

06/08/2018

# Wellcome's Open Access Policy Review

Q3 2018

Helena Wilcox and Diego Baptista





**Q2 - Which of the following best describes your current position as a researcher?**

Answer	%	Count
Early-career researcher	25.98%	113
Mid-career researcher	23.91%	104
Senior researcher	45.98%	200
Other	4.14%	18
Total	100%	435

Other

Public engagement specialist  
We are a museum funded as part of Wellcome Public engagement so are co  
Theatre Producer  
Director  
Lab manager  
Institution  
Informatics Service Developer  
Archivist  
laboratory facility director  
Community researcher  
ISSF Lead  
Independent Research Director (plenty of real world experience, but relatively new to research)

**Q3 - What is your primary area of research?**

Answer	%	Count	
Biomedical science	70.67%	306	
Population health	13.16%	57	
Product development and applied research	1.85%	8	
Humanities and social science	12.93%	56	
Public engagement and creative industries	1.39%	6	
Total	100%	433	

<b>Q4 - Where do you primarily conduct your research?</b>			
Answer	%	Count	
UK	78.74%	337	
Rest of Europe	2.10%	9	
Africa	11.92%	51	
Asia	3.74%	16	
North America	1.17%	5	
South America	0.70%	3	
Australasia	1.64%	7	
Total	100%	428	

<b>Q5 - Are you primarily based at an institution that receives block grant funding for open access costs from Wellcome via the Charity Open Access Fund?</b>			
#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	81.44%	272
2	No	18.56%	62
	Total	100%	334

<b>Q6 - Wellcome's open access (OA) policy applies to the following publication types: original research articles, book chapters and monographs. Have you published your Wellcome-funded research in one or more of these formats?</b>			
Answer	%	Count	
Yes I have published original research articles only	51.31%	216	
Yes I have published book chapters and/or monographs only	1.19%	5	

Yes I have published both original research articles and book chapters/monographs	26.37%	111
	21.14%	89
Total	100%	421

<b>Q8 - Do the articles that you've published on your Wellcome-funded research comply with our open access (OA) policy?</b>			
#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	93.77%	286
2	Some	4.59%	14
3	No	0.00%	0
4	I don't know	1.64%	5
	Total	100%	305

<b>Q9 - If not all of your research articles comply with our OA policy, please briefly explain why not?</b>
I did not know that Book Chapters were included
some relevant journals and book publishers don't have a full OA capacity.
The agreement between the Wellcome Trust and certain publishers [r] has been repeatedly made and then broken, making it difficult to keep a consistent policy and practice.
One article in a high profile journal [r] did not offer OA initially - only OA after 12m (at no cost). In this case, I made the pre-print available.
Primarily due to arcane differences in policies of journals and Wellcome that were not spotted by the numerous scientific and library professionals working in the process.
One of my articles was declined by [r] because it contained foreign language characters. I made it available online via other means instead. Apart from this, I complied with the policy. I would like to add that [r] are having significant technical problems with non-English characters which are rather baffling in the times of unicode.
Sometimes it's a category that the journal doesn't allow to be made open access. Sometimes we are co-authors but not lead authors and are unable to convince the lead authors to go for open access.
[r] does not use a CC-BY license
[r] license

Some are carried out by students and researchers without funding. They cannot afford to pay the Open Access fees that the journals require  
I published a paper in [r] which was compliant with OA policy for the REF but colleagues employed by the Wellcome Trust seemed less aware of the requirements

It is an opaque and difficult system to comply with and large publishers (e.g. [r]) seems to have no knowledge system  
I will make the necessary changes so my book chapter will be an open access publication

**Q10 - Thinking of your overall experiences of publishing Wellcome-funded articles, please review the following statements and indicate to what extent you agree/disagree with them:**

Question	Strongly agree		Somewhat agree		Neither agree nor disagree		Somewhat disagree		Strongly disagree		Total
Wellcome/s OApolicy enables me to maximise the audience my research reaches.	69.71%	214	21.82%	67	5.54%	17	1.95%	6	0.98%	3	307
Complying with Wellcome's OA policy for articles is simple and straightforward.	39.74%	122	40.07%	123	7.82%	24	10.75%	33	1.63%	5	307
Wellcome provides me with sufficient information and support to enable me to comply with the OA policy.	45.10%	138	37.91%	116	10.78%	33	5.23%	16	0.98%	3	306
Wellcome's OA policy provides me with freedom to choose where and how I publish my research.	48.04%	147	25.82%	79	12.42%	38	10.78%	33	2.94%	9	306

**Q11 - In addition to complying with Wellcome's OA policy do you have experience of complying with other research funder's OA policies?**

Answer	%	Count
Yes	59.15%	181
No	40.85%	125
Total	100%	306

**Q13 - How does complying with Wellcome's OA policy for original research articles compare to your experiences of complying with other funders OA policies?**

Question	Strongly agree		Somewhat agree		Neither agree nor disagree		Somewhat disagree		Strongly disagree		Total
Wellcome's OA policy is sufficiently similar to other funders, enabling me and my co-authors to comply with multiple policies at once.	45.86%	83	38.67%	70	7.18%	13	8.29%	15	0.00%	0	181
Wellcome's OA policy is more complex to comply with than other funders.	1.11%	2	6.67%	12	27.78%	50	35.00%	63	29.44%	53	180
Wellcome's OA policy is harder to comply with when the corresponding author on the article is funded by another organisation.	7.22%	13	18.89%	34	38.33%	69	23.89%	43	11.67%	21	180

**Q57 - Please explain why you think Wellcome's OA policy is more complex to comply with than other funders?**

The primary outcome of Open Access is that it eats up the valuable time of the researchers. It is largely a non-value-added activity. Funders have a responsibility to unify their policies and then work with the journals to make it happen automatically. There are only so many hours in a day. Shouldn't we spend our time doing life-saving research rather than decoding different OA policies?

Complex, at the level of working out what is acceptable.

The requirement that papers are available within six months is at odds with the policy of certain publishers (e.g [r]). Rather than have in place a ready-made solution the responsibility for dealing with this is placed on the PI's shoulders

some other funders are happy with just depositing the accepted version of the manuscript in an institutional repository. Some leading journals (eg. [r]) OA policies (even under CC BY) do not fully comply with requirements as laid out by all funders.

Use of specific databases. More stringent OA rules

Not all journals agree with the Wellcome OA policy; Creative Commons and Gold Access policies are not orivided by all journals.

It may be the way that things are explained but my University fully understands the UKRI policy but perhaps not that of the WT

Some publishers do not - for technical reasons - comply with posting on [r], although other aspects of AO are satisfied

Because I need to deal with my university to comply with Wellcome's OA policy and they are incompetent

the requirement for CC-BY - there is no uniform way to specify this, varies by journal. I still think CC-BY is worth it, and journals should make the selection of license more transparent.

It is more restrictive, which causes an element of challenge when one author on a manuscript led by an overseas group not under the same restrictions

**Q58 - Please explain why you think Wellcome's OA policy is less complex to comply with than other funders?**

There is no choice; if funding from Wellcome was involved, then open access is a requirement

[r] is worse.

Better OA options than others

Because NIH requires one to resubmit the article to PMCID

Research Councils exclude hybrid journals and instiutions vary policies locally as the block grant funding runs out

Because the article has to be open access - that doesn't however mean it is simpler to apply. It just means you are prohibited from publishing in particular journals.

NIH appears to require deposition in a unique repository - Wellcome simply requires open access within 6 months

Because Wellcome provide funds to go through the journal's open access route. So we don't need to do anything complicated. HEFCE require a separate deposit of pre-publication manuscripts on a server.

Wellcome doesn't change its policy as often. Wellcome policy is clear and straightforward - everything should be OA!

Easier to choose most appropriate journal to publish in without worrying about the cost...



Block grant simplifies local administration.

I think it's just that I know it better as most of my work is funded by Wellcome

**Q15 - Have you published your Wellcome-funded articles via the gold OA route?**

Answer	%	Count
Yes in fully OA journals	19.67%	60
Yes in hybrid journals	12.79%	39
Yes in both hybrid and fully OA journals	47.21%	144
No	11.15%	34
I don't remember	9.18%	28
Total	100%	305

**Q16 - Thinking of your most recent experience of publishing your Wellcome-funded research article in a fully OA journal please review the following statements and indicate to what extent you agree/disagree with them:**

Question	Strongly agree		Somewhat agree		Neither agree nor dis		Somewhat disagree		Strongly disagree		Total
Selecting the CC-BY license required by Wellcome was simple and straightforward	51.27%	101	32.99%	65	12.69%	25	2.54%	5	0.51%	1	197
The cost of the Article Processing Charge(APC) was clear.	53.33%	104	31.79%	62	7.18%	14	6.67%	13	1.03%	2	195
The cost of the APC was in line with my expectation of the costs of publishing an article.	29.23%	57	35.38%	69	18.46%	36	11.79%	23	5.13%	10	195

Accessing funding from Wellcome to pay for the APC was simple and straightforward.	50.77%	99	24.62%	48	14.87%	29	9.23%	18	0.51%	1	195
Upon publication, the article was made freely available both on the publisher website and in PMC/Europe PMC under the copyright licence selected.	70.77%	138	21.03%	41	4.62%	9	3.08%	6	0.51%	1	195

**Q17 - Thinking of your most recent experience of publishing Wellcome-funded research in a hybrid journal please review the following statements and indicate to what extent you agree/disagree with them:**

Question	Strongly agree		Somewhat agree		Neither agree nor disagree		Somewhat disagree		Strongly disagree		Total
Selecting the OA option was simple and straightforward.	36.16%	64	44.63%	79	9.04%	16	9.60%	17	0.56%	1	177
Selecting the CC-BY license required by Wellcome was simple and straightforward.	34.86%	61	43.43%	76	12.00%	21	8.00%	14	1.71%	3	175
The cost of the Article Processing Charge (APC) was clear.	35.23%	62	43.75%	77	9.09%	16	10.23%	18	1.70%	3	176
The cost of the APC was in line with my expectation of the costs of publishing an article.	15.82%	28	38.98%	69	19.77%	35	18.64%	33	6.78%	12	177

Accessing funding from Wellcome to pay for the APC was simple and straightforward.	52.57%	92	24.00%	42	13.71%	24	8.57%	15	1.14%	2	175
Upon publication, the article was made freely accessible both on the publisher website and in PMC/Europe PMC under the copyright licence selected.	59.32%	105	28.81%	51	7.34%	13	4.52%	8	0.00%	0	177

Q19 - Have you used the green OA route to comply with Wellcome's OA policy for articles?		
Answer	%	Count
Yes	35.25%	104
No	46.10%	136
I don't remember	18.64%	55
Total	100%	295

Q20 - Thinking of your most recent experience of using the green OA route for your Wellcome-funded article please review the following statements and indicate to what extent you agree/disagree with them:											
Question	Strongly agree		Somewhat agree		Neither agree nor disagree		Somewhat disagree		Strongly disagree		Total
Self-archiving the author accepted manuscript in Europe PMC was easy.	17.48%	18	36.89%	38	23.30%	24	17.48%	18	4.85%	5	103

The publisher policy on author self-archiving “ in terms of embargoes and license requirements - was clear and easy to follow.	9.71%	10	33.98%	35	21.36%	22	29.13%	30	5.83%	6	103
The 6-month embargo period where, permitted by the publisher, enables others to access my research in an acceptable time frame.	13.59%	14	28.16%	29	13.59%	14	25.24%	26	19.42%	20	103

**Q54 - If you wish to comment in more detail on your experiences of complying with Wellcome's OA policy for articles please do so here.**

6 months is too long to wait for access to the article

Some difficulty working with US-based publishers; they are not always set up to handle OA

I very much like the concise aspect - many policies are long-winded. Well done

Costs seem to be rising disproportionately for the OA agreement e.g. \$3k recently for a review

Please note: my current funding from the Trust is recent and has not yet led to publications. Previous WT funding related to an earlier publication regime, in which OA guidelines were quite different

I've never seen a justification for OA that weighs the benefits versus the cost in researcher (and Wellcome personnel) time. I imagine the costs far outweigh the benefits. We could all be involved in productive activities instead.

I like Wellcome OA policy as it gives opportunity to publish in a very fast manner and also increases the chances of findings to be published. My feeling so far was that, because of the impact factor, most of journal were rejecting articles.

Our institute makes the procedure quite difficult

the various Creative Commons licenses are confusing

Sorry, I have only just started my grant so have not published from it yet, but I have been [r] core funded for the past 18 years and I paid from my [r] consumables budget to make my last paper gold open access.

This can often be very straightforward, but sometimes is not, either because journal websites are not as clear as they might be or because of the need to remember to self-archive where relevant. In all cases where a fee is involved, there is an extra tier of bureaucracy involved. It is also sometimes unclear what component of a publication charge is the open access fee.

The journal was very slow to publish (full typesetting) 2 articles. Yes they complied with the 6 month embargo, but only because they took four-six months to publish the article at all. It's a gripe with the journal, not with Wellcome.

There are still some good journals that aren't green compliant.

Confusion at my institution about procedures to pay charges;

I am employed by [r]. The university does have a fund (to which Wellcome Trust contributes) for OA papers. The problem is that the fund pays OA papers only until there is money in the fund, which means that if the paper is published in January, it has a better chance to be funded in the contrary to papers that are accepted in the second half of the year. It hasn't happened to me yet, but it means that even though I am funded by Wellcome Trust, my papers could be refused to be paid for the OA from the fund based on the time of acceptance of the paper.

I am shocked by the cost of open access. The publisher loves it (you have given them the freedom to charge whatever they want), but I doubt this is a worthwhile use of scarce research funds.

Wellcome's OA policy is important and helps to maximise my research. My complaint is that the admin team at Imperial handling OA funding made every application cumbersome (back and forth with the journals); some journals will not formally accept the manuscript without journal payment versus Imperial will not pay for OA until the manuscript is formally accepted.

It is extremely important for African research that both researchers and readers are supported.

It would be great if significant review articles were covered as well.

My most recent experience was for a review and even though it contained previously unpublished primary data and was reviewed by 4 reviewers [r] (and the Wellcome OA team) would not pay for Gold access (via the block grant which is usually very easy). The embargo was more than 6 months and EuroPMC does not have an option for this so I had to contact them directly to ask about this.

I do think the OA policy that the Wellcome has is an excellent idea and good to have. Some pressure needs to be applied to the journals and publishers to provide this option and if they don't then alternatives need to be suggested.

I think that all types of scientific publications should be covered by the OA policy because the research that we publish stems from these protocols and if we do not get comments early in the process (by the maximum number of readers/researchers), we might end up publishing low-quality papers under the gold OA scheme. Also, I think that the OA fees should be covered no matter the position of the author in the byline and no matter whether he is the corresponding author or not.

Our library are very good at facilitating the process for us. I am constantly astounded at how much charges are for open access and have used the WOR route recently instead. This was smooth and easily facilitated. The disadvantage being the unknown way in which this will be viewed for the REF.

Most readers would like to access the article as rapidly as possible after publication, so the 6-month embargo period causes difficulties in this regard.

Many conventional journals are highly uncooperative in this

I was unaware that monographs (by which I mean reviews) could be funded via the Wellcome Trust. They do involve a substantial amount of background research to be published in quality journals.

I simply pay all charges to make the publications available to everyone. Did not read/research on policies further than that.

It is difficult for me to comment on some of the practicalities of dealing with the funding as my project manager has done that. It might be useful to access administrators' views on this.

The system is much more straightforward than it used to be but it does worry researchers that universities might decide to prioritise some researchers open access fees in the future and not others, as they have a habit of accepting grant conditions and then not fully supporting the researcher in reality

The process is relatively straightforward except in the case of edited volumes, some of the contributors to which are not WT-funded. In some cases, it still makes sense to make the whole volume OA and generally this has been made possible by the WT and the University staff responsible for liaising with the WT. The other concern relates to open access monographs with images - some publishers are reluctant to include images because of copyright issues and this constrains publication choices for researchers.

No comment

I do wonder if this policy is worth all the money being spent on it. The publishers seem to be getting richer and richer because of the money from Wellcome and other organisations

Wellcome does it very straightforward to comply with the open access policies

The self-archiving process is time-consuming and frustrating...this time would be better spent actually doing research

Correctly submitting articles to non-fully open access journals comes with significantly more complexity, less information to support the process, and a lingering concern I haven't managed to meet all the Wellcome open access requirements.

Thank you very much for providing so much support for OA!

It is great that Wellcome encourages open access publishing, and that it provides funding to make this happen in a straightforward way.

My recent Wellcome Trust funding has only just been awarded and so my answers are based on old experiences and expectations of where I expect to publish - fully open access

I have a new grant and will endeavour to bring myself up to speed shortly. I might then be able to answer the questions better

Some of the major, high-impact journals in my field e.g. [r] are not OA and have an embargo period of 12 months. This means I can no longer submit to these journals despite them having provided high impact, highly cited papers in the past. It is therefore slightly unfortunate given these are mid-range journals, between high impact [r] where my research is less likely to be suitable and the low-impact OA journals where I would prefer not to send my papers.

n/a

Actually getting the APC charges paid from COAF fund is very fiddly, each institution does it differently, argues over joint university funding, and it would all be a lot easier if WT coordinated it directly!

Some hybrid journals are charging extortionate fees for Gold OA

Embargo is a total nonsense. As is the old, deprecated, immoral and deeply unfair publishing model.

Once I figured it out, it was very easy and the Wellcome was most helpful. I believe your website has been updated with more info since I published my first OA article.

It seems a lot of effort to go to for relatively little gain

Both "research articles" and "reviews" can contain original thoughts and both deserve OA.

My articles contain a lot of foreign language characters, and PMC has problems processing these.

I would prefer to deal directly with Wellcome than with my university

Journals do not always provide the open access that is paid for. There have been cases of supposed OA papers that have still been behind a pay-firewall

Honestly, I do not understand it at all. I just follow instructions when I publish. It is a bit of a hassle.

Unfortunately this is another thing for us to worry about, there is always a sneaking suspicion that you can get this wrong and upset somebody.

Journals can offer about six different options, all have rather unhelpful acronyms, and it is easy to click the wrong box. In some ways the researcher is piggy in the middle between the funder and the publisher.

I like to use the gold route whenever possible. Since the green OA route is broadly equivalent to NIH & HHMI, I have found it an accessible fallback in almost every case where gold OA was not possible (e.g. the best journal to reach target audience do not offer CC-BY license). A few journals do not make it possible to comply (e.g. gold is not possible because they won't offer CCBY, green is not possible because they demand 12 month embargo). I try to identify and avoid these, but I have also been able to negotiate with them to adopt the Wellcome rules - the Trust has enough clout that journals do not want to exclude themselves from publishing WT funded work. It is a great lever to advance OA publishing IMO

I strongly support the OA policy, and comply with it. The issue is with institutes and universities, who value impact factor of journal above all else. I am therefore forced to attempt to publish in certain journals, even though I find their hybrid OA models exploitative and repugnant. The simple fact is that publishing in fully OA journals is not valued by those who decide on my career progression.

It's great that Wellcome will fund Open Access, but: (1) it is yet another bureaucratic burden on PIs to have to contact the OA team within the university and get them to pay the fee; (2) I think this process should somehow be handled automatically once one ticks a box on the submission metadata (when submitting the paper) saying that the work is Wellcome-funded; (3) the process gets really confusing for reviews for which, as far as I can understand, Wellcome will only pay for OA if it was not an invited review (which is a bizarre policy, because the highest journals rarely take unsolicited reviews, so you are forcing the best reviews to not be OA!).

It is really expensive to pay OA fees for the WT.

[r] is a notable omission from Wellcome OA funding due to license differences. It would be helpful if this were resolved as this is a leading journal and often a key target for publication.

I am unhappy that theoretical and review papers are not covered by Wellcome's OA policy. These can be important papers and are the ones likely to most useful, for example, to the general public. I think it's a terrible shame that they are excluded.

Open access in principle is a good idea. However, the publishers have made this a goldmine and are charging huge amounts where the authors are now required to do all the editing and formatting etc. This takes large amounts of funding that would be better used on research and should be looked at by all. The cost of open access is Extortionate.

Fully open access are the best. Hybrid gold models are usually ok but the publishers need policing and close monitoring for compliance. It's usually expensive but sometimes necessary either to reach the optimal audience for benefit (is top clinical specialty journal) or when collaborators are involved and they are the main authors.

It is relatively easy, but I do feel that the hybrid journals are quite simply ripping off the community to a shocking level.

Several journals claim they will upload to PMC for you. But you have to check - they don't all do this, or do this on time. Easier to just do it yourself and be sure it was done.

Sorry- I have not come across Gold or green OA before. In real world, most manuscripts are a pot pourri of researchers and funding sources and just so difficult to navigate. This is even more so with non-original papers- commentaries, reviews, letters, chapters etc etc

My University self-archives the papers for us, making the process very straightforward. We email the accepted paper with the acceptance letter to a dedicated email address and then it is taken care of for us

Many hybrid journals wrap their OA fee into their APC, which enables me to publish in these journals as Wellcome meets the open access costs. This is not always the case however, and it can be confusing which journals I am allowed to publish in and which I am not (as I have no funds to pay submission fees or APCs independently of Open Access fees). This can be difficult to navigate, and preclude me from submitting to some of the highest ranking journals (e.g. [r]).

Journals should agree on an immediate publication as long as publication fee is paid.

The whole system is a clunky mess for geneticists. I am on papers with 100 authors and I often do not see the final submitted version after editorial changes. It is horrible and a huge waste of my time. With the UK REF adding to the burden and bizarre differences in expectations and rules (NIH has differing rules so when I am on a paper with them, they comply with NIH rules but then this is not sufficient for UK rules... madness

Sometimes it is easy. The problems I have had arise when publishing a "Letter". This is something which confuses the open access teams in [r] as the WT language in the OA policy excludes Letters. But these are peer-reviewed high-impact journals, and the letters are just as prominent as the journal articles. So in those cases I often have resistance from the open access team to paying the invoices, and get involved in correspondence with the Trust and [r] to try to sort it all out which takes ages. The definition should be peer-reviewed, full stop. The same applies to reviews. If these are peer-reviewed they should be funded, in my opinion. Books - I have not even tried. I have no idea how this would work. These are not peer-reviewed of course, only edited, and fully referenced, so I am working on the basis that book chapters which do not contain new research results do not have to be open access but I might be wrong.

Personally I found it a nightmare but to some extent this may be because I was doing it for the first time.

In general I support the Gold OA route but do believe that this can be an expensive option, especially through hybrid journals. I am more inclined for a lot of work to go the green OA route (6 month embargo) as I now post preprints of the work so it is freely available anyway, even BEFORE publication in a journal. Maybe an option to consider green OA (6 mo embargo) where articles have been deposited as preprints. The only issue really is then discoverability.

It's quite time consuming and an additional burden for the researcher

I commend the WT for providing grant holders the financial resources to publish their work in OA outlets using the Gold OA route.



I think the publisher charges for OA are obscene and Wellcome and other funders should be leveraging their positions to drive them down.

The OA policies of Wellcome and MRC are generally fine. However, it can create problems when dealing with co-authors who are not funded by either and do not want to pay OA fees. In addition the OA fees paid to [r] journals simply allow [r] to make even more money. A lower fee for 6 month access might be a better approach. Likewise it would be helpful in Wellcome and OA could waive OA requirements on papers where their funded scientist is not corresponding author.

The Green Route seems problematic to me, in that it further proliferates different versions of a manuscript in the public domain (e.g. BioRxiv, pubmed central, publishers formatted) potentially leading to confusion

**Q22 - Do the monographs and book chapters that you've published on your Wellcome-funded research comply with our open access (OA) policy?**

Answer	%	Count	
Yes	38.46%	40	
Some	11.54%	12	
No	14.42%	15	
I don't know	35.58%	37	
Total	100%	104	

**Q23 - If not all of your monographs or book chapters comply with our OA policy, please briefly explain why not?**

I was not sure about the rules for book chapters

Did not realise this was a requirement, and do not usually include chapters in publication listings

Some book chapters were submitted a year or so before publication and I didn't realise the OA policy changed

Historically they didn't have to..old articles

Wellcome's open access policies have changed in the time that I've been publishing, and I'm not very clear on what kind of financial support

Wellcome provides to make open access possible for book chapters, or the extent to which open access is necessary when my previous research was funded by the Wellcome when open access conditions are different, versus the research the Wellcome is funding now, when policies are a bit more clear.

Book is not out yet. I don't know what policies are for this type of publication.

I thought that the OA regulations only covered research, not review articles

I have not published any book chapters on Wellcome funded research. have selected neither agree nor disagree below

[r] I have not got much done, so have not published Wellcome funded stuff yet.

Those published before the open access policy was extended to books and monographs may not comply. Since that date, I have found publishers to be quite variable in the degree to which they are willing to accommodate an open access request.

Not possible with some book chapters

No gold route available for [r] or [r]

I did not think invited reviews were included in OA

In most cases a review article is not "WT funded research" but a commentary about the literature in a field. Just because I am performing research in the same or partly overlapping field does not necessarily make it "WT funded research". Generally I have only made reviews or similar papers CC-BY compliant when they introduce a new idea or concept, or a new technique, but not when they are mere commentaries on published literature. In addition, many publishers of book chapters do not offer the option of CC-BY OA.

Uncertainty as to which apply and which do not

The publishers do not offer the option for book chapters

Publishers do not comply with OA policy. Often this is not apparent when the manuscript is solicited. I generally refuse such opportunities to write such monographs any more but this was harder when I was more junior in my career.

It is not even clear that you can do this in book chapters that are part of an edited book on a particular topic

Have no control over publisher

Some book chapters and editorials are invited and then I have found that they are not offered online. I have incurred no costs, but very hard to make open access. eg [r]

Sorry - probably shouldn't have ticked this box early on in the process. Reseach in chapters was from a while ago, before this policy came in.

Agreed to co-author paper once lead author had already accepted

Published in [r] and not sure whether they made OA

Wellcome Trust OA team told me that book chapters do not need to comply with its OA policy. Also, it was impossible to make my own book chapter OA. Making the whole book OA cost [r].

The book chapters were not funded by Wellcome

no possibility for open access

I don't think this is typically an option?

Published before OA policy was introduced

N/A book Chapters not funded by Wellcome

PUBlished before OA policy came into place

Once we submitted to the publisher, we made clear that they should be open access but not sure how much of that is implementable especially if the chapter is written by different authors who are funded differently

The cost for open access for this type of article is not covered by the oA policy and my lab can not afford these costs.

I really don't know

The book chapters I have published were from quite a long time ago, from before I was a Wellcome funded researcher and before open access fees existed.

I don't know what the policy is- chapter not yet published.

I didn't know Wellcome requires this...or what the policy this. I was only aware of the policy as it applies to papers and was asked to contribute

chapters for books

In the past book chapters were exempt - I can't recall if the chapters I published were under the old system

Can't recall - don't think it was allowed. Didn't really cross my consciousness.

I have given up writing book chapters in recent years, as it's mostly a waste of time, and the challenges making them OA are often just too difficult. My comments below are based on experiences some time back. To be clear my beef is not with WT OA policy but with the publishers of the books!

**Q24 - Thinking of your overall experience when publishing Wellcome-funded monographs or book chapter, please review the following statements and indicate to what extent you agree/disagree with them:**

Question	Strongly agree		Somewhat agree		Neither agree nor disagree		Somewhat disagree		Strongly disagree		Total
Wellcome's OA policy enables me to maximise the audience my research reaches.	42.11%	40	27.37%	26	22.11%	21	6.32%	6	2.11%	2	95
Complying with Wellcome's OA policy for monographs and book chapters is simple and straightforward.	12.63%	12	27.37%	26	33.68%	32	14.74%	14	11.58%	11	95
Wellcome provides me with sufficient information and support to enable me to comply with the OA policy.	18.95%	18	31.58%	30	31.58%	30	13.68%	13	4.21%	4	95
Wellcome's OA policy provides me with freedom to choose where and how I publish my research.	24.21%	23	23.16%	22	30.53%	29	16.84%	16	5.26%	5	95

**Q26 - Have you used the gold OA route to comply with Wellcome's OA policy for monographs and book chapters?**

Answer	%	Count
Yes	20.41%	20
No	55.10%	54
I don't remember	24.49%	24
Total	100%	98

**Q27 - Thinking of your most recent experience of publishing Wellcome-funded research in a monograph or book chapter via gold OA please review the following statements and indicate to what extent you agree/disagree with them:**

Question	Strongly agree		Somewhat agree		Neither agree nor disagree		Somewhat disagree		Strongly disagree		Total
Arranging for the title to be published OA was simple and straightforward	35.00%	7	25.00%	5	5.00%	1	30.00%	6	5.00%	1	20
Ensuring the OA version was published under a Creative Commons licence of my choosing was simple and straightforward	30.00%	6	40.00%	8	5.00%	1	20.00%	4	5.00%	1	20
The cost of making the chapter or monograph OA was clear	30.00%	6	35.00%	7	15.00%	3	15.00%	3	5.00%	1	20

The cost of making the chapter or monograph OA was in line with my expectations of the costs of publishing a book chapter or monograph.	20.00%	4	40.00%	8	15.00%	3	20.00%	4	5.00%	1	20
Arranging for payment of the OA fee was simple and straightforward.	30.00%	6	30.00%	6	20.00%	4	10.00%	2	10.00%	2	20
Securing the funding from Wellcome to reimburse these costs was simple and straightforward	60.00%	12	15.00%	3	25.00%	5	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	20
Upon publication an electronic version of the chapter or monograph was made freely accessible both on the publishers website and in NCBI Bookshelf/Europe PMC under the copyright licence selected.	55.00%	11	25.00%	5	20.00%	4	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	20

Q29 - Have you used the green OA route to comply with Wellcome's OA policy for monographs and book chapters?			
#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	14.58%	14
2	No	57.29%	55

3	I don't rem	28.13%	27
	Total	100%	96

Q30 - Thinking of your most recent experience of using the green OA route for your Wellcome-funded book chapter or monograph, please review the following statements and indicate to what extent you agree/disagree with them:											
Question	Strongly agree		Somewhat agree		Neither agree nor dis		Somewhat disagree		Strongly disagree		Total
Self-archiving the author accepted manuscript via the Wellcome OA deposit form was easy	14.29%	2	57.14%	8	0.00%	0	21.43%	3	7.14%	1	14
The publisher policy on author self-archiving " in terms of embargoes and license requirements - was clear and easy to follow	0.00%	0	50.00%	7	14.29%	2	21.43%	3	14.29%	2	14
The 6-month embargo, where permitted by the publisher, enables others to access my research in an acceptable time frame.	21.43%	3	35.71%	5	7.14%	1	28.57%	4	7.14%	1	14

<p><b>Q55 - If you wish to comment in more detail on your experiences of complying with Wellcome's OA policy for book chapters and monographs please do so here.</b></p> <p>see previous comment (albeit based on only two chapters)</p> <p>My book chapter was never open access. It complied with the policy at the time (ie was not required to be OA).</p> <p>book publishers seem confused about the policy</p> <p>see above. On one hand OA is particularly valuable for reviews published in books which are not subscription based and which are therefore less accessible to people. On the other hand (see above comments) it is debatable whether a commentary represents "Wellcome Trust funded</p>
---

research".

The issue that I had was that the book publishers were not aware about the Wellcome OA policies for book chapters.

I make use of LinkedIn to provide final journal PDFs on a private basis. It's not ideal, but is preferable to 6 months delay and then only available in a substandard format.

Same comment as before - seek the views of research administrators.

I didn't know there was an OA policy on book chapters. I published a book chapter but someone else handled all of the interaction with the publishers.

Publishers tend to want the OA fee for a book or chapter, and then they try to skimp on the service they offer to the author. I have had some really difficult experiences with this. They are only interested in maximising profits. So the author ends up having to do much more than in the past like their own copy-editing, their own type-setting and their own index. I personally feel very strongly that Wellcome's money is being mis-spent by many publishers. The other related thing that is really difficult for the author to manage is the issue of obtaining OA worldwide rights to images - publishers want the author to pay for all of this up front and it can be prohibitively expensive.

Monographs present a particular challenge to scholars in the humanities and social sciences. Not all publishers are aware of the expectations on researchers or prepared to discuss or consider OA, which shapes the choices that we make in relation to publication outlets. In addition, edited volumes can create problems when not all contributors are WT funded.

I find it harder to access the book chapters and monographs of others often.

Books are different from articles. Usually a lot of material gets "recycled" for books. It is not that important to have the open access policy there. I think this is very different from publishing my own research. Impossible to influence a multi author publication and so most authors simply ignore WT rules on chapters.

I was not aware of these options for book chapters.

My experience was that the publisher had absolutely no prior experience of complying with open access policies, and in the end my chapter was made open access with no fee as there was simply no way for them to process such a fee within their system. Note that was shortly after the change in Wellcome open access policy to include monographs and book chapters.

-

After consulting with Wellcome I published a book chapter open access. This was not straightforward due to confusing information provided by the editor & publisher. The editor thought that I could publish on PMC after six months while ultimately the publisher said their policy was 12 months. The solution in the end was for Wellcome to pay the full open access costs for a CC book chapter. In short - the process involved a lot of back and forth but this was not due to Wellcome, it was due to confusion between an academic editor and the for-profit publisher.

My book chapter is not yet fully published (it is a slow process) so I cannot comment fully. But it was great to have Wellcome's mandate as something I could point to requiring open access. I was not charged a fee for OA.

I hope that Wellcome Trust gives pressure to publishers so that they will allow individual book chapters to make OA.

Most of the publications took place before OA funding was available via the Trust. The publishers agreed to OA publication without fee or

embargo period, but declined the request to make the book available on other servers.

I haven't published any book chapters or monographs - this survey is poorly designed because I indicated this on an earlier page

Most of the high impact chapters I write are in major textbooks that are exempt. Writing reviews as part of monographs can be good for dissemination but usually strategic review in a mainstream journal is more impactful and I would be very reluctant to write monograph book chapters and go down the green option unless there was major major strategic benefit for disseminating through this route

My experience with book chapters is that the publishers don't know how to follow Wellcome's policy (or even know if they can) presumably because few articles come in this way. The costs are also shocking for gold OA. The reason that we have not published any book chapters as green OA is because our co-authors believe that this is not allowed and the book publishers simply do not respond to any questions about it. This section probably isn't relevant to me as I was not a Wellcome funded researcher at the time of publication, and this was at a time when open access publishing was not common.

no knowledge of what the policy is...this is the first I have heard of such a policy

see above

<b>Q32 - Thinking more generally about OA, please review the statements and indicate to what extent you agree/disagree with them.</b>											
Question	Strongly agree		Somewhat agree		Neither agree nor disagree		Somewhat disagree		Strongly disagree		Total
It is important that research publications are made OA to maximise the societal benefit of research.	84.13%	318	10.32%	39	1.32%	5	3.70%	14	0.53%	2	378
The costs associated with publishing and reading research (including OA publishing costs) are an essential research cost.	62.17%	235	22.22%	84	5.56%	21	5.82%	22	4.23%	16	378
The cost of publishing and reading research via the subscription model is too high.	60.58%	229	25.13%	95	12.17%	46	1.32%	5	0.79%	3	378



The cost of publishing research OA via article or book processing charges are too high.	48.68%	184	29.63%	112	18.52%	70	2.38%	9	0.79%	3	378
---	--------	-----	--------	-----	--------	----	-------	---	-------	---	-----

**Q33 - Wellcome's current OA policy only applies to original research articles, monographs and book chapters. However, there are many other publication types (study protocols, data notes, reviews, case reports etc) that make important contributions to the research literature. Do you think the scope of Wellcome's OA policy should be broadened to include all types of research literature?**

Answer	%	Count
Yes	64.12%	243
No	17.94%	68
I don't know	17.94%	68
Total	100%	379

**Q36 - Thinking about gold OA publishing and whether Wellcome should consider changing its policy regarding funding this route - please read the following statements and indicate to what extent you agree/disagree with them:**

Question	Strongly agree		Somewhat agree		Neither agree nor disagree		Somewhat disagree		Strongly disagree		Total
Wellcome should continue to fund article processing charges to enable researchers to publish via the gold OA route.	64.58%	237	23.43%	86	6.81%	25	3.54%	13	1.63%	6	367

Wellcome should encourage researchers to publish in fully OA journals as in general they offer better value for money than hybrid journals	31.69%	116	24.59%	90	18.31%	67	16.39%	60	9.02%	33	366
Wellcome should continue to allow researchers to publish in hybrid journals even though in general they are more expensive than fully OA journals.	42.47%	155	33.42%	122	14.52%	53	6.85%	25	2.74%	10	365
Wellcome should set a cap on the maximum article processing charge it is prepared to pay.	21.10%	77	26.03%	95	17.81%	65	16.16%	59	18.90%	69	365

**Q37 - The bulk of our funding for Gold OA is provided to institutions as block grants to cover researchers OA publication costs. Researchers not at institutions in receipt of a block grant, need to contact Wellcome to arrange reimbursement of OA costs. Who do you think is best placed to manage the payment of OA charges (article processing charges and/or book processing charges)? Please select one option**

Answer	%	Count
Researchers with dedicated funds for OA publishing costs included within their research grants.	19.89%	70

Institution Libraries with funds provided by Wellcome to cover their researchers OA costs.	42.05%	148
Wellcome should manage OA costs directly on researcher's behalf.	38.07%	134
Total	100%	352

**Q39 - Thinking about green OA publishing “ and whether Wellcome should consider changing its policy regarding this route - please read the following statements and indicate to what extent you agree/disagree with them:**

Question	Strongly agree		Somewhat agree		Neither agree nor dis		Somewhat disagree		Strongly disagree		Total
Wellcome should continue to support the green OA route despite its limitations in terms of the embargo period and licence restrictions.	26.33%	94	31.37%	112	23.25%	83	13.45%	48	5.60%	20	357
Wellcome should continue to support the green OA route with a 6 month embargo period but should require a licence that enables greater reuse.	22.13%	79	35.85%	128	28.85%	103	8.68%	31	4.48%	16	357
Wellcome should promote the green OA route over gold OA as the way to realising its OA ambitions.	10.08%	36	16.81%	60	32.49%	116	20.73%	74	19.89%	71	357

Wellcome should discontinue its support for green OA to ensure that all the research it funds is made freely available and reusable at the time of publication.	13.45%	48	20.73%	74	26.05%	93	22.41%	80	17.37%	62	357
---	--------	----	--------	----	--------	----	--------	----	--------	----	-----

<b>Q41 - Thinking about preprints, please consider the following statement and indicate to what extent you agree/disagree with them.</b>											
Question	Strongly agree		Somewhat agree		Neither agree nor disagree		Somewhat disagree		Strongly disagree		Total
Publishing a preprint should be an acceptable way of complying with Wellcome's OA policy.	21.79%	78	31.56%	113	17.60%	63	17.60%	63	11.45%	41	358
Publishing a preprint should be an acceptable way of complying with Wellcome's OA policy in cases where the cost of gold OA is above a price cap.	25.14%	90	28.21%	101	18.72%	67	17.32%	62	10.61%	38	358
Publishing a preprint should be an acceptable way of complying with Wellcome's OA policy in cases where the embargo period for green OA is longer than that permitted by Wellcome.	26.82%	96	31.28%	112	18.44%	66	16.20%	58	7.26%	26	358

Q43 - Please read the following statements and indicate to what extent you agree/disagree with them:											
Question	Strongly agree		Somewhat agree		Neither agree nor disagree		Somewhat disagree		Strongly disagree		Total
The flexibility provided by the current OA policy is important in enabling researchers to comply with policy when publishing long form texts.	23.08%	78	25.74%	87	46.45%	157	3.85%	13	0.89%	3	338
The flexibility provided by the current OA policy is important in encouraging publishers to experiment with OA options.	17.46%	59	31.07%	105	47.93%	162	2.66%	9	0.89%	3	338
Wellcome should only support the gold OA route for long form texts as it ensures immediate access to the research.	8.58%	29	13.61%	46	52.07%	176	18.64%	63	7.10%	24	338
Wellcome should only support the green OA route for long form texts as the cost of gold OA is too expensive.	7.08%	24	19.47%	66	53.10%	180	14.16%	48	6.19%	21	339

**Q44 - Wellcome currently allows long form texts such as monographs and book chapters to be licenced under one of 3 options: CC-BY, CC-BY-NC and CC-BY-NC-ND when it is paying a book processing charge to make a monograph or chapter OA. Do you think Wellcome should restrict the licence choices to enable maximal reuse of the research as it does for original research articles?**

Answer	%	Count
Yes only CC-BY	31.95%	100
Yes CC-BY or CC-BY-NC should be allowed	37.06%	116
No	30.99%	97
Total	100%	313

**Q59 - If there was just one thing you would encourage us to change about Wellcome's OA policy, what would it be?**

Get more funders to adopt it!

Reduce the length of the embargo period for green route

only allow gold access

Include case reports in OA policy as these are useful publications for clinical scientists to have access to.

Make sure that repayment for the costs incurred works

A stronger pushback against expensive Gold OA in for-profit journals

Use influence to persuade hybrid journals to become OA

Make specific jnl info on WT pages for major jnls

I would make more clear guidelines available on the website about the Open Access policy, or at least give an e-mail address for a person to contact with queries, because there are many exceptional cases arising that are not easily understood through the information available.

Keep it simple!

Perhaps the future is open access platforms through revised university, WT presses etc

Make it so that it takes absolutely none of my time to comply.

The onus is on research projects to check PMC compliance. This should be done by the publishers but is frequently not done. It is a huge headache for people running research projects.

More information for PhD students on whether OA funding is provided in addition to studentship funds.

Please stop paying the extortionate Gold open access fees. Some publishers (e.g. [r]) are charging close to 5k GBP per article. 3 of these and you have a PhD student's salary. Preprints should be considered open access. Also, WT researchers should be encouraged to submit their accepted article (not journal formatted) to Europe PMC. Journal policy should be ignored in this case. I am happy to tell them that my funder (WT) mandates that my accepted article needs to be in PMC. The accepted article was written and peer reviewed by academics and journals should have no claim to this.

As in most things, the Wellcome generally does a terrific job. Perhaps consider or review on case-by-case basis other outputs such as influential review or opinion pieces.

To encourage humanities and social science journals to move to open access rather than relying on a pay per article basis

Strongly promote Preprints in the field

make it less different from other funders

To be honest I don't know enough about it, as I have not published yet, but I am strongly pro open access and anything that makes it easier for people to do so.

streamline paying process

nothing comes to mind

It would be simpler for the researchers if Wellcome managed the OA payments itself. I find it a headache and time consuming to pay these charges, having worked at three different institutions and I am always concerned I may have got it wrong, plus some journals are a pain to deal with.

I think paying for Gold access in many cases is exorbitant and there are other and better ways of disseminating research findings.

my issue with OA is that currently WT money subsidizes private publishing companies; this system is broken

Greater pressure on traditional journals to lower the cost and ease the process of open access publishing. I like the way Wellcome Open Research is moving, but as a mid-career academic, I need to publish in the big traditional journals to get REF recognition and to (hopefully) get a permanent job at the end of my fellowship.

Streamline the payment of OA charges

Spend less on it - it is exorbitantly expensive and does little to disseminate information to those who can use it. It started off as a good idea, but ended up a rip-off, enriching the publishers whilst providing little of use to anyone else. You have been duped!

N/A

maintain flexibility

I am very happy with the OA support from Wellcome. How we communicate our research is evolving rapidly and Wellcome has an opportunity to shape this.

none

Centralise the process or more assistance from Wellcome to comply - it takes a lot of time for researchers who publish a substantial number of papers

Allow more direct management. The intermediate in the institution can be inefficient.

Apply direct pressure to publishers to influence their pricing approach to OA

And now on to Open Data...

More flexibility in allowing different types of OA. "Re-use" is not necessarily so important for material in a publication and can easily be abused.

A way of checking if compliance has been met

Challenge publishers to reduce their charges. Scientific publishing is broken, Wellcome pays for the research, researchers do the research, the writing and the reviewing and the journal make a very big profit.

I need help sometimes and a phone number helpline would be great. Especially in complex situations - like if I am a minor co-author in papers lead by others.

I believe that the researcher should have the maximum flexibility; encouragement to publish under creative commons license but when not possible other alternatives should be easily accessible by the researcher.

if Wellcome organised the OA for the publications it would be a lot of work but might help green OA to be used more, as currently I think a lot of scientists are

not clear on what is acceptable to comply with Wellcome policy.

do not know

promote publication in Wellcome Open Research

Just telling researchers more about what can be paid for and at regular intervals

Strongly encourage/require preprints

Clearer guidance on what to do for papers from collaborators on which you are a minor contributor

Any articles published from research grants should be made freely available. Therefore, Wellcome can ensure that this is done regardless of their price/route/journal. As a researcher, we shouldn't be worrying about the publication costs, and therefore it would be really great if Wellcome could take over the publication costs without any restrictions.

To put more energy and effort into promoting the model of publishing used by Wellcome Open Research, initially by stronger advocacy of the model to Wellcome-supported researchers.

Exclude minor co-authorships from the policy

I think a major limitation of some less well off universities is the lack of access to journal articles particularly in higher impact journals. I would strongly encourage open access policy of Wellcome Trust as it enables researchers in these research environments to better access cutting edge research articles which in turn will have a large impact on science. I personally value the access to the article to a higher extent than the ability to reuse the data-set (currently). While there is value in being able to re-use data I would be able to contact the researchers in question directly after reading the article to facilitate this re-use. Access to the article is fundamental to facilitate this re-use.

allow green access with pre-printing so immediately available and costs nothing. Journals make enormous amounts of money from gold which would be better spent on research rather than their profits.

I think this survey was only partially useful. I entirely agree on free access but I do not agree on the economics how this is presently handled. Millions of pounds are transferred to the publishers and it seems money that is lost for the research community. A much better separation between publisher, peer review process and those that take advantage of OA for commercial purposes is needed. Also, the contractual agreements between researcher and publishing house need to be re-visited. I do not agree to the common policies of making manuscripts freely available before the final proofs are made.

Put a cap on APCs. The fees are sometimes exorbitant, especially when the University library also pays a subscription to a journal.

Funders' OA policy is unfortunately constrained by the publishers' business model (subscriptions + APC). Funders, like the Wellcome, need to exert pressure on publishers to change this. This would alleviate the current OA costs.

Use your influence to cap costs of OA to enable a more reasonable pricing regime

The Wellcome Trust needs to review just how much publishers are charging for monographs to be on open access and what authors are still expected to do for that high fee. The publishers are pushing more and more of their basic production costs and requirements onto WT authors and pocketing the commercial profit. The author having had a WT grant feels morally obliged to still go on with the OA process even though it is onerous and often a really stressful publishing situation to be in. For this they get no royalty and a lot of publishing problems. By way of example, one book I published in 2016 was so badly copy-edited and produced that I said it was unacceptable for a £[r] OA fee. As a mid-career researcher I had the confidence to insist it was reset properly but those at an early career stage might not have known what to do. They could end up with a sub-standard publication because publishers only really want to pocket the OA fee. Advice and support for monographs to enable full texts and images to be included in OA versions - and to encourage more publishers to consider OA.



No proposition for the moment

I think the current costs are too high but not sure of the best way to solve this

I think it is a good policy that doesn't limit research with exorbitant costs. I still don't understand why the publisher gets the copyright in the end. I strongly feel this should stay with the creator of the work, the researcher.

Don't require books and chapters to be OA

Effort to support OA publishing will help quick access to research findings

Lean on publishers who make a fortune out of Wellcome philanthropy to make less of a fortune

Encourage publishers to reduce subscription charges especially if open access charges are also high.

Emphasise green over gold

Wellcome should use its clout to keep within reasonable limits the profits that the publishing industry makes at every stage of the process from publicly or charitably funded research.

Nothing related to the licence. I think the hybrid journals charge too much. Maybe by negotiating together with other funders costs could go down.

Wellcome should continue to help researchers with payment for publications in open access journals.

Get rid of any complexities that distract researchers from actually doing the research.

Less onerous for individuals

Try to change the policy to leverage parity in cost of open access publishing in open and non open access journals, restricting researchers to only publish in certain journals would be potentially harmful to young researchers who are still often (erroneously) judged by journal of publication rather than value of research.

Gold OA should be required for all funded RAs, preferably through open peer review eg AAS Open Research or Wellcome Open Research

Stay as you are, but continue making pressure on journals to keep prices low, maybe even by teaming up with big research organisations/funders.

not sure, perhaps allowing preprints to stand in for open access publications

Always provide grantholders with additional funding to cover open access charges

don't know, nothing in particular comes to my mind

I think the mechanism works well but Wellcome has the clout to force down publication charges and the abusive use of hybrid publishing models

I agree that open access is key and welcome needs to push for it but this cannot be for the excessive benefit for for-profit journals. Using pre-owned print journals as a way to save good open access cost could be an efficient way to do so.

Set the standard for the community by using powerful position in the community to promote reasonably priced gold open access (e.g. capping OA fees, no hybrid, transparency/quality requirements for journals)

Potentially have guidelines for commonly used journals / book series. I have published in fully open and hybrid journals from the [r] series of journals and it has been painless due to the journal suggesting the open access route I needed to take based on my Wellcome funding. For other publishers it has been hard to work out what the options I need to choose are.

All research that Wellcome funds should be published in OA journals.

I wonder if funding book chapters is good value for money. I would focus on peer-reviewed literature.

It is unfair that Wellcome pays for the research and then pays again to have it published - but this is a big battle to win  
make sure the data are also OA

Pay special attention to needs of LMIC researchers

take a tougher line on the costs of hybrid APCs

It would be great if Wellcome can somehow find a way to break the monopoly of the big publishers, particularly the (perceived) role they have found as arbiters of quality for jobs and funding.

You should support publication in fully open access journals and not those that benefit from subscription charges and from additional open access charges

Supporting named institutional library staff to help get our papers out there quickly. We have no admin support to wade through the tangles of the OA process which means we often don't do this as well as we could.

Simple and straightforward and something that's automatically triggered when acknowledging Wellcome funding

HVE CONCERN ABOUT THE SHEER NUMBER OF PHONEY OPEN-ACCESS JOURNALS WHICH ARE RADICALLY UNDERMINING THE CREDIBILITY OF OA

Make all manuscripts to be published in preprint servers.

Wellcome should seriously consider whether it should be spending so much money increasing publisher's profits when it could be spent far better

Maybe align it with NIH

Make it easier for the PI

Refuse to pay extortionate (and unjustifiable) APCs levied by for-profit publishers, by encouraging submission to its own publications (eLife, WOR) and other vetted publishers (e.g. [r]), or insisting on an APC price cap.

You could easily force publishers to drop the embargo period on Green Open Access option.

there is a risk that commercial enterprises eg google will benefit from Wellcome funded research and not reciprocate by publishing their findings in an open access way. This could undermine scientific progress and result in the biggest beneficiaries of open access being large multinational corporations, which might not be the intention

Put pressure on publishers to lower Gold OA costs

Make it stricter and police it more to speed up the demise of the historical (and diabolical) publishing and achievement / reward allocation system.

Pressurise journals into making it less expensive for Wellcome.

try to convince the publisher not to charge a huge fee for publishing.

Greater info on how to comply and how to select the best option for each individual publication

I feel that OA is not worth the trouble. For relatively low gain in terms of readers it has very high costs and creates a major administrative burden for researchers. If anything, review articles should be open access rather than research papers as they are more accessible to the non-experts who are more likely to not have access to journals.

See earlier comment about review articles. They can contain substantial original thought and deserve OA.

Cost of OA in the grants rather than block grant as would be easier than accessing it via institution

Perhaps ask PMC to resolve their technical problems. This can be very fixed very easily. At present, we lose at least one working day per article dealing with this, which is not a good use of our time. Moreover, encourage universities and major publishers to streamline the process of fund transfer. This is where I am experiencing problems at the moment.

stop block grants to the universities

provide own open access site in collaboration with partners

The OA system is a racket which is something I can live with when the racketeers are the journal publishers. However, increasingly I am encountering academics - usually very ECR - who have lost the ability to discern a genuine academic journal (with solid peer review) from a predatory journal (which publishes anything for the OA money). This is shocking. OA policy is fuelling the breakdown of academic standards; I am inundated by emails daily asking me to publish in this or that journal or review with a fixed time limit a manuscript all for journals that exist to make money and have no interest in anything beyond an appearance of peer review to keep the OA funds flowing. Wellcome needs to police this if they are going to continue to feed the journals with OA funds. It is undermining the quality of academic research.

I'm happy with this policy and agree that science should be open access. I think it great that Wellcome supports open access publishing continue to work towards a single universally applicable standard for all journals. It's still too complex for researchers.

Reduce costs

reduce the choice and complexity, but realise that when it comes to grant applications some of our publication choices will have been influenced by your publication policy.

Stronger mandation of open access! If researchers use Wellcome money, the research should be immediately available with CC-BY or equivalent, and it should not be acceptable to spend even more money that could be spent on research, paying for publication in glamour journals with extortionately high profit margins.

Encourage preprint submissions (e.g., BioRxiv). Speak with publishers to point out the excessive and unfair costs of OA.

Keep simple!

Use the power of Wellcome funding and influence to change the way that institutes and universities assess research output. Impact factor means little - open access and rapid distribution of new scientific information is much more important.

more funding to pay for gold OA charges

The cost for low income countries

a short guide would be useful and could be included when grants are awarded

The final burden of responsibility should be on the research institution not the individual researcher

More in-house journals where research can be published

Work with hybrid publishers to get gold OA costs down - some are exorbitant and taking advantage of funders' desire for research to be OA. While journals need to ensure they have enough income to turn a profit they too should have a vested interest in supporting OA publishing and not disincentivising it with exorbitant costs. Some hybrid journals also have page print fees now also, so even if not publishing OA a hefty fee is required just to have the article published in the journal, this seems unreasonable when the article is only available via subscription anyway.

I would like to see the Wellcome use its (financial) clout to encourage the growth of fully open-access publishing.

Streamline the system whereby an older publication (from before OA was mandatory) can acquire a PMC number and thereby comply with the Trust's OA policy. Currently it takes about half a day per article, even though the staff at PMC Europe are very friendly and helpful. Just finding the pre-pub version of the manuscript can be very time consuming when the PI is not the first author, and the first author no longer works at the same institution or when she has changed

manuscript can be very time consuming when the PI is not the first author, and the first author no longer works at the same institution or when she has changed her name after marriage. Another long-winded procedure is conversion of html format articles to pdf and checking for accuracy. Why can't the publisher's version be used direct, especially when the journal has lifted the copyright restriction on "historic" articles. The other thing you could do with respect to publications from say more than 5 years back is lean on [r] to make its archive freely accessible. This plea comes from my experience as a consumer of articles outside my discipline - as a cancer sufferer, I think it is fundamentally morally wrong that I cannot freely read up research on treatment for my specific cancer that was done over 5 years ago. done wrong that I cannot access

Remove the burden on PIs to make sure they are complying with it!

I think it is fine! Nothing needs to be changed.

make it easier to fund processing charges when an article gets published - it is a bureaucratic nightmare

Insist on publishing only in Open Access only journals. The "hybrid" journals are charging for open access and again for subscriptions, and prices are going up rather than down. Wellcome is in an ideal and unique position to use its influence to break the societally unfair model of these pirates. Now is the ideal time to insist on openness of research findings and data - it will change the future world that we will live in.

Perhaps having Wellcome deal with the OA process ad page charges. My institution is rather slow and cumbersome in actioning this.

A clear statement about preference for gold or green status

press to cut embargo time for green OA

align it with Hefce and RCUK policies

The problem is the publishers. They are raking in the cash and do very little in return. This is where the real problem lies. I am fully supportive of OA, and Wellcome have done a brilliant job of making it happen, but at some considerable cost, and with huge profits going to the publishers.

Put a cost cap for publishers.

Put pressure on publishers to drive down gold costs; I am massively supportive of OA platforms but sometimes an article has to be targeted to an audience for maximal clinical benefit

Wellcome should try to exert more control over the hybrid journals by limiting the amount they will spend on publishing costs and forcing immediate open access.

Direct negotiation with hybrid journals to bring the OA costs down.

Lobby to bring down prices - currently we write a blank cheque to publishers, who still make us do the legwork. Make articles OA at the point of choosing the licence, not the point of paying the invoice (some journals do this, others do not).

Don't allow researcher to publish in ridiculously expensive journals like nature.

Simplify as much as possible and align with universities as their OA is being driven by the REF

I think its working well too improve access, but some publishers costs are too high.

I would include a broader range of published work, such as reviews, etc. so that anything a researcher who is in receipt of Wellcome funding publishes is accessible to the widest possible audience.

To continue with the open access policy to enable research findings to be accessed by poor researchers and participants who cannot high fees . This is best way to disseminate information to the populations that provide data, but are unable to access it due to unaffordable costs.

stop paying for gold OA in hybrid journals, instead encourage researchers to preprint the submitted version, and put pressure on publishers to allow revised versions to be updated (not all do).

I believe "strict" rules should apply where the Wellcome funded researcher is either first or corresponding author of a publication. My experience as co-author

working with overseas collaborators is that it can be very difficult to convince them to e.g. self-archive a manuscript.

Work with all other bodies to make it easier

Management of the funding should either be by researchers with grants, or by Wellcome itself

Putting more resources at the researcher's discretion to meet publication costs in hybrid or open access journals. I am currently unable to submit to top tier journals because I cannot pay their submission fees.

Breaking the monopoly of the 'big' journals

Encourage 'preprints' as is accepted practice in the physical sciences and engineering

put pressure on publishers not to over-charge

If wellcome is concerned about value for money alternatives are either drop hybrid model and ensure this does not disadvantage researchers by enforcing policies on assessing publication quality - or relax the policy and give researchers fixed sums of money to manage in their grants (this will reduce open access) - or decide the current situation is OK and fund it sufficiently. These depend on values that Wellcome chooses not on researcher's views. Wellcome should lead.

Tell us all to publish on biarchiv or similar and leave it at that. Free.. simply and no damn paperwork

More readily open information when beginning with a grant. It is very confusing and worrisome.

Caution in promoting pay to publish open access - I receive 10 emails/day from predatory journals. Ensure proper listing of Wellcome journal in Thomson-Reuters otherwise they disappear into this mass of dubious journals

You have to keep it going. It is totally naive to expect us to publish in OA journals which have lower impact factors than the hybrids. At the moment most researchers cannot afford to do this in terms of their career advancement (and chances of getting further WT funding I would suggest). It is totally different for very well established 60 year old scientists, they have the luxury of being able to just put a pdf online. If the WT did not pay these exorbitant fees we could not stick to the principles of open access which are so important for gradually breaking down this system. The publishers are however charging way too much and personally I think WT should negotiate these fees downwards.

Impact factor issue should not be taken into account when reviewing (Wellcome Funded) scientists' CV.

Wellcome is in a powerful position to force publishers to lower OA fees; lower OA fees in combination with OA will maximise research dissemination

make the policy on book chapters better-known

simplify it

I do support OA but at present it imposes an intolerable admin burden on researchers. If there is some way of minimising this it would be great.

Ensure that Universities make it as easy as possible to reclaim costs. Keep funding OA - it is very important

Consider wider use of "Preprint plus green OA" to save costs

The NC bit of the licence. Commercial entities should not benefit from publicly funded research at zero cost.

Stop the publishers fleecing us. Make Gold OA the norm

simplify the system. Complying with multiple funder mandates and navigating all the rules (especially for papers that are being led by others where we are authors) is becoming extremely time-consuming. There should be a one-stop shop system where an author accepted version can be dropped for any Wellcome crediting paper and that should cascade to PMC, local repositories, payments for green/gold etc. Automate the process

Immediate access to longer texts should not be a priority. Longer texts in the biomedical field rarely contain time sensitive information due to the extended processing time for monographs and books.

To my mind the major issue now is incentivising authors to publish in journals such as eLife rather than [r].

someone needs to hold the publisher's feet very close to the fire to break their parasitic hold

make it simpler and cheaper

I would hope that if Wellcome dealt directly with the publishers for the researchers they would be able to exert more effect to make charges reasonably reflect the underlying costs

Administrative - make it happen all automatically (at the publisher side) instead of separate emails to separate bodies



**06/08/2018**

**Version 1**

**Wellcome exists to improve health for everyone by helping great ideas to thrive. We're a global charitable foundation, both politically and financially independent. We support scientists and researchers, take on big problems, fuel imaginations and spark debate.**

**Wellcome Trust, 215 Euston Road,  
London NW1 2BE, UK  
T +44 (0)20 7611 8888, F +44 (0)20 7611 8545,  
E [contact@wellcome.ac.uk](mailto:contact@wellcome.ac.uk), [wellcome.ac.uk](http://wellcome.ac.uk)**

The Wellcome Trust is a charity registered in England and Wales, no. 210183. Its sole trustee is The Wellcome Trust Limited, a company registered in England and Wales, no. 2711000 (whose registered office is at 215 Euston Road, London NW1 2BE, UK).