

オープンアクセス出版の動向

DRF, 宮崎大学附属図書館

市原 瑞基

2012/08/23

OAジャーナルとは


OAとは

査読済み論文に対する障壁なきアクセス

OAジャーナルとは

読者が購読料を支払うことなく、インターネットを通じて無料で利用できる雑誌

OAジャーナル数および論文数の推移




Laakso M, Welling P, Bukvova H, Nyman L, Björk B-C, et al. (2011) The Development of Open Access Journal Publishing from 1993 to 2009. PLoS ONE 6(6):e20961.

Figure 2. The development of open access publishing 1993–2009.

doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0020961.g002

分野別OAの割合



Björk B-C, Welling P, Laakso M, Majlender P, Hedlund T, et al. (2010) Open Access to the Scientific Journal Literature: Situation 2009. PLoS ONE 5(6): e11273.

Figure 4. OA availability by discipline.

doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0011273.g004

OAの5類型

類型	例
完全無料型	first Monday, D-Lib Magazine
著者支払い・読者無料型	PLoS, BioMed Central, NAR
ハイブリッド型	Springer, Wiley, Elsevier, APS,ACS
一定期間後無料公開型	HighWire Press
電子版のみ無料公開型	Hindawi、J-Stage

三根慎二, オープンアクセスジャーナルの現状(大学図書館研究v.80,2007)

APC（論文出版加工料）

- Article Processing Charge
- Article Processing Fees
- APC自体は従来から存在（ページチャージ、カラーチャージ等）
- 購読料に変わるOA誌の収益としてクローズアップ

OA誌出版社APC比較

Publisher	Journal	ドル換算
American Society for Clinical Investigation	Journal of Clinical Investigation	\$2500～
American Society for Microbiology	mBio	\$3000 ～
BioMed Central	Typical BioMed Central journal	\$1665-\$1905
BMJ Publishing Group	BMJ (flagship journal)	\$3,930
	BMJ Open	\$1,885
Co-Action Publishing	Co-Action Publishing	\$305 - \$1250～
Company of Biologists	Disease Models & Mechanisms (DMM) 、Biology Open	\$1965
Hindawi	Typical open access journal	\$300-\$1500
Journal of Medical Internet Research	Journal of Medical Internet Research	\$1900～
Nature Publishing Group	Molecular Systems Biology	\$3900 + \$900 publishing fee
	Scientific Reports	.\$1,350
Oxford University Press	Nucleic Acids Research	\$2770～
Public Library of Science	PLoS Biology, PLoS Medicine	\$2,900
	PLoS Pathogens, PLoS Computational Biology, PLoS Genetics, PLoS Neglected Tropical Diseases	\$2,250
	PLoS One	\$1,350
Sage Open		\$695
Springer	Typical SpringerOpen journal	\$645-\$1935
	SpringerPlus	\$1,085
Taylor & Francis	Taylor & Francis Open	\$995-\$1500
Wiley-Blackwell	Typical open access journals	\$1850-\$2500

BioMed Central, Comparison of BioMed Central's article-processing charges with those of other publishers

<http://www.biomedcentral.com/about/apccomparison>


ハイブリッド誌出版社APC比較 (OAchoice時)

Publisher	ドル換算
American Chemical Society*	\$3,000
American Physiological Society *	\$2000～
BMJ Unlocked	\$3,145
BRILL*	\$2800～
Cambridge University Press *	\$2700～
Cell Press	\$5,000
Elsevier*	\$3000-\$5000～
Journal of Neuroscience*	\$980～
Maney Publishing*	\$2000～
National Academy of Sciences*	\$1300～
Nature Publishing Group*	\$3000-\$5000
Oxford University Press*	\$3000～
Royal Society*	\$1932-\$2380
Sage*	\$3,000
Springer*	\$3000～
Taylor & Francis*	\$3,250
Wiley-Blackwell*	\$3,000

BioMed Central, Comparison of BioMed Central's article-processing charges with those of other publishers

<http://www.biomedcentral.com/about/apccomparison>

OA誌の収入源



The SOAP Symposium-I The Landscape of Open Access Publishing Today
 (SOAP Symposium, Berlin, 13 January 2011)

PLoS ONE

- 創刊日：2006年12月
- 出版者：PLoS
- 収入源
 - 助成金+APC → APCによる採算が可能に
- 分野：自然科学全域
- 査読方法
 - 科学的見地からみた適格性のみを評価
 - その論文のあたえる影響度（インパクト）は問わない。
 - 論文の価値はポストレビューで読者が決める。

OAMJ

- 独特の査読・編集工程により従来誌よりも素早く大量の研究論文を掲載
- 同種の特徴をもったジャーナルの創刊が他商業出版社，学協会からも相次いでいる

eLife

- 創刊日：2012年冬
- 出版者：eLife Sciences Publications, Ltd.
- 収入源
 - 助成金 HHMI, Max Planck Society, Wellcome Trust
 - APCは、当分の間、無料
- 分野：life science and biomedicine
- 査読方法
 - ピアレビューは論文の価値も重視し、最上級の論文を選別する。
 - 素早い査読
 - pLos的な論文(アクセス)解析ツールを用意(予定)
- 特徴
 - 生命科学分野の「一流」の論文のためのオープンアクセスジャーナルを目指す
 - 査読・編集プロセスには、研究者コミュニティが関与

eLifeに対する意見



SEARCH

Search

[Home](#) [About](#) [Archives](#) [Subscribe](#)

ADVERTISING, BUSINESS MODELS, MARKETING

Top-Tier Open Access Journal Arrives with Fanfare, Few Details

POSTED BY PHIL DAVIS · JUN 27, 2011 · 25 COMMENTS

FILED UNDER HOWARD HUGHES MEDICAL INSTITUTE, MAX PLANCK SOCIETY, OPEN ACCESS, OPEN ACCESS JOURNAL, WELLCOME TRUST

Accompanied with much fanfare, a media event, and an embargoed news release, the [Howard Hughes Medical Institute](#), the [Max Planck Society](#) and the [Wellcome Trust](#) announced plans today to launch a top-tier open access journal in 2012 for biomedical and life sciences research.

The journal, however, lacks a name, an editor-in-chief, and even a business model.

Still, the journal is intended to attract the “very best research” and “make highly significant contributions that will extend the boundaries of scientific knowledge.”

How they plan to do this is unclear. And the process by which articles are selected, vetted and published seems neither groundbreaking nor transformative. Indeed, the process very much resembles that of *BMJ Open*, with a few missing pieces:

The journal will employ an open and transparent peer review process in which papers will be accepted or rejected as rapidly as possible, generally with only one round of revisions, and with limited need for modifications or additional experiments. For transparency, reviewers’

[TWITTER](#) | [RSS](#) | [VIA EMAIL](#)

SIDE DISHES BY STEWART WILLS

- ▶ US News discovers the Open Access story. [usnews.com/news/articles/...](#) 10 hours ago
- ▶ 40 years ago last Saturday, George Carlin was arrested for performing his “seven words” monologue. [mediapost.com/publications/a...](#) 1 day ago
- ▶ Appalled but Not Surprised Dept: 0.001% of population controls \$9.8 trillion (yes, trillion) in wealth. [guardian.co.uk/business/2012/...](#) (RT @drs1969) 3 days ago

AUTHORS



FIND POSTS BY CATEGORY

Select Category

Follow

eLifeに対する意見1

- エディター-in-チーフ(編集責任者)により決定されたビジネスモデルのままでは、病院の経営をスタッフドクターに、飛行機の運転を航空技師のままにしておくようなものだ
- Leaving the “business model” to be determined by the editor-in-chief is like leaving the management of a hospital to a staff doctor and the operation of an airline to an aeronautical engineer—not necessarily the best way to get the best model!
- Posted by Sandy Thatcher | Jun 27, 2011, 2:05 pm
- The Scholarly Kitchen
<http://scholarlykitchen.sspnet.org/2011/06/27/top-tiered-open-access-journal-arrives-with-fanfare-few-details/>

eLifeに対する意見2

- ここに潜在的なビジネスモデルがある。もし、3助成団体からの資金援助を受けているなら、オープンアクセスでフリーで発表できるので、論文発表のためのコストを助成金に追加する必要はない。ジャーナルが赤字運営であったとしても、助成団体にとっては長期的には得だろう。
- Here's a potential business model. If you have research funding from HHMI, Max Planck or Wellcome trust, you can publish here open access and for free. That way we don't have to add publication costs to grants. Even if the journal itself runs at a loss, this would be cheaper for these grant bodies in the long run. Wouldn't it?
- Posted by Stephen Davey | Jun 27, 2011, 3:37 pm
- The Scholarly Kitchen
<http://scholarlykitchen.sspnet.org/2011/06/27/top-tiered-open-access-journal-arrives-with-fanfare-few-details/>

eLifeに対する意見3

- Scienceの記事によれば、このジャーナルは
 1. プロの編集者を雇わず、学術研究者を頼る
 2. 著者からの料金を「当分の間」とらない
 3. 査読者への支払いを考えているそうだ
- Details, details.
According to a [piece](#) in *Science*, the new journal:
 1. Will not employ professional editors, but rely on academic scientists
 2. Will not charge author fees “for several years”
 3. Is considering paying reviewers
- Posted by Phil Davis | Jun 27, 2011, 5:18 pm
- The Scholarly Kitchen
<http://scholarlykitchen.sspnet.org/2011/06/27/top-tiered-open-access-journal-arrives-with-fanfare-few-details/>

eLiifeに対する意見4

- このジャーナルは大いに出版風景を変革するポテンシャルをもっていることは疑いようがない。
- This journal has the makings of becoming a great success. The great funders will lend their prestige to it, which will attract the best authors. Not charging any of their grantees for article fees is likely to become a permanent feature, and it may become a journal mainly filled with HHMI, Wellcome Trust and Max Planck funded research. They may even outsource the mechanics to a 'traditional' publisher, for an agreed service fee. But that this journal has the potential to change the publishing landscape materially is beyond doubt. I have a suggestion for a title: JONAS (Journal Of Nature And Science). They could even present that as an homage to the great Jonas Salk.
- Posted by Jan Velterop | Jun 28, 2011, 2:04 am
- The Scholarly Kitchen
<http://scholarlykitchen.sspnet.org/2011/06/27/top-tiered-open-access-journal-arrives-with-fanfare-few-details/>

eLifeに対する意見5

- エディターとレビューワーに対価が支払われるということは重要だ。これまで、学術出版は、学術コミュニティが無償で価値を付与していた
- An important part of the plan is that editors and reviewers will be paid. Science publishing has been so profitable because all the value is added by the academic community, usually without payment. Elsevier and other publishers, including societies, are subsidised to a huge extent by universities and funders. It's time to end that.
- Posted by Richard Smith | Jun 28, 2011, 9:42 am
- The Scholarly Kitchen
<http://scholarlykitchen.sspnet.org/2011/06/27/top-tiered-open-access-journal-arrives-with-fanfare-few-details/>

eLifeに対する意見6

- 少なくとも短期的・中期的には料金を著者から徴収しないというこれらの決定は、論文あたり何千ドルというauthor feeを課している、PLoSやBioMed Centralのような、経済的に成功したOA publishingを弱体化させることにより、OA出版を事実上後退させる。
- Declan Butler posts a [very good critique of the press event](#), and highlights a lack of clarity in the details and apparent contradictions in the promises made. He also points out how the new journal—offered for several years without author-side fees—may undermine some of the successful ventures to date:

[Their] decision not to charge author fees, at least in the journal's short and medium term, in fact could risk setting back the cause of open-access publishing by undermining — through what might be considered unfair competition — economically successful open access publishers such as PLoS and Biomed Central, which charge author fees often in the region of thousands of dollars per article. High profile initiatives are all very well, but if scientific publishing is to be improved, it requires business models proven to be both workable (and scalable, so to be of relevance of science publishing more generally), and firm evidence that the proposed untested and unproven model is better (and not worse) than the existing system, and also tangibly solves real problems.

- Posted by Phil Davis | Jun 28, 2011, 7:05 pm
- The Scholarly Kitchen <http://scholarlykitchen.sspnet.org/2011/06/27/top-tiered-open-access-journal-arrives-with-fanfare-few-details/>

eLifeに対する意見7

- IFは助成団体にとってもメジャーな指標だと思われるが、同等の価値を持つNature掲載論文とeLife掲載論文は同等とみなされるのか？
- The Impact Factor of the journal you publish in is still seen as a major factor by grant reviewers and granting organisations, including these three. If a decision on a grant is being made by one of these three institutions, will a publication in their own new journal ‘count’ the same as a paper in Nature or Science – after all the grantors’ ambition is to publish only the best science, so wouldn’t it make sense to trust the value of their own journal? Say, one of these 3 organisations has to decide between two grant applications; let’s assume, everything else being equal, one applicant has 2 papers in Nature, the other 2 papers in the new OA journal. Who will get the grant? Will a publication in the new journal be regarded the same as publications in any other new, ambitious journal without IF?
- Posted by Hans Zauner | Jun 29, 2011, 7:39 am
- The Scholarly Kitchen
<http://scholarlykitchen.sspnet.org/2011/06/27/top-tiered-open-access-journal-arrives-with-fanfare-few-details/>

eLifeに対する意見8

- 「科学出版業界の最高峰となり、NatureやScienceにとっての目に見える目立った競争相手となろうというものだ。これは決してそれらの雑誌を締め出そうとする戦争ではない、出版社がすべき最良のことは、その出版モデルを変えることだ」
- "The idea is that that will take on the very top end of the scientific publishing industry, a visible high-profile competitor to Nature and Science," said Walport. "In no sense is this a war in which we're trying to put them out of business, the thing that would be best for them [publishers] to do is to change their publishing model."
- Walport. Guardian, 9 April 2012
<http://www.guardian.co.uk/science/2012/apr/09/wellcome-trust-academic-spring>

まとめ

- ビッグディール契約の購読規模維持が困難
- ビジネスモデルの転換、OA誌の増加
- 購読料モデルと競争できるOA誌
 - 研究者の求めるジャーナル
 - 質の高さ
 - 素早い査読
 - 投稿料の安さ
 - 持続可能性