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37% for Elsevier (in 2016*)

In 2014:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Profit</th>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Industry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10%</td>
<td>BMW</td>
<td>automobiles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23%</td>
<td>Rio Tinto</td>
<td>mining</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25%</td>
<td>Google</td>
<td>search</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29%</td>
<td>Apple</td>
<td>premium computing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35%</td>
<td>Springer</td>
<td>scholarly publishing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37%</td>
<td>Elsevier</td>
<td>scholarly publishing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*RELX Group 2016 Results


Alex Holcombe, 21/05/15 [link]
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Open Access = gold Open Access only (author pays) ...
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Production of tongue twisters by speakers with partial glossectomy

ABSTRACT
A partial glossectomy can affect speech production. The goal of the present study was to investigate the effect of the presence of a tumour as well as the glossectomy surgery on the patients’ production of tongue twisters with the sounds [t] and [k]. Fifteen tongue cancer patients and 10 healthy controls took part in the study. The outcome measures were the patients’ speech acceptability, rate of errors, the time needed to produce the tongue twisters, pause duration between items repetitions, and the tongue shape during the production of the consonants [t] and [k] before and after surgery. The patients’ speech acceptability deteriorated after the surgery. Compared to controls, the patients’ productions of the tongue twisters were slower but not more errorful. Following the surgery, their speed of production did not change but the rate of errors was higher. Pause duration between items was longer in the patients than in the controls but did not increase from before to after surgery. Analysis of the patients’ tongue shapes for the productions of [t] and [k] indicated a higher elevation following the surgery for the patients with flap reconstructions. The results demonstrated that the surgical resection of the tongue changed the error rate but not the speed of production for the patient. The differences in pause duration also indicate that the tumour and the surgical resection of the tongue may impact the phonological planning of the tongue twister.
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Glossectomy, tongue, tongue resection, speech production, speech errors, tongue twister, ultrasonod
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ABSTRACT
A partial glossectomy can affect speech production. The goal of the present study was to investigate the impact of the presence of a tumor as well as the glossectomy surgery on the patients’ production of tongue twisters with the sounds [t] and [k]. Fifteen tongue cancer patients and 10 healthy controls took part in the study. The outcome measures were the patients’ speech acceptability, rate of errors, the time needed to produce the tongue twisters, pause duration between items repetitions, and the tongue shape during the production of the consonants [t] and [k] before and after surgery. The patients’ speech acceptability deteriorated after the surgery. Compared to controls, the patients’ productions of the tongue twisters were slower but not more errorful. Following the surgery, their speed of production did not change but the rate of errors was higher. Pause duration between items was longer in the patients than in the controls but did not increase from before to after surgery. Analysis of the patients’ tongue shapes for the productions of [t] and [k] indicated a higher elevation following the surgery for the patients with flap reconstructions. The results demonstrated that the surgical resection of the tongue changed the error rate but not the speed of production for the patient. The differences in pause duration also indicate that the tumor and the surgical resection of the tongue may impact the phonological planning of the tongue twister.
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ABSTRACT
A partial glossecotomy can affect speech production. The goal of the present study was to investigate the effect of the presence of a tumour as well as the glossecotomy surgery on the patients’ production of tongue twisters with the sounds [t] and [k]. Fifteen tongue cancer patients and 10 healthy controls took part in the study. The outcome measures were the patients’ speech acceptability, rate of errors, the time needed to produce the tongue twisters, pause duration between items repetitions, and the tongue shape during the production of the consonants [t] and [k] before and after surgery. The patients’ speech acceptability deteriorated after the surgery. Compared to controls, the patients’ productions of the tongue twisters were slower but not more errorful. Following the surgery, their speed of production did not change but the rate of errors was higher. Pause duration between items was longer in the patients than in the controls but did not increase from before to after surgery. Analysis of the patients’ tongue shapes for the productions of [t] and [k] indicated a higher elevation following the surgery for the patients with flap reconstructions. The results demonstrated that the surgical resection of the tongue changed the error rate but not the speed of production for the patient. The differences in pause duration also indicate that the tumour and the surgical resection of the tongue may impact the phonological planning of the tongue twisters.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RoMEO Colour</th>
<th>Archiving policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Can archive pre-print and post-print or publisher's version/PDF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Can archive post-print (ie final draft post-refereeing) or publisher's version/PDF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Can archive pre-print (ie pre-refereeing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>Archiving not formally supported</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


This summary is for the journal's default policies, and changes or exceptions can often be negotiated by authors. All information is correct to the best of our knowledge but should not be relied upon for legal advice.
<table>
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<tr>
<th>Journal</th>
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<th>Preprint</th>
<th>Postprint</th>
<th>Publisher's version</th>
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<tr>
<td>American Journal of Physiology-Heart and Circulatory Physiology</td>
<td>APS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>2000 USD</td>
<td>YES</td>
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</tr>
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<td>Antioxidants &amp; Redox signaling</td>
<td>Mary Ann Liebert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atherosclerosis</td>
<td>Elsevier</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>3300 USD</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biochimica et Biophysica Acta</td>
<td>Elsevier</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>4050 USD</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cancer Research</td>
<td>AACR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>3500 USD</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical and Experimental Allergy</td>
<td>Wiley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>4200 USD</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMBO Molecular Medicine</td>
<td>Wiley OA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>ONLY</td>
<td>4200 USD</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genome Biology</td>
<td>BioMed Central</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>ONLY</td>
<td>2975 USD</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Archives of Allergy and Immunology</td>
<td>Karger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>3030 USD</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAMA Cardiology</td>
<td>AMA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>5000 USD</td>
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<td>Journal of Biological Chemistry</td>
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<td>12</td>
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<td>3000 USD</td>
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<td>Nature</td>
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<td>Pathogens and global health</td>
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<td>1450 USD</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stem Cell Research and Therapy</td>
<td>BioMed Central</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>2175 USD</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stem Cells</td>
<td>Wiley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
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<td>6</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>2000 USD</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
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<td>Stem Cells Translational Medicine</td>
<td>Wiley OA</td>
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<td>0</td>
<td>YES</td>
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<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The New England Journal of Medicine</td>
<td>MMS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theranostics</td>
<td>Ivyspring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>ONLY</td>
<td>2500 USD</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vaccine</td>
<td>Elsevier</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>2450 USD</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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WHAT IS A REPOSITORY?

A social networking site is not an open access repository

“What’s the difference between ResearchGate, Academia.edu, and the institutional repository?”

“I put my papers in ResearchGate, is that enough for the open access policy?”

KATIE FORTNEY AND JUSTIN GONDER [link]
University of California Office of Scholarly Communication, 01/12/2015

Open access repositories | Academia.edu | ResearchGate
--- | --- | ---
Supports export or harvesting | Yes | No | No
Long-term preservation | Yes | No | No
Business model | Nonprofit (usually) | Commercial. Sells job posting services, hopes to sell data | Commercial. Sells ads, job posting services
Sends you lots of emails (by default) | No | Yes | Yes
Wants your address book | No | Yes | Yes
Fulfills requirements of UC’s OA policies | Yes | No | No

Publishers take ResearchGate to court, alleging massive copyright infringement

_Scholarly publishing giants Elsevier and the American Chemical Society (ACS) have filed a lawsuit in Germany against ResearchGate, a popular academic networking site, alleging copyright infringement on a mass scale. The move comes after a larger group of publishers became dissatisfied with ResearchGate’s response to a request to alter its article-sharing practices._

ResearchGate, a for-profit firm based in Berlin that was founded in 2008, is one of the largest social networking sites aimed at the academic community. It claims more than 13 million users, who can use their personal pages to upload and share a wide range of material, including published papers, book chapters, and meeting presentations. Science funders and investors have put substantial funds into the firm; it has raised more than $87 million from the Wellcome Trust charity, Goldman Sachs, and Bill Gates personally.

In recent years, journal publishers have become increasingly concerned about the millions of copyrighted papers—usually accessible only behind subscription paywalls—that are being shared by ResearchGate users. And on 15 September, the International Association of Scientific, Technical, and Medical Publishers wrote to ResearchGate on behalf of more than 140 publishers, expressing concerns about its article-sharing policies. Specifically, the organization proposed that ResearchGate implement a “seamless and easy” automated system that would help the site’s users determine whether an article was protected by copyright and could be legally shared publicly or privately. The association asked for a response by 22 September, noting that its members could follow-up individually or collectively if ResearchGate failed to agree to its proposal. (AAAS, which publishes ScienceInsider, is a member of the association.)
WHAT IS A REPOSITORY?

Find your subject-specific repository:

OpenDOAR

Or choose a generic one:

zenodo

Self-archiving

Author pays Article Processing Charges (APC)
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journal</th>
<th>Publisher</th>
<th>Preprint</th>
<th>Postprint</th>
<th>Publisher's version</th>
<th>Embargo (months)</th>
<th>Paid OA?</th>
<th>APC</th>
<th>Hybrid journal?</th>
<th>Listed on DOAJ?</th>
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<td>American Journal of Physiology-Heart and Circulatory Physiology</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biochimica et Biophysica Acta</td>
<td>Elsevier</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>4050 USD</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cancer Research</td>
<td>AACR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>YES</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plos Pathogens</td>
<td>PLOS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>The New England Journal of Medicine</td>
<td>MMS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theranostics</td>
<td>Ivyspring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>ONLY</td>
<td>2500 USD</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vaccine</td>
<td>Elsevier</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>2450 USD</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Information compiled from [http://www.sherpa.ac.uk/romeo/](http://www.sherpa.ac.uk/romeo/) on 12/12/2017
Minimum for Open Access = SELF-ARCHIVING

= deposit on a suitable repository (embargo period may apply)
Go even further = IMMEDIATE ACCESS + RETAIN RIGHTS

= read immediately from anywhere, including journal’s website (no embargo)

But you should still deposit on a suitable repository
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Even with Green ... Know your rights

AUTHOR RIGHTS
Using the SPARC Author Addendum to secure your rights as the author of a journal article

THE SPARC AUTHOR ADDENDUM

Your article has been accepted for publication in a journal and, like your colleagues, you want it to have the widest possible distribution and impact in the scholarly community. In the past, this required print publication. Today you have other options, like online archiving, but the publication agreement you’ll likely encounter will actually prevent broad distribution of your work.

KNOW YOUR RIGHTS AS THE AUTHOR.

SCRUTINIZE THE PUBLICATION AGREEMENT.

HOW TO USE THE SPARC AUTHOR ADDENDUM:

https://sparcopen.org/our-work/author-rights/

Do you want access to research articles for your own research?

WHAT IS IN IT FOR YOU?

• Access to relevant literature
• Long-term preservation (i.e. find quickly the final version of your own article)
• Transparent and reproducible research
• Increased visibility = increased citation
• Visible employability skills = future job prospects
Be open → get more citations

Citations = Better author metrics = Better job prospects

Slide by: Erin C. McKiernan
http://whyopenresearch.org

Adapted from Fiwatar & Vision (2013), PeerJ 1:e175

Wagner (2010), Issues in Science and Technology

NEW FNR OPEN ACCESS POLICY AND FUNDING INSTRUMENT

20 Dec 2016

FUNDERS’ OA MANDATES

With the launch of calls for some of its major funding programmes, the FNR introduces its new policy on Open Access publications from FNR-(co)funded research, and a new funding instrument to help cover article processing fees.

For all proposals where positive funding decisions are taken after 1 January 2017, the FNR requires that Open Access options are selected for scientific publications resulting from those projects (exception: monographs). Up until now, the FNR recommended that research results are published in Open Access, but it was not mandatory.

An Open Access publication is one that is made freely available to any potential reader or user with access to the internet, with the only limitation that the work is properly attributed to its author(s).

Open Access publications contribute to a more efficient and effective use of research results, maximises the potential for innovation, increases the visibility of researchers and their research institutions and provides the conditions for a bigger return on investment of public money.

The new FNR policy is in line with the global transition towards Open Access and the National Open Access Policy that is supported by all major research institutions. Please see the FNR’s policy document ‘FNR Open Access Policy’.

https://www.fnr.lu/new-fnr-open-access-policy-funding-instrument/
http://storage.fnr.lu/index.php/s/9k72EH61fXGL9oX#pdfviewer
https://www.fnr.lu/funding-instruments/open-access-fund/

‘The publishing process and Open Access’ - Workshop series for early career researchers - Luxembourg Institute of Health - 13/12/2017

BEYOND OPEN ACCESS...

PUBLISHING
Post-publication peer review

OPENNESS...

DATA
5stardata.info
re3data.org
REGISTRY OF RESEARCH DATA REPOSITORIES

CAREER
ORCID
Connecting Research and Researchers
doi

PUBLICATING
think
check
submit

‘Open Science’ is just ‘Science’

Open science describes the practice of carrying out scientific research in a completely transparent manner, and making the results of that research available to everyone. Isn’t that just ‘science’?


Thank you!

Jonathan ENGLAND

jonathan.england@uni.lu

@jonatortue
Predatory journals recruit fake editor
Plotr Sorokowski, Emanuel Kulczycki, Agnieszka Sorokowska & Katarzyna Pisanski
22 March 2017
An investigation finds that dozens of academic titles offered ‘Dr Fraud’ — a sham, unqualified scientist — a place on their editorial board. Katarzyna Pisanski and colleagues report.

CURRICULUM VITAE

dr hab. Anna Olga Szust
Associate Professor
Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznań

History of Science Unit
Institute of Philosophy UAM

Email address:
anne.olga.szust@gmail.com

Personal website:
http://amu.edu.pl/~anneolgaszust/

The research of the Fictional Anna O. Soost, Sadowski et al. Nature

WHO EMBRACED THE FAKE?
Journals deemed predatory were much more likely to accept a fake, subpar candidate as an editor.

- Accepted
- Accepted, but later disputed
- Rejected
- No Response

PREDATORY TITLES
As assessed by librarian Jeffrey Beall
33% 13% 54%

TITLES ON THE DIRECTORY OF OPEN ACCESS JOURNALS (DOAJ)
A whitelist for open-access journals
7% 38% 55%

TITLES INDEXED BY JOURNAL CITATION REPORTS (JCR)
A whitelist that calculates impact factors
40% 60%

120 titles
From: How To Attribute Creative Commons Photos by Foter