

Political science  
Open access scientific publishing

This article is more than 7 years old

# Elsevier are corrupting open science in Europe

Jon Tennant

Fri 29 Jun 2018 17:00 CEST

Elsevier - one of the largest and most notorious scholarly publishers - are monitoring Open Science in the EU on behalf of the European Commission. **Jon Tennant** argues that they cannot be trusted.



Carlos Moedas, European Commissioner for Research, Innovation and Science, is a fan of open science. Can the big science publishers be trusted to help him? Photograph: Emmanuel Dunand/AFP/Getty Images

Open Science is all about making science work better so that it can address the world's challenges. It has been at the top of the EU's agenda for some time. The **European Commission has the ambitious target of achieving Open Access to all scientific publications by 2020**. The development of the **European Open Science Cloud** and **Open Science Policy Platform** indicate that Open Science has entered the mainstream, shifting the process and governance of scholarly communication.


Now, the **European Commission have launched an Open Science Monitor to help provide data on the development of Open Science in Europe**. To their credit, the Commission have been relatively transparent about **the methods and data sources** used for this and who is involved. They are also inviting **comments** to improve the indicators.

However, a cursory glance at the methodological note reveals something rather odd. **The subcontractor for the monitor is Elsevier**, the publisher and data analytics provider. Within scholarly communications, Elsevier has perhaps the single worst reputation. With **profit margins around 37%, larger than Apple and big oil companies**, Elsevier dominate the publishing landscape by selling research back to the same institutes that carried out the work.

Most viewed



We face but new children as stars



New ph highlighted Epstein

It gets worse too. Throughout the methods, you can see that **there is an overwhelming bias towards Elsevier products and services, such as Scopus, Mendeley, and Plum Analytics**. These services provide metrics for researchers such as citation counts and social media shares, as well as data-sharing and networking platforms. There are now dozens of comments in the note pointing out the clear bias towards Elsevier and the overlooking of alternatives.

It is worth highlighting some of the key issues here that the Commission seems to have ignored in subcontracting to Elsevier.

First, **Elsevier has a notorious history of campaigning against openness in order to protect its paywall-based business**. In 2004, they submitted **evidence** to the UK House of Commons Science and Technology Select Committee on what they saw as the risks associated with Open Access such as threats to scientific integrity and research quality. In 2007, they were **part of a PR campaign** that connected Open Access to government censorship while lobbying the US Congress. In the USA, **Elsevier supported a range of anti-open bills, including the Research Works Act (RWA), for which they made numerous financial contributions to members of the House of Representatives**. All of this has stifled the growth of public access to knowledge and slowed the advance of Open Science, benefiting nobody except Elsevier.

Second, many EU member states are currently turning against Elsevier due to its anti-open business practices, high and ever-increasing prices, and dangerously powerful size as a commercial publisher. **Research institutes are typically prevented from disclosing details of their 'big deal' subscriptions with Elsevier**, as this would place downward pressure on journal prices. **This profoundly anti-competitive practice has created a dysfunctional scholarly publishing market, and a budget crisis for university libraries**. We are seeing national boycotts of Elsevier and rejection of Elsevier journal bundles. Just recently, **Swedish** and **German** research institutes announced that they were cancelling all Elsevier subscriptions due to concerns about sustainability, unfair pricing arrangements and a general lack of value.

If this wasn't bad enough, the conflict of interest of having an organisation that stands to benefit from the monitor by using its own services is so blindingly apparent that you have to wonder why Elsevier were subcontracted in the first place. **How is it reasonable for a multi-billion dollar publishing corporation to not only produce metrics that evaluate publishing impact, but also to use them to monitor Open Science and help to define its future direction?** Elsevier will be providing data through the monitor that will be used to help facilitate future policy making in the EU that it inevitably will benefit from. **That's like having McDonald's monitor the eating habits of a nation and then using that to guide policy decisions.**

Consider Elsevier's CiteScore metric, a measure of the apparent impact of journals that competes with the impact factor based on citation data from Scopus. An **independent analysis** showed that titles owned by Springer Nature, perhaps Elsevier's biggest competitor, scored 40% lower and Elsevier titles 25% higher when using CiteScore rather than previous journal impact factors.

Bianca Kramer, a librarian at Utrecht University, **commented that the monitor should "only include indicators that are themselves open, so data can be reused and results can be reproduced."** This is a fundamental part of **responsible metrics** and begs the question of **why closed databases like Scopus feature so prominently**.


With so many glaring issues, we should ask why the European Commission allowed this. It seems like a profoundly undemocratic practice to have a company with such an anti-open history now with such a powerful position in the future of Open Science in Europe. The risk here is that by using Elsevier services for such a crucial task, it creates a perverse incentive for researchers to use those services, and thus become dependent on them. This very real issue became apparent last week when Mendeley **encrypted its**



French  
sue righ  
comme  
Owens



US judg  
admini  
unseal  
transcr



Tour de  
backlas  
wins st

**databases**, making it more difficult for users to access even their own data. Researchers could become trapped in a relationship with Elsevier in which they are the service and content providers, the product and the consumer.

It is a cruel irony that Elsevier are to be paid to monitor the very system that they have historically fought against. **The European Commission should remove Elsevier as sub-contractor and look into better options such as an independent group with no conflicts of interest. It is time to stand up to these ruthless mega-corporations before they corrupt Open Science.**

---

### **We know, we know, we know ...**

Seeing these messages is annoying. We know that. (Imagine what it's like writing them ... )

But it's also extremely important. One of the Guardian's greatest assets is its reader-funded model.

**1. Reader funding means we can cover what we like.** We're not beholden to the political whims of a billionaire owner. No one can tell us what not to say or what not to report.

**2. Reader funding means we don't have to chase clicks and traffic.** We're not desperately seeking your attention for its own sake: we pursue the stories that our editorial team deems important, and believe are worthy of your time.

**3. Reader funding means we can keep our website open,** allowing as many people as possible to read quality journalism from around the world -

especially people who live in places where the free press is in peril.

The support of readers like you in France keeps all that possible. At the moment, just 2.4% of our regular readers help fund our work. If you want to protect independent journalism, please consider joining them today.

**We value whatever you can spare, but supporting on a monthly basis makes the most impact, enabling greater investment in our most crucial, fearless journalism. As our thanks to you, we can offer you some great benefits. (Including making these messages go away.) We've made it very quick to set up, so we hope you'll consider it. Thank you.**

Support €4/monthly

**Support €12/monthly**

Unlock **All-access digital** benefits:

- ✔ Far fewer asks for support
- ✔ Ad-free reading on all your devices
- ✔ Unlimited access to the premium Guardian app
- ✔ Exclusive newsletter for supporters, sent every week from the Guardian newsroom
- ✔ Unlimited access to the Guardian Feast app

Support with another amount

Continue →

Remind me in September



### Political science

Why is populism suddenly all the rage?

20 Nov 2018



From diet pills to driverless cars: why we need to debate the politics of science and technology

3 Sep 2018 34




A no-deal Brexit will betray British science

28 Aug 2018 1,369



Is UK science innovation climate change?

16 Jul 2018



### More from Opinion

British ministers are betting they won't face justice for complicity over Gaza. It's a big risk to take

5h ago



Well done the Lionesses on reaching the final, but not taking the knee was a gift to the racists

7h ago



So Ellen has fled Trump's US for a 'simpler' life in the Cotswolds. Nice if you have the money, don't you think?

4h ago



Want to toxic chemical Britain with scrutiny? I go right ahead

16h ago 807



### Most viewed