Open access for IJPH

Results of morning workshop

by Anke Berger and Nino Künzli

16:15 – 16:40

Shaping the future of our *International Journal of Public Health* in the age of open access:

Results from the workshop on business models & peer review options

Nino Künzli, Editor-in-Chief IJPH
Anke Berger, Managing Editor IJPH

Background I

About IJPH

- Subscription based, with option for open access (hybrid)
- ~1300 submissions per year
- Double blind peer review
- Acceptance rate 11%
- Impact Factors 2017: 2.617// >3 (5 year)
- Income meets costs (35% of SpringerNature net revenues)
- Average revenues from SpringerNature 2014 -2019: CHF 109’189
- Contract with SpringerNature expires end of 2020

- **Change to gold open access (Jan 2021, the latest)**

Background II

- Request for proposals to 6 publishers (Feb 2019)
    1 SpringerNature
    2 BioMed Central
    3 F1000 research
    4 Frontiers (Lausanne)
    5 EMH (Editores Medicorum Helveticorum; Basel)
    6 MDPI (Multidisciplinary Digital Publishing Institute; Basel)
- **Offer stated (benchmark): IJPH costs to cover: CHF 200’000**
- Proposals received from all 6 publishers (Apr 2019)

SSPH+ SWISS SCHOOL OF PUBLIC HEALTH
A FOUNDATION OF SWISS UNIVERSITIES

Why these publishers?

	Pro's	**Con's**
SpringerNature	transition already 2020 viable financial forecasts excellent production team easy transition	slow processes not innovative OA publisher insufficient support in peer review
BMC	transition already 2020 experienced OA publisher easy transition	
F1000 research	innovative OA publisher post-publication peer review open peer review	no Impact Factors
Frontiers	innovative experienced Swiss based	not every innovation makes sense; philosophy: everything should be published; some dubious journals
EMH	Platinum model with SMW Swiss based	small publisher
MDPI	highly efficient, lean in all processes highly service oriented Swiss based	very technical appearance temporarily on Beall's list

Workshop conclusions I

1. Publish all well-done work, or only the best research?

- Publish more, but keep high quality
- Impact factor remains key, should increase, needs to be managed

2. Peer review: Pre- or post-publication? Blind or open?

- Pre-publication to avoid information overflow
- Transparency: “Like in a trial”: blinding during the process but full transparency afterwards (all names and reviews published)

Workshop conclusions II

3. Selecting reviewers by admin staff & algorithms? Are scientific editors needed?

- Reviewers should be invited by scientific editors
- Algorithms might support them
- The scientific decision making process should be paid; e.g. 1 FTE shared among editors

4. For profit vs. not for profit: Shall IJPH generate income for SSPH+ ?

- APC of 2000 CHF should be the above limit to be affordable outside CH
- Generate money only for the editorial processes, not for SSPH+, e.g.
- Use extra money to pay editors, and for waivers

Next steps

- Discussions and conclusion Editorial Board: July 2019
- Proposal to SSPH+ funding board: September 2019
- Decision SSPH+ by November 2019
- Note to SpringerNature: by 31 December 2019

Online survey: your preferences?

Link:

www.surveymonkey.com/r/BHC3GGV

Thank you for your contributions!