of view
- 2) Try to negotiate with the EC, that the EUROfusion community will comply with the collection and storage of the manuscripts on publication, but will only open them after 12, max 24 month embargo. This agreement should hold preferably up to the end of the grant, but nonetheless up to 2024, as Plan-S requires. Special attention should be dedicated to Fusion Engineering and Design and other Elsevier journals, because Elsevier is not planning to include the fusion related journals among the journals with transformative status.

During the negotiations, the EC should be informed that the publishers relevant for the fusion community, are not accepting to publish under the CC-BY license as Plan-S is suggesting/requiring. Furthermore, this license was only used by ~500 times which is negligible compared to the size of the whole European scientific community.

Open Research Europe

When ORE becomes available some test submissions should be performed. The assessment of this system can only be done after the platform has been made available to EUROfusion.