

[publicaccess@ostp.gov](mailto:publicaccess@ostp.gov)

6<sup>th</sup> January 2012

**A response from Taylor & Francis to the Office of Science and Technology Policy Request for Information: Public Access to Peer-Reviewed Scholarly Publications resulting from Federally Funded Research**

Taylor & Francis is a leading international academic publisher. Operating from a network of 20 global offices, including New York, Philadelphia, Oxford, Melbourne, Stockholm, Beijing, New Delhi, Johannesburg, Singapore and Tokyo, the Taylor & Francis Group publishes more than 1,500 journals and around 3,600 new books each year, with a books backlist in excess of 60,000 specialist titles.

(1) Are there steps that agencies could take to grow existing and new markets related to the access and analysis of peer-reviewed publications that result from federally funded scientific research? How can policies for archiving publications and making them publically accessible be used to grow the economy and improve the productivity of the scientific enterprise? What are the relative costs and benefits of such policies? What type of access to these publications is required to maximize U.S. economic growth and improve the productivity of the American scientific enterprise?

- Researchers have more access to more material than at any time in human history, facilitated by a vibrant and healthy publishing industry. If lack of access to information was constraining growth and productivity then these constraints have lifted significantly in the last decade.
- A range of business models are emerging including “traditional” subscriptions to print and online journals; site-license access to journals, books and databases; author/funder pays open access. This is all part of a healthy knowledge economy, if agencies interfere in this then they incur real costs for no clear benefit and may undermine the sustainability of the existing system.

(2) What specific steps can be taken to protect the intellectual property interests of publishers, scientists, Federal agencies, and other stakeholders involved with the publication and dissemination of peer-reviewed scholarly publications resulting from federally funded scientific research? Conversely, are there policies that should not be adopted with respect to public access to peer-reviewed scholarly publications so as not to undermine any intellectual property rights of publishers, scientists, Federal agencies, and other stakeholders?

2&4 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxfordshire OX14 4RN  
Tel: +44 (0) 20 7017 6000; Fax: +44 (0) 20 7017 6336

Distribution (Books) Bookpoint Limited, 130 Milton Park, Abingdon, OX14 4SB  
Tel: +44 (0) 1235 400524 ; Fax: +44 (0) 1235 400525

[www.tandf.co.uk](http://www.tandf.co.uk)

Registered in England and Wales. Registered Number: 1072954  
Registered Office: Mortimer House, 37-41 Mortimer Street, London, W1T 3JH

an informa business

- Publication in the peer-reviewed literature involves considerable costs which are borne by publishers and recovered in subscription and/or open access fees. Funding agencies should not expect this peer-reviewed literature to be freely available unless the publishers are rewarded for the service they have provided, the products they have created and the value that they have added. Unfunded mandates for open access deposit of published material threaten the sustainability of the publishing system.

(3) What are the pros and cons of centralized and decentralized approaches to managing public access to peer-reviewed scholarly publications that result from federally funded research in terms of interoperability, search, development of analytic tools, and other scientific and commercial opportunities? Are there reasons why a Federal agency (or agencies) should maintain custody of all published content, and are there ways that the government can ensure long-term stewardship if content is distributed across multiple private sources?

- Existing standards for identifying digital works ([www.crossref.org](http://www.crossref.org)) and authors ([www.orcid.org](http://www.orcid.org)) need to be fully adopted by government agencies to allow a distributed model of access to flourish. This spreads cost and risk throughout the system rather than concentrating it in federally funded projects. The case for a distributed archive is demonstrated by the success of the LOCKSS initiative ([www.lockss.org](http://www.lockss.org)).

(4) Are there models or new ideas for public-private partnerships that take advantage of existing publisher archives and encourage innovation in accessibility and interoperability, while ensuring long-term stewardship of the results of federally funded research?

- Site-license access to publisher archives is now widely facilitated by state-funded library consortia and this has worked well to increase access. Increased funding to libraries has the potential to deliver even greater benefits.

(5) What steps can be taken by Federal agencies, publishers, and/or scholarly and professional societies to encourage interoperable search, discovery, and analysis capacity across disciplines and archives? What are the minimum core metadata for scholarly publications that must be made available to the public to allow such capabilities? How should Federal agencies make certain that such minimum core metadata associated with peer-reviewed publications resulting from federally funded scientific research are publicly available to ensure that these publications can be easily found and linked to Federal science funding?

- Public availability of journal abstracts is established practice and well supported by publishers and researchers. Funding agencies could do more to support the digital object identifier ([www.crossref.org](http://www.crossref.org)) as a means of permanently linking to the peer-reviewed literature.

(6) How can Federal agencies that fund science maximize the benefit of public access policies to U.S. taxpayers, and their investment in the peer-reviewed literature, while minimizing burden and costs for stakeholders, including awardee institutions, scientists, publishers, Federal agencies, and libraries?



Taylor & Francis

Taylor & Francis Group

- The published peer-reviewed literature is well maintained by the current publishing ecosystem. Federal agencies could enhance this by working with publishers to establish a registry of grants, so that items in the peer-reviewed literature could be linked back to their supporting grants. The original research progress reports that are sent to the funding agencies should be made publicly available by them and also linked to the resulting peer-reviewed publications. Funding agencies have a poor track record of documenting and providing access to their own material and could learn a great deal from the publishing sector on how to make material widely available in a sustainable way. This collaboration is beginning to take shape around CrossGrant, a pilot project between Crossref, NISO, DOE-OSTI and Wellcome Trust.

(7) Besides scholarly journal articles, should other types of peer-reviewed publications resulting from federally funded research, such as book chapters and conference proceedings, be covered by these public access policies?

- If funding agencies were more open with their information on what grants had been awarded when and to whom and if this information were accessible and organised then publishers could link publications to grants. This would make the whole system far more useful and transparent, but publishers would still have to charge for access to the resulting publication. If books were to be made open access without payment to publishers then there would be no more books.

(8) What is the appropriate embargo period after publication before the public is granted free access to the full content of peer-reviewed scholarly publications resulting from federally funded research? Please describe the empirical basis for the recommended embargo period. Analyses that weigh public and private benefits and account for external market factors, such as competition, price changes, library budgets, and other factors, will be particularly useful. Are there evidence-based arguments that can be made that the delay period should be different for specific disciplines or types of publications?

- If content is made “free” after an embargo period then it effectively limits the copyright term during which the publisher can make a return on their investment. Shorter embargo periods will reduce publisher investment and degrade the quality of the peer-reviewed scholarly literature.
- There is considerable variation across subject areas but research in this area is still in its infancy and it is too early to establish definitive embargo periods for any discipline. These issues are being explored by the PEER project, funded by the European Commission ([www.peerproject.eu](http://www.peerproject.eu)).