## La ciencia como bien común:

una otra mirada

1







At the end of this book, one can read:

Reverently made for universal free distribution by Wang Jie on behalf of his two parents on the 15th of the 4th moon of the 9th year of Xiantong [11 May 868].



## However, as Reggie Raju and Jill Claassen have argued\*, after 20 years of OA, a sense of **betrayal** dominates.

## In their words, **purpose has been replaced by process**.

\*"Open Access. From Hope to Betrayal", *College and Research Libraries News*, v. 83, n. 4 (April 2022), 161-5. https://doi.org/10.5860/crln.83.4.161





Two main questions try to respond to the sense of frustration and even betrayal just quoted:

Why should we privilege a diamond option?

What form should diamond publishing take?

To begin:

No solution other than diamond can make Open Access fair to all

Fair to all the readers Fair to the researchers-as-authors



## What happened to create the present problems?



First came the economics of scientific publishing.

But note that the market form of scientific publishing emerged recently, becoming visible only in the 1970s;

Increasingly, it is posing problems to the scientific research process itself.



Beside its market commercialization, Scientific publishing was deeply impacted by the digital revolution and the Internet.

The two processes are now entangled.

In the words of historian Aileen Fyfe,

"Journal publishers who were willing to look to an international English-speaking market, rather than a national one, and to focus their efforts on institutions, rather than individuals, discovered that it was possible to make journal publishing commercially successful in a way that had been unimaginable 50 years earlier."\*

\*Aileen Fyfe, From Philanthropy to Business: The Economics of Royal Society Journal Publishing in the Twentieth Century", 10 *Notes and Records of the Royal Society*, doi:10.1098/rsnr.2022.0021.



What Aileen Fyfe's calls a "national market" Is really a national audience

Before 1960s, most journals were largely indifferent to markets. They sought various forms of subsidies

But what kind of market?



A market is created by resting on rules of competition.

Journals were the merchandise, but they had to be changed and adapted to a new competition.

They had to become instruments of prestige, a brand.

The management of citation chasing through the algorithm of the impact factor achieves this goal.

And pricing could reflect a degree of prestige.

The price of journals rose dramatically.



However, treating scientific results in terms of citation visibility can (and does)distort the process of knowledge production.

It deeply changes incentives. The steep rises in prices create deeper inequalities, Both within countries and between countries.



Furthermore, citation bias exists, and is well documented.

## For example:

"...the impact factor of the original publishing journal, not the methodology or quality of the research, was the strongest predictor of citations per year."\*

\* M. Callaham, R. L. Wears, E. Weber, "Journal Prestige, Publication Bias, and Other Characteristics Associated With Citation of Published Studies in Peer-Reviewed Journals", *JAMA*, vol. 287 No 21 (Je 5, 2002), 2849.



The market philosophy of scientific publishing is readily opposed to Redalyc's slogan:

## la ciencia que no se ve en una revista prestigiosa no existe.

A prestigious journal, of course, is a journal with a high IF.

Science always harboured elites, but now elitism has become the rule



The market commercialization of scientific journals has also intensified competition at all levels, from individuals to institutions up to countries.

Rankings dominate at all levels, from individuals to whole countries. Doing science had become a league sport.



## The emergence of Open Access was dictated by the diffusion of the Internet.

But, at the time when BOAI was proclaimed, OA was often mistaken as a tool to combat rising prices



Most publishers of all feathers first saw OA as a threat.

But the invention of APCs at Biomed Central (2002) offered the promise of a business plan compatible with both OA and profit seeking.

Springer's Open Choice (2005) made OA appear as the source of new revenue streams.

As research funding agencies began to pay for APCs, They also began to see the advantages of OA for impact.

They are now fully involved with OA



- By 2010-13, OA discussions are still dominated by economic arguments, not access.
- The Finch report illustrates clearly the new dilemma: journals are to be protected; optimizing research process can wait.

"Consider carefully the balance between the aims of, on the one hand, increasing access, and on the other of avoiding undue risks to the sustainability of subscription-based journals during what is likely to be a lengthy transition to open access. Particular care should be taken about rules relating to embargo periods."





In effect, the Finch report has applied the famous Lampedusa principle:

## "Everything must change for everything to remain the same."

Hence the sense of betrayal mentioned earlier;

Publishers remain in the driver's seat while adapting OA to business plans that suit their purposes.



## This need to redress is where the diamond program finds its root:

A return to the imperative of access,

A concern for the process of scientific research and the integrity of scientific knowledge

A concern for a way to do science where diversity can thrive, and also feed the universal value of scientific knowledge



## The way forward

Let us recap what we have learned so far:

Journals as fundamental elements of the commercial market are part of the problem.



## Three options present themselves:

1) Create diamond journals that are as prestigious as possible, presumably to compete against existing commercial journals;

2) Create diamond journals that exclusively seek quality and ignores silly forms of competition such as citation chasing;

3) Work toward changing journals again, this time in conjunction with platforms and "Green" OA .



The first option is questionable as it will lead the new journals reinforce the dominant game which has been designed according to the Lampedusa rule. Watching some charity journals will be interesting in this regard



The second option is the one that a number of public platforms follow.

This is an important development.

However, how well do they succeed in improving the processes of knowledge production?





The third option is the most promising:

It allows changing journals according to the rules of a platform;

It allows coalitions of platforms, and platforms also include Green OA which has not been discussed so far

Bad examples have shown how powerful platforms can be;

This also means that well designed platforms can help shape better scientific communities.



# This observation means that public platforms should coordinate:

 To share journals, articles, etc.
To develop powerful standards
To design journal functions more in line with the possibilities of the digital universe

## There are many ways to improve journals:

- They do not need to own what they aggregate;
- They should record successive versions rather than hang to versions of record;
- They can, through open comments, bring the context of discovery closer to the context of justification;
- They can contribute to growing communities (think about COAR's Notify supported by Arcadia). 31



# Platforms also allow to revisit publishing functions (instead of publishers and libraries)

## Functions can be distributed across various actors; they are flexible.





Lorcan Dempsey's notion of "inside-out libraries" fits well with platforms:

Libraries collect locally, implement various publishing functions, network with other libraries, and in so doing, develop a platform of their own.

Such platforms can also harbour new kinds of journals.



In all of these possibilities, the publishing process:

- Is tightly integrated within the local research communities;
- The development of research programs is completely under the control of researchers;
- There are no financial barriers for readers or authors;
- The local and the planetary reach are reconciled;
- Competition, when present, is based on quality, not prestige.

## This is what diamond publishing is about.



In conclusion, diamond publishing is about re-aligning scientific publishing with scientific research while taking advantage of the digital context.

It is also about creating a fair playing field where the local, the global and the universal coexist harmoniously.

In such an environment, the sense of betrayal should vanish.