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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paper ID</th>
<th>U0350030</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paper Title</td>
<td>Get me off Your Fucking Mailing List</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


1. Appropriateness to publish in IJACT  | Option: Excellent |
2. Accuracy                                 | Option: Excellent |
3. Innovation                               | Option: Very Good |
4. Relevance                                | Option: Very Good |
5. Presentation                             | Option: Good      |
6. Quality of writing                       | Option: Very Good |
7. Application of paper as introductory study material for revolutionary new concepts | Option: Very Good |

8. Overall Recommendation (Mark the right option):

- **Strongly Accepted**
- Accepted ✓
- Accepted with revisions

Jeffrey Beall's list stopped December 2016
+1150 predatory scholarly OA publishers

Also [http://thinkchecksubmit.org/](http://thinkchecksubmit.org/)
Potential, possible, or probable predatory scholarly open-access publishers

This is a list of questionable, scholarly open-access publishers. We recommend that scholars read the available reviews, assessments and descriptions provided here, and then decide for themselves whether they want to submit articles, serve as editors or on editorial boards. In a few cases, non-open access publishers whose practices match those of predatory publishers have been added to the list as well. The criteria for determining predatory publishers are here.

We hope that tenure and promotion committees can also decide for themselves how importantly or not to rate articles published in these journals in the context of their own institutional standards and/or geocultural locus. We emphasize that journal publishers and journals change in their business and editorial practices over time. This list is kept up-to-date to the best extent possible but may not reflect sudden, unreported, or unknown enhancements.

- 1088 Email Press
- 2425 Publishers
- The 5th Publisher
- ABC Journals
- A M Publishers
- Abhinav
- Academe Research Journals
- Academia Publishing
- Academia Research
- Academia Scholarly Journals (ASJ)
- Academic and Business Research Institute
- Academic and Scientific Publishing
- Academic Direct Publishing House
Reference this list for your chosen journal to check if it is trusted.

- Do you or your colleagues know the journal?
  - Have you read any articles in the journal before?
  - Is it easy to discover the latest papers in the journal?

- Can you easily identify and contact the publisher?
  - Is the publisher name clearly displayed on the journal website?
  - Can you contact the publisher by telephone, email, and post?

- Is the journal clear about the type of peer review it uses?

- Are articles indexed in services that you use?

- Is it clear what fees will be charged?
  - Does the journal site explain what these fees are for and when they will be charged?

- Do you recognise the editorial board?
  - Have you heard of the editorial board members?
  - Do the editorial board mention the journal on their own websites?
### Hybrid = Racket ≠ OA

**Lesson 1 for (profit) publisher: How to maximize profit**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STEPS</th>
<th>ACTIONS</th>
<th>WHO PAYS</th>
<th>WHO PROFITS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td>Choose a serial</td>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td>Use the subscription model &amp; dont’ reduce the price of subscription</td>
<td>Libraries = Scientific community</td>
<td>Publisher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 3</td>
<td>Ask APC for publishing articles</td>
<td>Authors = Scientific community</td>
<td>Publisher!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 4</td>
<td>Communicate largely: « We are in favour of OA »</td>
<td></td>
<td>Publisher!!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 5</td>
<td>Since you appear as good OA publisher, impose higher price increase than for other titles</td>
<td>Libraries = Scientific community</td>
<td>Publisher!!!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Conclusion: profits x4 ! (…and for scientific community triple dipping …)**

Not always… open! (see for example Elsevier)
Gold titles

- Launched in 2003 at Lund University (Sweden)
- Non profit organisation in UK
- 9,456 journals (6,805 searchable at Article level)
- Only peer reviewed and quality journals (standars of quality defined)
- Fair gold and unfair gold

But they are also other good gold titles not yet included in DOAJ (not submited…)

Part of gold
- 2011: 12% of worldwide publication
- 2014: 17%
- 2017: ?
Fair gold (some examples)

http://www.scielo.org/
Mainly South America
1,249 serial titles
Supported by BIREME (The Latin American and Caribbean Center on Health Sciences Information)

https://www.openedition.org/catalogue-journals
Part of OpenEdition
456 serial titles (mostly in French)

https://olh.openlibhums.org/
Funded by an international library consortium
APC: 0€

For profit publishers
(De Gruyter, Elsevier...)

See DOAJ: journals without APC
Why??
Phishing?
Fair gold (some examples)

- [http://popups.ulg.ac.be/](http://popups.ulg.ac.be/)
- Funded ULg Library
  + Université Saint Louis (Bruxelles) + Académie Royale des Sciences (Bruxelles)
- 20 serial titles + 1 congress
- Powered by Lodel (as Revues.org)
- 2 formats of articles
  - XML-> HTML
  - PDF (mainly for backfiles)
- APC: 0€

**Very easy**
- for editors
- for readers
- for ULg Library

**Statistics**
- +4.4 M views (html)
- +1.5 M downloads (pdf)

**Impact**
- 2 serials received an IF since they are on PoPuPS
**Presentation:**

PoPvPS (Portail de Publication de Périodiques Scientifiques) is a portal which allows journals editors from the University of Liege to publish easily and quickly their journals in Open Access. By this way, the visibility of research publications and the reputation of the journals are wider and improved. Next to the online version, each journal may still be published in print format. So, PoPvPS is a project which is alternative and complementary to commercial initiatives.

PoPvPS is based on partnership: the University of Liege Library develops the platform and acts as a technical support for journals editor. Since editorial independence is guaranteed, each journal remains fully responsible for the content and the diffusion of the articles.

PoPvPS respects international OAI standards. Its content is interoperable with similar foreign initiatives and therefore integrated into a large international network.

In January 2015, the Université Saint Louis de Bruxelles joined the PoPvPS portal, by integrating several of its journals.

**Scientific Context:**

PoPvPS is one of the initiatives of the University of Liege Library to promote open access to scholarly communication. Among other initiatives, let's mention ORBI, the open access institutional repository.

Indeed, the aim of the scientific community is indeed not to guarantee financial incomes to commercial publishers, but to allow a quick and large spreading of their researches while authors keep their right to be acknowledged for the works they publish.

So researchers have the responsibility to take control again on the scholarly publication process with the help of new technologies. In this regard, libraries have an important role to play: since they have always been specialized in giving access to information, they have to put their expertise at the disposal of scientific communities in order to develop and maintain new diffusion supports and new ways to have access to free information.
Jean-Christophe Defrasne

Is a strengthening south-south regional integration possible?
The case of Mercosur and Latin America

Résumé

Cet article vise à analyser les difficultés de l'intégration régionale en Amérique Latine et en particulier le cas du Mercosur. Il montrera que le régionalisme ne s'est réellement développé qu'après la guerre froide, à une période qui coïncidait avec la dominance du Consensus de Washington, ce qui a signifié l'abandon des politiques d'industrialisation basées sur la substitution aux importations. Le contexte économique global a renforcé la spécialisation des économies du Mercosur et celles du reste de l'Amérique Latine dans le rôle de fournisseurs de matières premières et de produits agricoles. Cela a engendré une plus grande instabilité macroéconomique de ces économies et de plus grandes tensions entre les pays membres du Mercosur. Cela a également affaibli la capacité du lobby multiétat de influencer les politiques économiques. La faiblesse relative de l'industrie dans cette région explique pourquoi la régionalisation générée par la dynamique microéconomique des firmes sera plus faible qu'au sein d'autres processus d'intégration régionale tels que l'UE, l'ALENA ou l'ANASE pour lesquels cette dynamique joue un rôle décisif.

Abstract

This article will look at the structural difficulties that regional integration faces in Latin America and in particular will analyze the evolution and prospects of Mercosur. It will show that regional integration could only fully develop at the end of the Cold War but this period coincided with the adoption of the Washington Consensus and that meant that the largest Latin American economies renounced to a substantial part of their import substitution industrialization policies. The global economic context reinforced the specialization of Mercosur and the rest of South American economies on commodities and energy sectors. This has generated a higher macroeconomic instability and more tensions between the member States of the Mercosur. It has also weakened the lobby of industrialists in shaping economic policies. The relative weakness of the industry in this region explains why the enterprise-driven regionalization will be weaker than in other regional integration processes such as the EU, NAFTA or ASEAN where it played a decisive role in the deepening of the economic integration.

Table of content

Introduction
The historical roots of Latin American regional integration in the late 20th century
The geopolitical weight of the Cold War and regional integration in Latin America
The conditions for the launching of new integration processes based on an "open regionalism" across Latin America in the 1990s
Mercosur and its structural weaknesses
The Mercosur members' economies face greater and more recurrent macroeconomic shocks
Mercosur increased specialization in the export of commodities and its consequences on regional integration
Can Mercosur follow East Asia and break from this path-dependency of commodities exporter?
5. Mercosur weakened by rival liberalization and integration projects
Unfair Gold

- APC 500 -> 5000$/article (ACS AuthorChoice+CCL)!
  - Where is the limit? Real cost or capacity of payer?
  - (according to Nature NPS, the cost/article should be 30,000-40,000$)

- Payed
  - by authors; institutions; funders
  - not by libraries

- Accepted by some funders
  - RCUK, Wellcome Trust (UK)
  - H2020
  - Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG)
  - ....
  - FRS-FNRS (Belgium) with a max 500€

- And many institutions
  (see for example http://oad.simmons.edu/oadwiki/OA_publication_funds)
Unfair Gold

Cost for institutions? Difficult to aggregate => largely unknown

- APC spent by Wellcome Trust/COAF (75% hybrid)
  - 2013/2014: 4.7M£ for 2,556 articles (mean=1,837£)
  - 2015/2016: 7.3M£ for 3,552 articles (mean= 2,055£/article)

- APC spent by University of Cambridge (via RCUK)
  - 1.288M£ for 785 articles paid (mean= 2,008£/article)

- APC spent by German universities between 2005-2015
  - 9,627,537€ for 7,417 articles (mean= 1,298 €/article)
  - Increasing year by year

- APC spent by ULg
  - First analysis : January to September 2016 : +179,000€
  - Increasing
Towards an "new deal"?

The "good" idea of Max Planck Institute & others (Dutch universities with publishers DEALS…):

Offsetting agreements: global transition from subscription model to APC model
- To accelerate the movement toward OA
- To avoid double dipping
- With no extra costs (?)

But…

- Not sure that for profit organisations will be keen to reduce their profits 😊
- The number of payers will automatically be reduced (only research institutions)
- No reason to limit the price increase
- Total number of publications +3,5%-5%/year
- Needs that ALL institutions in the world make the same transition
- Probably some will be winners… and many other losers
- Unresolved ethical aspects (judge and party)!

Réseau des Bibliothèques de l'ULg
All articles in "unfair gold" for ULg?

Circa 3000 articles/year - Mean APC 2000€/article

and subscriptions to be maintained

Largely more expansive!
A special case: SCOAP3
(Sponsoring Consortium for Open Access Publishing in Particle Physics)

- High energy physics (particle physics)
- Converting most important HEP journals to OA without APC to be paid by authors
- Worldwide project managed by CERN
- Partners: 3,000 libraries, research institutions from 47 countries + intergovernmental organizations
- Start 2104
  - Phase 1: 2014-2016
  - Phase 2: 2017-2019
- Few serials concerned (8+3) choice after a tender
- 13,368 articles in phase 1
## A special case: SCOAP3
(Sponsoring Consortium for Open Access Publishing in Particle Physics)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Publisher</th>
<th>Part of HEP articles (1)</th>
<th>Phase 1 articles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acta Physica Polonica B</td>
<td>Jagiellonian University</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advances in High Energy Physics</td>
<td>Hindawi</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>2654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese Physics C</td>
<td>IOP</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The European Physical Journal C</td>
<td>Springer</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Journal of High Energy Physic</td>
<td>Springer</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>6283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuclear Physics B</td>
<td>Elsevier</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics Letters B</td>
<td>Elsevier</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>2654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress of Theoretical and Experimental Physics</td>
<td>OUP</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Review C</td>
<td>APS</td>
<td>(since 2018)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Review D</td>
<td>APS</td>
<td>(since 2018)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Review Letters</td>
<td>APS</td>
<td>(since 2018)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Based on ArXiv
A special case: SCOAP3
(Sponsoring Consortium for Open Access Publishing in Particle Physics)

HEP articles in the world

- APS 37%
- APS without APS 50%
- Other 16%
A special case: SCOAP3
(Sponsoring Consortium for Open Access Publishing in Particle Physics)

- **Business model:**
  - Maximum amount to be paid to publisher for each title
    - Based on
      - APC/article agreed (fixed for the 3 years)
      - Estimated number or articles to be published agreed
    - If real number
      > estimated: no more money
      < estimated: recalculation: number published x APC agreed
  - APC paid by partners (countries or international organisations)
  - Participation of partners based on the part of articles published by authors of the country in SCOAP3 journals
  - Reduction in subscriptions

- **Budget**
  - Phase 1: 13.9 M€ (1.2M€ for CERN)
  - Phase 2: 24.8 M€ (3.6M€ for CERN)

- **Mean true APC/article phase 1: 1040€**
A special case: SCOAP3
(Sponsoring Consortium for Open Access Publishing in Particle Physics)

• Success?
  – Actual mean APC/article: 1040€
  – Most publications in HEP concerned
  – Many countries implied
  – Growth of publications
    • in SCOPA3 journals 5%
    • other HEP journals (2% APS; -3% others)
  – More downloads observed

• But
  – Impact on publisher profit? No information
  – Important financial effort of CERN (1.2 M€ for Phase 1; 3.6 for Phase 2)
  – Twice as expansive for Belgium compared to previous subscriptions
  – Hidden costs
    • 2-3 ETP staff appointed by CERN dedicated to SCOAP3
    • Operations costs
    • communication
    • Travels of representatives for meetings…
    • Infrastructure (portal, harvesting, database…)
A special case: SCOAP3
(Sponsoring Consortium for Open Access Publishing in Particle Physics)

- Globally positive (except for losers as Belgium) due to
  - CERN
    - Very large human and financial support
    - Specific position in the discipline
  - Very specific field
    - With few serials
    - All preprints articles available in ArXiv

- Generalizable?
Thank you for your attention

NOW...

Time for sharing experiences and opinions!
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