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Agreement and Disagreement

Agreement between publishing and research communities that access to results of publicly funded research is important to maximize its use and impact.

However, they hold different views on:
- whether mandated deposit in OA repositories is necessary
- the appropriate embargo periods
- impact on journal viability
PEER: Background


- No clear evidence of effect of embargos

- STM proposes to HLG an experiment to find out
PEER: a Ground-breaking Collaboration

- High degree of collaboration
- Huge scale and scope
- Unique experiment in real time
- Duration: September 2008 – May 2011 (includes 9 month extension)
What is a Stage 2 manuscript?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage One (NISO Author’s original)</th>
<th>Stage Two (NISO Accepted Manuscript)</th>
<th>Stage Three (NISO Version of Record)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Investment</td>
<td>Publisher Investment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Outputs of Research:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Final published article on journal website: version of record with copyediting, typesetting, full citability, cross-referencing, interlinking with other articles, supplementary data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• raw data</td>
<td>Author’s manuscript incorporating peer review enhancements &amp; as accepted for publication</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Draft for submission to a journal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Stage Three
(NISO Version of Record)

Final published article on journal website: version of record with copyediting, typesetting, full citability, cross-referencing, interlinking with other articles, supplementary data
Project objectives

• **PEER** has been set up to monitor the effects of systematic archiving of ‘stage two’ research outputs (NISO: accepted manuscripts)

• Large-scale ‘experiment’ regarding deposit of author manuscripts: in an ‘observatory’ of OA repositories

• **Research studies commissioned to gather hard evidence to inform future policies**
  – Usage Research ➔ Availability, usage
  – Behavioural Research ➔ Author, reader behaviour
  – Economic Research ➔ Costs, viability

• Collaborative project of diverse stakeholder groups
  – Publishers, research community and library/repository community
Stakeholders in scholarly communication

- Publishers
- Researchers – authors and users
- Libraries and repositories
- Funding agencies

All of the above stakeholder groups are represented within PEER, both within the consortium & an advisory board.
PEER Consortium

The PEER consortium (5 Executive members):

- International Association of Scientific, Technical and Medical Publishers (STM) - Co-ordinator
- European Science Foundation (ESF)
- Göttingen State and University Library (UGOE)
- Max Planck Gesellschaft (MPG/MPDL)
- Institut National de Recherche en Informatique et en Automatique (Inria)

Plus technical partners: SURF & Universität Bielefeld
Project Overview

• Duration
  – 09/2008–05/2012 (3 years plus 9 months extension)
• Budget/Funding
  – €4.2M : 50% from the EC (eContentplus programme) 50% partners
• PEER by Numbers
  – 5 Executive & 2 Technical Partners
  – 12 Publishers
  – 241 participating Journals
  – 1 Depot/ Dark Archive
  – 6 Repositories
  – 1 Long-term preservation archive
  – 3 Research studies
  – 3 Research Oversight Group Members & 1 Industry Research Advisor
  – 18 Advisory Board Members