

Academic Publishing in Europe – Short report: The funding of publishing. Changes and consequences for science and society

29–30 January 2013, Berlin-Brandenburg Academy of Sciences preceded by the Education and Training Course: “Talking to the Elephant in the Room” on 28 January 2012

Chris Armbruster^a and André Pleintinger^b

^a *glubal.com, Berlin, Germany*

^b *Institute for the Study of the Book, Friedrich-Alexander Universität Erlangen-Nürnberg, Germany*

Day 1

Welcome and Opening Addresses

Anna Metzner (German Association of Publishers and Booksellers) welcomed chairs, speakers and participants to Academic Publishing in Europe 2013. This being the 8th conference, she highlighted as continuous the open and discursive nature of the proceedings, and as evolving the themes under discussion. The funding of publishing is an especially timely theme as digital business models are being consolidated by the publishing industry.

Eric Merkel-Sobotta (Chairman, International Association of STM Publishers & EVP Corporate Communication, Springer SBM) emphasized in his opening remarks that any discussion on the funding of publishing must focus on the political and economic foundations. Scholarly publishing is now supported by two business models, subscriptions and article-processing charges, and it is in the interest of all stakeholders that the foundations be solid and the publishing operation sustainable. Particularly in the United Kingdom, the foundation for both business models now seems dependable, and in the United States and Germany policy development is also progressing. Stable foundations enable publishers to continue adding value to scholarly communication.

Prof. Dr. Karl Ulrich Mayer (President, Leibniz Association) started with his first keynote on *Open Access: Improving Returns of Public Investment into Research – A perspective from Germany*. He highlighted that the IT Revolution had resulted in new dysfunctions and inequalities in scholarly communication. A major problem is large price differences among publishers and journals. Secondly, widespread usage limitations and re-use restrictions indicate that copyright has become a barrier. Thirdly, publication has become an instrument that some scholars seek to manipulate illegitimately. Indicators, for example,

are unmerited co-authorship, outright fraud, undue delays in peer review, and the manipulation of impact measures. Open Access mitigates or resolves these dysfunction and inequalities, as it supports the following: (a) fair returns to all stakeholders; (b) unlimited access and efficient usage; (c) quality safeguarding (transparent processes including easier detection of plagiarism and fraud); and (d) free sharing and re-use (e.g. CC-BY license). Thus, Open Access has become a major mechanism whereby the returns to public investment are maximized. In the first instance, Open Access provides cost control. Because open access publishing flips the business model, research funders and institutions may determine in advance how much they will spend. Moreover, APCs are a transparent pricing mechanism. Secondly, strings may be attached to open access publication funds, such as the requirement for a CC-BY license. Thirdly, open access integrates seamlessly with the emerging infrastructure of open science, thus enabling mining and re-use in the context of discovery as well as an acceleration of this process. Fourthly, funders and institutions may choose to sponsor an open access journal directly, thus lowering or abolishing article-processing charges, and thereby containing general price increases. Fifthly, during the period of transition to open access publishing, Green Open Access provides a cost-effective means of increasing the scholarly output available, particularly if embargoes are reduced to six (STM) and twelve months (SSH) and a standard license includes mining rights. In sum, the road to open access maximizes public returns by securing scholarly outputs as a public good, accelerating science and creating new discovery routes as well as opening up a new playing field for value added services in the academy, industry and society.

In the second keynote, *Dame Prof. Dr. Janet Finch* (Sociology, University of Manchester) reported on *Accessibility, Sustainability, Excellence: the UK Approach*. Dame Janet Finch chaired a Working Group on Expanding Access to Published Research Findings, resulting in a report on Accessibility, sustainability, excellence: how to expand access to research publications (18 June 2012). The recommendations of the report were accepted in full by the UK government, which charged the Research and Funding Councils with implementation – in consultation with all relevant stakeholders. Dame Janet Finch reported on process and outcomes. The working group was commissioned by government, but independent, and composed of senior representatives from universities, libraries, publishers, learned societies and funders. Its remit was to find ways to make published research outcomes accessible for free, immediately, and with re-use rights – without harming research quality, publishing standards and established publishers. Interests among constituencies differed and are not necessarily reconcilable but success criteria were developed to assess possible recommendations for the ‘best fit’. Success criteria were that access would be expanded considerably, preferably free/open, while the publishing system would retain its quality and be sustained economically, yet would become more affordable for public institutions. The working group considered itself constrained and enabled by drivers for change, particularly the moral and political momentum, internationally, for public access to publicly funded research outcomes; the digital revolution in science and publishing; and the cost pressures of the existing system. An extension and adaptation of the licensing system, including Green OA via repositories was considered, but while considered helpful did not meet the success criteria as well as an orchestrated move to open access publishing. The main recommendations of the report are (a) that a mixed economy with subscription-based and open access journals should be tolerated for the foreseeable future; (b) policy direction should be set towards open access; (c) actions needed to implement this should be identified by relevant stakeholders; (d) the costs of transition should be monitored, but allow for a temporary increase in line with estimates predicting GBP50-60M.

Prof. Dr. Adam Tickell (Pro Vice-Chancellor, University of Birmingham) spoke on *Implementing Open Access in UK Universities*. He highlighted the rapid implementation process since the UK Government had accepted the recommendations of the Working Group on Expanding Access in July 2012. By April

2013 RCUK policies and institutional procedures will come into effect. First reviews of the implementation process may be expected to become available in 2014. Prof. Tickell reminded the audience of the particularly favourable national and international context. Previously, the United States Congress had passed legislation mandating open access (for NIH funded research). In the UK, the general push for more transparency in the public sector is highly complementary with the idea of open access to publicly funded research outcomes. Globally, research councils are increasingly stepping up their commitment to open access through coordinated policy development and funds for article processing charges. Moreover, new open access journals are being launched by publishers, institutions and scholars alike. Particularly the RCUK and the research universities are implementing rapidly, but in close consultation with the other stakeholders to minimize disruption and costs. Details are still under discussion, such as the length of embargoes for Green OA manuscripts where an open access publishing option is not available. Prof. Tickell reminded the audience that the government supported the UK Publishers' Association 'Decision Tree'. If the publisher offers open access publishing but no APC funds are available to the author, then the embargo would vary from 12 to 24 months. If the publisher does not provide open access publishing, then the embargo would be shorter, from 6 to 12 months. Given the speed of implementation, Prof. Tickell noted, some quarters are resisting (e.g. some humanities scholars or learned societies). Moreover, there remains some uncertainty as to whether the transition costs will not exceed the present estimate (GBP50-60M). Major intervening factors could be the failure of publishers to match rising APC income with reductions in subscription prices for UK universities and, possibly, the failure of other countries to follow suit. Finally, the overall affordability of the new system, and in particular the level of APCs and associated transaction costs require close monitoring in the public interest.

The *Overviews* were chaired by Dr. H. Frederick Dylla (Executive Director and CEO, American Institute of Physics, College Park, MD).

In the first overview, *Dr. John Vaughn* (EVP, Association of American Universities and Chairman, Scholarly Publishing Roundtable, Washington, DC) spoke about *The Future of Scholarly Communication: US Efforts to Bring Warring Factions to Common Purpose in Support of Scholarship*. University research and publication are becoming more and more international. This vision of international scholarly publishing leads to new challenges in terms of library budgets, research volumes and costs. To face these challenges, the Scholarly Publishing Roundtable was created in 2009 – a committee of librarians, publishers and university administrators who worked on developing consensus policies for expanding public access to journal articles arising from federally funded research. The core recommendation of the committee's report is that each federal research funding agency should expeditiously but carefully develop and implement an access policy that brings about free public access to the results of the research that it funds. The subsequent COMPETES Act of 2010 adopted many recommendations of the roundtable and in Section 103 called for a coordination of public access policy by the President's Office of Science and Technology Policy. Since 2012, a task force of six AAU provosts and six ARL library deans and directors continues seeking sustainable policies and concentrates in the present connection on three areas, namely university presses, scholarly journals and institutional repositories. Finally, Dr. Vaughn stressed the importance of good faith engagement of all stakeholders in harnessing digital technology to expand public access to the results of publicly funded research in sustainable ways that enables creating, preserving and disseminating knowledge in an international community of research universities. CrossRef, FundRef and ORCID are promising programs and public/private partnerships involving government and external stakeholders that produce mutually beneficial outcomes.

In the second overview, *Brian A. Hitson* (Associate Director, U.S. Department of Energy, Office of Scientific and Technical Information (OSTI), Oak Ridge) reported on *Improving Access to U.S. De-*

partment of Energy R&D Results – Agency/Publisher Collaboration. He explained that the U.S. Government has long recognized its responsibilities in the public dissemination of unclassified Scientific and Technical Information (STI). The mission of advancing science and sustaining technological creativity by making R&D findings available and useful to the Department of Energy (DOE) researchers and the public is translated into practice by the Office of Scientific and Technical Information (OSTI). Therefore, OSTI has produced dissemination products and discovery tools like ECD (Energy Citation Database) or E-Print Network. Mr. Hitson remarked that the key remaining “gap” is in DOE’s ability to fully provide access to its journal articles. Several collaborations (FundRef, ORCID, OSTI-Publisher Metadata-Sharing and Linking Agreements) are working on that challenge. In addition, OSTI cooperates with primary publishers like Elsevier or the American Institute of Physics. The benefits of these agreements are: (a) DOE’s improved ability to more fully account for its scholarly (article) output; (b) a better mechanism to find DOE scholarly output without having to use multiple search engines for the public; (c) higher web traffic to publishers and the Version of Record and finally; (d) increased opportunities for reference linking across different types of STI. Mr. Hitson pointed out that the OSTI-Publisher Agreements do not fulfill the broadly understood meaning of “public access”, but contribute towards better search results in finding agency-funded scholarly literature. In sum, OSTI highly appreciates the value publishers add to scholarly literature and therefore it seeks arrangements, which ensure the wide dissemination and long-term sustainability of scholarly publications.

In the third overview, *Michael Mabe* (CEO, The International Association of STM Publishers, The Hague and Oxford) presented a review of the last ten years of Open Access discussion in *Gold and Green: Post PEER Reflections*. He reminded the audience of the development of the different OA types: Gold (publishing model), Green (repository model) and Delayed (optional publisher model). In 2012, the gold option has come back into fashion. After highlighting stations along the golden, green and delayed way, he spoke about publishers’ fears, for example that the free availability of publications through may harm the subscription-based journals on which these roads to open access depend. The position of STM and its members is to support sustainable Open Access models. In order to test the effects of different embargo lengths, the PEER project was carried out from 2008 to 2012. The project found that the availability of green manuscripts may increase traffic at publishers’ websites, particularly in the natural and life sciences. Scholars, on the whole, prefer access to the version of record. Economically, a larger variety of business models have become sustainable. In summary, publishers prefer the gold route. Green “one size fits all” mandates remain unacceptable, but where journal-specific embargo periods can be used, the PEER project shows that a *modus vivendi* between journals and institutional repository Green OA is possible. However, it seems that subject repositories, on the other hand, do undermine subscriptions.

The session on *Research Data* was chaired by Dr. Jan Brase (DataCite, German National Library of Science and Technology, Hannover).

Dr. Thomas Lemberger (Chief Editor, Molecular Systems Biology and Deputy Head of Scientific Publications, EMBO, Heidelberg) spoke about *Source Data – Towards Next Generation Open Access*. In essence, the next step in open access publishing is that (a) the review process becomes transparent and (b) the publication includes or points to source data that are made freely available, preferably using the Creative Commons Zero license (CC-0). Powering this move is the need for protecting and enhancing the integrity of scholarly communication and the machine-readability of research outputs. It requires improved processes of peer review and of specifying and attaching metadata. In sum, this should stabilize the economy of publishing and thus the ecology of scholarly communication.

Nigel Robinson (Director, Operations and Development, Thomson Reuters, York) spoke about the *Data Citation Index*. Millions of data records are distributed across personal, repository and publisher

websites. Presently, their visibility and impact is often quite limited, not least because many of them are neither registered nor tracked for re-use and citations. Data producers and scientists receive little or no credit. DataCite is enabling registration and citation standards are being developed. This will power data bibliometrics, and Thomson Reuters is committed to aiding discovery, linking data sets, measure their use and develop new data metrics.

Dr. Salvatore Mele (Head of Open Access, CERN, Geneva) reported on *The Discovery of the Higgs-like Boson at CERN: Physics and Publishing*. Data-intensive science that requires massive investments over many years is re-defining 'Big Science' and with it the meaning of authorship. The researchers conducting the experiments are using an elaborate content management system for writing up their results. An editorial board will seek to manage those writing up the research results on behalf of very many authors, on one instance it was 2899 authors. In such circumstances an elaborate internal review process is required to ensure the veracity of the publication. As soon as possible, the publication is made available online, i.e. by posting it on arXiv. It is then submitted to a journal so that a version of record may be archived.

The *APE Lecture* – introduced by Dr. Sven Fund (Managing Director, De Gruyter, Berlin) – was delivered by *Prof. Dr. Wolfram Koch* (Executive Director, German Chemical Society, Frankfurt) and dealt with *Learned Societies and Scientific Publishing – A Multi-Faceted Relationship*. He reported on scientific exchange and communication from the point of view of the "Gesellschaft Deutscher Chemiker" (GDCh). The GDCh as a typical learned society is committed to providing service to its community. To be competitive in an international market, 12 national journals have been transformed into high quality European journals: the ChemPubSoc Europe – which strives for "sustainable publishing" and enables strong cooperation of learned societies in chemistry – was born. Prof. Dr. Koch stressed that the publishing environment in chemistry is different, because it is the only science with an attached industry of the same name and therefore, the discipline has to pursue commercial goals as well. Data has to be available for cooperating industry partners. Moreover, they may have additional requirements, such as holding key data confidential until a patent has been obtained. On the whole, publishing serves two purposes for learned societies: (a) it provides service to members and the scientific community in general, and (b) it is an important source of income. The future challenges of publishing affect library budgets, the peer review system, the interaction with commercial publishers and of course the question of how to deal with Open Access. According to Prof. Dr. Koch, members of learned societies don't have significant access problems. Consequently, OA isn't a big issue for the community. But as text mining is easier in an OA environment, the industry sees more advantages in Open Access strategies. Mandates from policy makers also contribute towards a more meaningful position of OA in chemistry. Several severe problems can arise from that: learned societies will potentially lose much of their income and hence, many of the services for their community will disappear. Finally, Prof. Dr. Koch suggested being compliant and responding to demands of one's customers to address these arising problems. The introduction of new tools and services as well as the strengthening of one's own brands is another possibility.

Day 2

The session on *Innovations – Open Science and New Apps for Open Sharing* was chaired by Drs Eefke Smit (Director, Standards and Technology, STM, The Hague).

Ian Mulvany (Head of Technology, eLife, Cambridge) spoke on *Innovations for Open Sharing at eLife*. Scholarly publishing has become part of the shareconomy, hence publishers need a new approach for

enhancing their value in authors' eyes. eLife is committed to maximizing the accessibility, attention and re-use of published content, by humans and robots alike. For human readers, eLife is offering access to the results of the review process, a lay summary and digest of all articles published, and a sustained effort at creating media news. On the robot side, eLife is enhancing its API, pushing out content to repositories and other interested parties, developing automated feedback mechanisms, and integrating the information in a dashboard aimed at authors and readers alike.

Dr. Rebecca Lawrence (Publisher, Faculty of 1000, London) spoke on *Innovations in Open Peer Review and Data Sharing*. F1000 Research has developed a new approach to peer review, focusing on soundness, and an open format for requiring and sharing data. This new mode of open science publishing – where the article-processing charge includes 1 GB of data space – works as follows: submission are edited and published without delay. Within ten days an open peer review is conducted that leads to acceptance, possibly subject to reservations, or rejection. All data relevant to the article must be submitted too. The publisher enables and controls the versioning. The article carries a CC-BY license and the data CC-0. The open data is mandatory. Preferably it is deposited in a repository for easy sharing, review and reproduction. Hence, the data is not only visible, but also permanently accessible.

Dr. Victor Henning (Co-Founder and CEO, Mendeley, London) spoke on *How to make sharing easy for researchers. Will publishers become redundant?* Dr. Henning indicated that the title of his presentation was not of his own choosing. He also pointed out that Mendeley was not about sharing, but collaboration. Mendeley is a collaboration tool for two types of groups: public and private. Public groups collaborate on managing references and reading. Private groups have enhanced possibilities of collaborative reading that enables them to integrate this activity more effectively in their workflow. There is ever more to read and reading takes time. With Mendeley the information ingestion becomes more effective as well as efficient.

Iain Hrynaszkiewicz (Publisher, BioMed Central & GigaScience, London) gave an insight into *Open Data at GigaScience and BioMed Central*. Not just physics, but also the life sciences are increasingly characterized by big data, which poses new challenges for capturing and processing this data. The four crucial issues are: (a) the representation of data in journals, integration of data sets, licensing of data and mining. GigaScience follows the Panton Principles. Important is enabling the citation of data sets, the detection of plagiarism and the provision of data for re-use scenarios, including commercial ones.

The session *New Business Models & Enabling Technologies* was chaired by Arnoud de Kemp (Co-Editor-in-Chief, *Information Services & Use*).

In her presentation *The Usage-driven Decade. How 'Patron Driven Acquisition (PDA)' changes Scholarly Publishing* *Katrin Siems* (VP Marketing and Sales, De Gruyter, Berlin) introduced PDA as the “next dance” between libraries and publishers. It is a new method for libraries to acquire e-content only when users request it and hence, it reflects the trend that usage has become a key factor for librarians in any buying decision. The advantages for libraries are obvious: PDA presents theoretically all content to their patrons and it is highly efficient by no longer purchasing shelf warmers. But Mrs. Siems didn't miss pointing out new challenges, namely the more complex budget management and the need of new skills and agility in metadata handling. Publishers have to accept PDA as a natural business model in the digital economy, as complete exposure of the content increases the chance that it will be used. De Gruyter has introduced the new model in 2012 and seeks to find a balance between “hardcore” usage-driven PDA and the traditional gatekeeper role of libraries. According to Mrs. Siems, it is an ideal tool to acquaint new customers to the product portfolio and hence, it strengthens the cooperation between publishers and libraries. In her closing outlook, Mrs. Siems predicted that the defragmentation of content will con-

tinue and the importance of data processing will increase. Moreover, the next industry debate will be on pricing of usage.

Zofia Brinkman Dzwig (Product Manager, Delft University of Technology) gave an insight into the *Innovative Collection Development with PDA in the TU Delft Library* – according to a CNN list, number four of the seven coolest libraries in the world. To be able to compete in the information world, a modern academic library has to address several issues: budget cuts, “just in time” acquisition models, a shift towards user driven library services and products and, last but not least, the duty to provide access to rapidly increasing content. The TU Delft has been pursuing an E-only policy since 2003 and reformed the old acquisition model of approval plans for paper books because it was too expensive and didn’t match with users’ expectations. The solution was to combine approval plans with Patron Driven Acquisition (PDA) to a hybrid model. Finally, Mrs Brinkman Dzwig stressed the advantages for the library: There isn’t a financial risk any longer because not all of the “approval titles” need to be purchased in advance. In addition, there is instant availability of digital titles for the user while it is ensured that the content fits in the library profile. And, users are actively participating in keeping the collection relevant and up to date.

Kevin Cohn (Chief Operating Officer, Atypon, New York) reported on *Improving Research Efficiency through User and Content Fingerprinting*. At the beginning of his talk, he started with the thesis that research efficiency could be greatly improved if publishers tapped into their huge volume of data to better connect users to content. According to Mr. Cohn, users don’t want an advanced search, but they do want relevant results, e.g. in the form of personalized information. Relevancy is the only order that matters (more than 50% of the clicks to the first result), filter possibilities aren’t used. The technology “Automatic Topic Modeling” (ATM) wants to fulfill users’ expectations of a simple, Google-like search interface and therefore, it tracks the search behavior of the users over a period of time to filter and to create “topics” – collections of words that occur together with great frequency. So, fingerprints of the users are arising. ATM started as collaboration with academic researchers and will still require considerable experimentation and testing. In the end, it will improve research efficiency by using proprietary data to calculate relevancy for each individual user.

In his talk *The Luxid[®] Community – An Online Platform for Collaborative Semantics* *Stefan Geißler* (Managing Director, TEMIS Deutschland, Heidelberg) pointed at several problems of publishers, researchers and domain hosters. The Luxid[®] Community was built up to enable communication and collaboration of these different stakeholders, which creates added value for all of them. Users, vendors and application developers benefit from broader offerings, easier and standardized deployments and increasing adoption. Inside the community, they build, use and exchange resources for semantic content enrichment: the offer and usage of diverse semantic apps at an online marketplace is an example. Sharing e.g. a vocabulary on labor law under CC BY 3.0 has benefits for publishers as well, because the linking leads back to their own domains. The community effect leads to a win-win-win situation for users, partners and scholars. In sum – Mr. Geißler closed his talk – increased collaboration, more visibility, access to a large range of complementary technologies and the monetization of expertise are undeniable advantages of the Luxid[®] Community.

The session on *Open Books* was chaired by Bettina Goerner (Director, Open Access & Business Development, Springer SBM, Heidelberg).

Eelco Ferwerda (Director, OAPEN Foundation, The Hague) spoke on *Open Access Models for Monographs gaining Momentum*. New infrastructures are aggregating books, leading to increased visibility and better retrieveability. This has led to new book publishing initiatives, including book publishing software and platforms and new agreements between scholarly institutions and publishers. More than fifty

serious and credible open access book publishers may be identified, of which about 80% are non-profit, and most are university presses. With books, open access may mean a variety of things: possibly just free-to-read online (with all rights reserved and no downloading), maybe some version of a Creative Commons license (including non-commercial and/or no derivatives). Also distinctive is that open access may mean that the backlist or the ‘long tail’ is converted to open access (but not current titles or best-sellers). Generally, open access book publishing is still highly selective, with business models based on dual-edition publishing, and/or institutional subsidies and/or book processing charges.

Frances Pinter (Founder and Director, Knowledge Unlatched, London) and *Eric Hellman* (President, Gluejar Inc., Montclair) spoke on *Freeing Books with Disruptive Models*. Ms. Pinter emphasized that scholarly books are typically published in small print runs that compete for increasingly scarce library budgets. Hence, Knowledge Unlatched is committed to making book publishing more viable again by concentrating on covering the fixed costs of book production in advance through consortia or crowd funding. Mr. Hellman argued that Gluejar is a model intermediary that enables the conversion of already published books to open access. This is achieved by agreeing a title fee with the publisher, which if raised through the Gluejar platform through sponsorship or crowd funding, will liberate the book, enabling free access and re-use.

Carrie Calder (Marketing Director, Palgrave Macmillan, London) spoke on *Open or Not: What is a Book?* Ms. Calder pointed out that a representative panel of scholars had established that the typical monograph is now considered to be too long a format – still averaging between 70–100,000 words. Edited volumes often are even longer. Hence, the academic book needs re-inventing, and as shorter formats become more widespread, it will be easier to provide open access. Open access to books must mean that readers are free to share and extend the text – anytime and anywhere. This requires sufficient funds to cover the peer review, editing and production of the book, including its delivery across all kinds of devices.

The closing panel *The Communication of Information* was introduced and moderated by *Robert M. Campbell* (Senior Publisher, Wiley Blackwell, Oxford). The participants were *Dr. Rick Borchelt* (Office of the Director, National Cancer Institute, Bethesda, MD), *Michael Mabe* (CEO, The International Association of STM Publishers, The Hague), *Alice Meadows* (Director of Social Relations, Wiley, Maiden, MA) and *Dr. Bernd Pulverer* (Head, Scientific Publications, EMBO, Heidelberg). The goal of the closing discussion was to begin a dialogue with the APE participants about a common set of communication principles to express the value that publication process adds to the scientific process and to public understanding of science and technology.

First, Dr. Borchelt outlined changes and consequences for communication. From his point of view, it is important to find an answer to the question “what kind of values in terms of publication should be highlighted?”, because many alternative publication models in a relative short period caused chaos in the press and so in the public perception. The positive values ‘selection’, ‘construction’, ‘review’, ‘curation and dissemination’ have to be stressed and should lead to a managed trust portfolio of academic publishing (credibility, integrity, dependability).

Mr. Mabe pointed out that the discussion in the press is not about business models, but much more fundamental: Has publishing a value at all? Digital products have certain qualities, they are reproducible. This affects not only business models, but also the business structure of publishers. Public perception is influenced by the growth of the world wide web and this development facilitates another era of thought: Electronic products have no value. Mr. Mabe stated a general problem, namely that the public and even the opinion makers don’t know what publishers do. As a consequence, publishers have to work on

emotional aspects of communication, not on technical arguments. They must avoid to be too detailed in their explanations. Communication has to be simple and straight forward.

Mrs. Meadows made three statements for a general communication strategy: (1) Understand your audience by means of formal and informal research; (2) Understand what is important to them (and why). A survey of Wiley Blackwell shows that the participating stakeholders have a different understanding of commercial and quality issues. Authors and researchers are mainly interested in a high quality of publications for example; (3) Demonstrate value through collaboration: Publishers want to contribute to the scholarly endeavor. So, they should cooperate with stakeholders and even other publishers. The audience added that publishers have missed to promote their brands yet, the main part of their marketing activities still concentrates on their products.

Dr. Pulverer asked the audience to consider that publishing activities often take place behind closed doors. From his point of view, it is important that by adding value, publishers create a reliable literature which is also reusable. So, they will catalyse research and scholarly publication. The principles of transparency, (common) standards and collaboration must be addressed to the authors, the readers and the public. In Dr. Pulverer's opinion, peer review in journal articles is not broken as long as there is a transparent process and evolution. He denoted the core principles of this transparent review process, amongst them the management of cross-commenting, source data and manuscript transfers. Finally, he explained how selectivity, editing, functionality & rich content through data, quality assurance, ethics and policy add value to scholarly publication. According to Dr. Pulverer, it is up to the publishing industry to build up common standards, but all stakeholders should play an active role in developing them.

In the further discussion, the audience remarked that the public isn't interested in the publishing process, but simply thinks that publishers are making too much profit. Mr. Mabe answered that it is important to communicate that profit is necessary to provide services and that sustainability needs investment.

A key problem is that authors don't have an idea what is happening in a publishing process. Wiley Blackwell offers author workshops to counter this lack of information. Mr. Mabe pleaded, that there should be more communication efforts on the invisible side of publishing. The audience asked to make added value more visible, e.g. through additional reviews or comments. Dr. Pulverer commented that meaningful value must be transported by the whole system, then it will be used.

Finally, the participants of the discussion and the audience threw the light on the role of the journalists. Dr. Borchelt mentioned that there is a difference between writers and journalists, many bloggers for example contribute to a bad public reputation of scholarly publishers. The audience added that this public debate is less about profitability, but it is based more on the perception of a cost-free digital world.

Berlin, Erlangen, April 2013

For correspondence: info@digiprimo.com

Please note: APE 2014 will be held 28–29 January 2014