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NEW FNR OPEN ACCESS POLICY AND FUNDING INSTRUMENT

20 Dec 2016

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 invest 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/
Reality 1

"SO, LET'S GET THIS STRAIGHT: 'THE TAXPAYER PAYS FOR YOUR LABS AND RESEARCH?'

YES..."

"AND YOU ARE FORCED TO GIVE YOUR PAPERS TO SOME HIGH CLASS JOURNAL FOR PUBLICATION?"

"YES..."

"AND WE NEED TO FUND YOU AGAIN SO THAT YOU CAN READ YOUR OWN PUBLICATIONS?"

"YES! TOLD YOU"

Tax-payers are paying twice to access publicly-funded research outputs

Patrick Hochstenbach, "Yes! I told you!", 2012

Yet another mandate! I want to publish wherever and however I want!
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Luxembourg spends per year >1.1M € (HTVA) for journal subscriptions

Figures from 2016, kindly provided by Consortium Luxembourg

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

http://www.relxgroup.com

Stephen Buranyi, The Guardian, 27/06/17 [link]

Alex Holcombe, 21/05/15 [link]

Alex Holcombe, 21/05/15 [link]
Myth 1

Open Access = journal ...

Open Access = archiving model / philosophy

It is NOT about where you publish but where it is made available

“Is the reviewing process in OA journals as good as non OA journals?”
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Myth 2

Open Access = author pays for Open Access

Several routes to make research outputs freely available

"I’d like to publish Open Access but I can’t pay the high costs"

Open Access = author pays for Open Access

Several routes to make research outputs freely available
Self-archiving

Freely available on publisher/journal website

 Might include Article Processing Charges (APC)

Open Access explained, Piled Higher and Deeper Production, CC-BY
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Minimum for Open Access

= SELF-ARCHIVING

= deposit on a suitable repository
'Myths and Realities around Open Access' – FNR Open Access Fund information session – 01/03/2018

You do not own your article copyrights anymore

COPYRIGHT TRANSFER AGREEMENT

Dear Contributor,

Thank you for submitting your Contribution for publication. In order to expedite the editing and publishing process and enable Wiley-Blackwell to disseminate the Contribution to its fullest extent, we need to have the Copyright Transfer Agreement signed and returned as directed in the Journal's instructions for authors as soon as possible. If the Contribution is not accepted for publication, or if the Contribution is subsequently rejected, this Agreement shall be null and void. Publication cannot proceed without signed copy of this Agreement.

A. COPYRIGHT

1. The Contributor assigns to Wiley-Blackwell, during the full term of copyright and any extensions or renewals, all copyright in and to the Contribution, and all rights thereto, including but not limited to the right to publish, re-use in derivative works, adapt, and license for commercial use in any form or medium now known or hereafter developed.

2. Final Published Version. Wiley-Blackwell retains the following rights with respect to the Final Published Version of the Contribution:
   - Copy for colleagues. The personal right of the Contributor to retain and share a copy of the Contribution for colleagues.
   - Cite the publication. The right to use the Contribution for personal or educational purposes or for the personal or educational purposes of others in the same Department or Institution.

B. Reprint Rights

Production of tongue twisters by speakers with partial glossectomy

TIM BRESSMANN1, ANOUSCHKA FOLTZ2, JANA ZIMMERMANN2, & JONATHAN C. IRISH3

0003-3472/538.00 © 2012 The Association for the Study of Animal Behaviour. Published by Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.anbehav.2012.06.015
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RoMEO Colour | Archiving policy
--- | ---
Green | Can archive pre-print and post-print or publisher's version/PDF
Blue | Can archive post-print (i.e. final draft post-refereeing) or publisher's version/PDF
Yellow | Can archive pre-print (i.e pre-refereeing)
White | Archiving not formally supported

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.

Keywords
Glossectomy, tongue, tongue resection, speech production, speech errors, tongue twister, ultrasound
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ABSTRACT
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Myth 3

A social networking site is not an open access repository

Provide free, unrestricted and permanent access
## 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supports export or harvesting</th>
<th>Academia.edu</th>
<th>ResearchGate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Long-term preservation</th>
<th>Academia.edu</th>
<th>ResearchGate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Business model</th>
<th>Academia.edu</th>
<th>ResearchGate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nonprofit (usually)</td>
<td>Commercial. Sells job posting services, hopes to sell data</td>
<td>Commercial. Sells ads, job posting services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sends you lots of emails (by default)</th>
<th>Academia.edu</th>
<th>ResearchGate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wants your address book</th>
<th>Academia.edu</th>
<th>ResearchGate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fulfills requirements of UC’s OA policies</th>
<th>Academia.edu</th>
<th>ResearchGate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Publishers take ResearchGate to court, alleging massive copyright infringement

By Dalmeet Singh Chawla | Oct. 6, 2017, 5:47 PM

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

Freely available on publisher/journal website

Might include Article Processing Charges (APC)

Open Access explained, Piled Higher and Deeper Production, CC-BY
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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## LICENSES

### ATTRIBUTION

**CC BY**
This license lets you distribute, remix, tweak, and build upon the original work, even commercially, as long as you credit the original creation. This is the most accommodating of licenses offered.

### ATTRIBUTION-SHAREALIKE

**CC BY-SA**
This license lets you remix, tweak, and build upon the original work even for commercial purposes, as long as you credit the original work and license your new creations under the identical terms. This license is often compared to “copyleft” free and open source software licenses. All new works based on the work should carry the same license, so any derivatives will also allow commercial use. This is the license used by Wikipedia.

### ATTRIBUTION-NODERIVS

**CC BY-ND**
This license allows for redistribution, commercial and non-commercial, as long as it is passed along unchanged and in whole, with credit to the original work.

### ATTRIBUTION-NONCOMMERCIAL

**CC BY-NC**
This license lets you remix, tweak, and build upon the original work non-commercially. Your new works must be non-commercial and acknowledge the original work, but you don't have to license your derivative works on the same terms.

### ATTRIBUTION-NONCOMMERCIAL-SHAREALIKE

**CC BY-NC-SA**
This license lets you remix, tweak, and build upon the original work non-commercially, as long as you credit the original work and license your new creations under the identical terms.

### ATTRIBUTION-NONCOMMERCIAL-NODERIVS

**CC BY-NC-ND**
This license is the most restrictive of the six main licenses, only allowing you to download the original work and share it with others as long as you credit the original work. You can’t change the original work in any way or use it commercially.

---

From: [How To Attribute Creative Commons Photos](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/3.0/) by Foter
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Many Academics Are Eager to Publish in Worthless Journals

By GINA KOLATA  OCT. 30, 2017

Link

Publish or Perish

Images:
PhD Comics, Publish or Perish
Hagen, 2008, CartoonStock
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## Hijacked Journals

Sometimes someone will create a counterfeit website that pretends to be the website of a legitimate scholarly journal. The website creators then solicit manuscript submissions for the hijacked version of the journal, pocketing the money. In some cases, the legitimate versions of the journals are only published in print form and may not have websites.

In the table below, the hijacked journal is listed in the left column; the corresponding authentic version of the journal is on the right. In cases where no website can be found for the original journal, a link is made to a bibliographic record for the journal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hijacked Journal</th>
<th>Authentic Journal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACADEMIE ROYALE DES SCIENCES D'OUTRE-MER BULLETIN DES</td>
<td>Bulletin des séances- Académie royale des sciences d'outre-mer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEANCES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acoreana Journal (Journal of Acoreana)</td>
<td>Acoreana: revista de estudios acoreanos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acta Bioethica</td>
<td>Acta Bioethica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACTA CIRURGICA BRASILEIRA</td>
<td>Acta cirúrgica Brasileira</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afinidad</td>
<td>Afinidad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGROCHIMICA</td>
<td>Agrochimica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIMS Report Journal</td>
<td>AIMS report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Journal of Albertiana</td>
<td>Albertiana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amoeba Journal</td>
<td>Amoeba: NUN-mededelingenblad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anais da Academia Brasileira de Ciências</td>
<td>Anais da Academia Brasileira de Ciências</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Minimum for Open Access

= SELF-ARCHIVING

= deposit on a suitable repository
(embargo period may apply)
‘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

0000-0001-6715-8628