PEER – additional results
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the means whereby….

✓ PEER Depot infrastructure
✓ Publisher participation (e.g. metadata transfer, deposit, author invitation, survey invitation, logfiles)
✓ Repository participation (e.g. deposit model, transfer process, user survey, logfiles)
✓ Author deposit
✓ User experience
... lead to additional outcomes

1. Scalable, efficient & international workflow
2. New modes of automated content management and distribution
3. Sustainable technical innovations for repositories and publishers
4. Opportunity for publishers to examine their policies vis-à-vis Green Open Access
5. Opportunity for repositories to reflect on deposit model and transfer process
6. Analysis of author deposit behaviour
7. Survey of user experience
Publisher point-of-view (1)

• All publishers emphasize their OA publishing ventures and their hybrid offers;

• Collaboration with the PEER Depot was appreciated – for some the investment was significant, others already had complementary workflows and/or software;

• Some publishers have few or no issue(s) with manuscript self-archiving, but the PEER Project confirms that publisher cooperation would be required for any large-scale Green OA scenario – and this would be a game changer;
Publisher point-of-view (2)

• If publishers are part of a Green OA scenario (& not all can imagine this), then their expertise, cost and opportunity costs need to be recognized;

• If libraries strive to introduce usage as a (additional) pricing mechanism, then the proliferation of additional manuscript versions (e.g. Stage I, II) via repositories is highly problematic;

• Given the growth of open access publishing (gold & hybrid) & the investment of publishers in archiving, are the (substantial) additional costs for Green OA justified?
Repository opinion (1) – Deposit model

Systematic provision of a large number of manuscripts by publishers
• enables automated deposit of manuscripts and metadata
• expands the number of journal articles available to various OARs
• some repositories consider as part of future green OA policies

Deposit of stage two manuscript versions
• Heterogeneous versions from publishers, some originally not intended for public distribution
• quality check or standardization procedure would be desirable (by OAR’s central depot or publishers)?
Repository opinion (2) – Transfer process

Efficient, automated transfer process
• development, implementation and intensive practical testing
• large quantities of documents and metadata to be processed and disseminated to repositories
• SWORD protocol for exchange of documents and metadata
• some repositories consider as part future green OA policies

Central processing unit (PEER depot)
• clearing house, filtering EU-authors
• matching manuscripts with metadata
• embargo management
• some repositories consider as part of future green OA policies
Author self-archiving

- Publishers raise author awareness upon submission
- Publishers invite authors upon acceptance
- Single deposit interface with a help desk
- Centralized management
- Convenient deposit:
  - Deposit prompted when manuscript fresh
  - Concerns about permission and copyright removed, so authors may deposit with confidence
  - As the invitation specified the manuscript version to be deposited, and authors had this version at hand, this facilitated prompt deposit
Year 2010: **118 depositors, 3,913 authors**
User experience: Repository exit survey

- Host repositories and PEER Repositories: HAL, HAL INRIA, UGOE, MPDL, SSOAR
- Survey link: repository homepage or search page
- 299 responses from users visiting repositories (HAL & HAL INRIA = 226): this is a pilot survey (non-representative)
- Sample survey questions:
  - 3.1 Is this the first time you have visited an Open Access Repository?
  - 3.2 How do you arrive at the Open Access Repository?
  - 4.1 For what purposes do you visit the Open Access Repository?
  - 5.1 On this visit to the Open Access Repository are you looking for ..?
  - 5.2 Did you find what you are looking for?
  - 5.3 If you did not find what you are looking for, why not?
  - 6.1 Which version of an article have you found?
  - 6.2 To what extent is the version of the article you found satisfactory for your purpose?
Is this the first time you have visited an Open Access Repository? (%)

- Yes: 19 (All), 48 (Peer only)
- No: 74 (All), 32 (Peer only)
- Not sure: 7 (All), 20 (Peer only)

- PEER users are new, by chance, non regular
How do you arrive at the Open Access Repository? (%) Respondents could tick more than one option

- Went directly to the repository: 44% All, 20% Peer only
- Via Google Scholar: 17% All, 8% Peer only
- Via Google Library portal, digital library: 17% All, 0% Peer only
- Link from a webpage or copy a reference: 32% All, 19% Peer only
- Personal contacts: 19% All, 16% Peer only

• PEER users arrive via Google or link
• PEER users look for a known item, that they need for writing an article or literature review
Did you find what you are looking for? (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>All</th>
<th>PEER only</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, I found exactly what I was looking for</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, not exactly but something similar</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, I found something that is also useful</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, nothing useful</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To what extent is the version satisfactory for your purpose? (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction Level</th>
<th>All</th>
<th>PEER only</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfactory</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quite satisfactory</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not very satisfactory</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all satisfactory</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure / Unclear</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- PEER users found something similar: the Stage II version
- The item is not “very”, but “quite” satisfactory
User experience: Summary

• PEER content is more likely to be accessed directly via a search engine than by routinely visiting the repository

• For half of the PEER users Open Access was a new experience, they used it “by chance”

• Half of the PEER users were looking for a specific/known article, they (probably) had no regular access to

• Half of the PEER users found something similar (or: also) useful, but not exactly what they were looking for
  – Often users were not sure what version they got
  – For half the article found was only “quite” satisfactory

• But nearly everybody would use an OA repository again