



*Analysis of Author Self
Archiving Policies of
Publishers in Asia*

Anjali Sandesh Kale

Knowledge Resource Centre,
University of Mumbai
anjalisandesh@library.mu.ac.in

Introduction

Open access initiative has changed the scholarly communication process drastically. It has provided authors and researchers with different mediums to communicate and disseminate their research. Open access journals and self-archiving are two such medium through which open access to scholarly literature is provided. Though open access journals are widely used, self-archiving is not utilized by the scholarly community to its maximum extent.

Self-Archiving Definition

Steve Harnard and Paul Ginsperg used the term self-archiving in the year 1999. "It is the act of (the author's) depositing a free copy of electronic document online in order to provide open access to it". (Harnard 2001)

"Self-archiving or author self-archiving is defined as a broad term to the electronic posting without publisher mediation of author supplied research". (Crow 2002)

Self-archiving is not an alternative to publishing in learned journals, but an adjunct, a complementary activity where an author publishes his or her article in whatever journal s/he chooses and then simply self-archives a copy. In practice,

this means a depositing the file in open access archive or repository. (Swan and Brown, 2005)

Thus it can be said that self-archiving is the strategy employed by the author to make their scholarly work published in non-open access medium to the open web to provide open access to it.

Scholarly work which can be self-archived is peer reviewed research journal, conference articles, theses and book chapters. These can be deposited by the author to their own website, institutional repository or open archive for the purpose of enhancing its visibility and citation impact.

Self-archiving can take place at different stages in the publication process. So it is necessary to understand different stages of publication process as publishers have different policies for each version of publication. The different stages of publication are as follows

- The first draft of paper written by author before it is refereed is known as Pre-print.
- When the author sends the preprint for publication and when it is revised in response to referees comments, it is known as post prints.
- Publisher pdf is the final version of the article which is published by publishers.

Authors can archive any of these different versions of same document, but it depends on the self- archiving policies of the publisher.

Self-archiving may or may not be permitted depending upon the publishing contract. Authors often are not aware that they have signed an agreement prohibiting these forms of distribution. Thus it is necessary to understand the policies of the publishers.

Review of Related Literature

Coleman (2002) cited BOAI and defined self-archiving as whereby an author deposits digital copies of his or her works in a publicly available website preferably one compliant with the open archives initiative.

Pinfield describes the different benefits of self-archiving. According to them self-archiving helps in removing the impact barriers and access barriers and thus helps in accelerating the research.

In a study conducted, it was found that there is a substantial level of ignorance within the scholarly community with respect to open access journals and self-archiving wherein only 29% of the respondents were aware of self-archiving and 71% were not. (Swan & Brown, 2005)

Whereas (Antelman 2006) reported that authors are self-archiving according to the norms of their respective disciplines rather than publishers self-archiving policies and as such they are archiving significant number of publisher version.

(Gadd 2003) studied self-archiving concerns of authors. Some of the major concerns identified that their work will be plagiarized and it will be used by others for commercial gain. In addition to this it will also be compromised as no journals will publish it. Apart from this it will also break existing copyrights agreements with publishers.

(Gadd and Covey 2017) also studied the twelve year journey of 107 publishers which were included in the SHERPA/ROMEIO database. It was found that almost there is increase in 12% over 12 year in publishers allowing some forms of self-archiving.

(Fry 2011) found that there is lack of clarity in publishers' policy due to which authors feel that they might infringe copyright and this inhibits them to deposit in open access repositories.

(Hanlon and Ramírez 2011) reported that the policies of publishers change over time as a result librarians and repositories managers have to contact publishers to ask permission to deposit materials.

(Singsona 2015) also studied the self-archiving policies of open access library and information science journals.

(Curry 2017) reported that the European-based SHERPA (Securing a Hybrid Environment for Research Preservation and Access) services are a suite of free scholarly communication resources aimed at providing authors information on publisher's open access policies. SHERPA's most notable service is RoMEO, is a database aggregating publisher archiving policies which allows researchers quick access to copyright and self-archiving policies of more than 23,000 global publishers.

Based on the literature, inference may be drawn that many authors and researchers are not aware of self-archiving policies of the publishers. Thus this study was initiated to analyze self-archiving policies of different publishers.

Objectives of the study

- To study the status of different Asian publishers listed in SHERPA/Romeo database.
- To study self-archiving policies of the publishers.
- To identify the Romeo color coding of Asian publisher
- To assess the licensing clauses of publishers.

Methodology

Sherpa/Romeo database was used to analyze the self-archiving policies of the publishers. Under the advance search option, search was conducted using 'country' and the results retrieved were analyzed. It was found that 301 publishers

were listed under the category 'Asia'. These were further analyzed to study the status, self-archiving policies, color coding and licensing policies of the publishers.

Sr. no	Country	No. of publishers	%
1	India	124	41.19
2	Turkey	31	10
3	Indonesia	29	9.63
4	Japan	20	6.64
5	Iran	18	5.98
6	Pakistan	14	4.65
7	China	10	3.32
8	Korea, Republic of	8	2.65
9	Bangladesh and Malaysia	7	2.32
10	Iraq and UAE	4	1.32
11	Nepal and Singapore	3	0.99
12	Hong Kong, Jordan, Thailand	2	0.66
13	Armenia, Bahrain, Georgia, Israel, Kazakhstan, Korea, Democratic, Philippines, Qatar, Seychelles, Srilanka, Syria, Taiwan, Turkeminasthan	1	0.33

Table 1 presents the country wise analysis of publishers listed in SHERPA/Romeo database.

30 countries from Asian continent were listed in Sherpa/Romeo database. Total of 301 publishers were listed from these countries and they published 2739 journals. Maximum number of publishers were from India (124), followed by Turkey (31), Indonesia (29), Japan (20), Iran (18) and other countries as represented in table. It was also found that from these 301 publishers, 162 were open access publishers.

It was observed that publishers listed in database are less compared to total number of publishers in Asian continent. This may be due to the fact that Sherpa/

Romeo provides the general policy of publishers of peer reviewed journals and serials that have been suggested by the user. Thus there is need that user suggest more publishers from this continent.

Self-Archiving policies of Publishers

Sr.no	Self-Archiving Policy	Yes	Yes with restrictions	No	Unclear	Total
1	Pre-print archiving	132	3	125	41	301
2	Post print archiving	204	13	74	10	301
3	Publisher Pdf archiving	226	9	36	30	301

Table 2: Self Archiving policies of publishers

Self-archiving policies of the publishers include policy regarding pre-print archiving, post print archiving and archiving of publishers pdf. Table 2 represents the self-archiving policies of the publishers.

With respect to pre-print archiving, it was found that 132 publishers allowed for archiving. 3 publishers allowed for archiving with restrictions.

Post print archiving: 204 publishers allowed for archiving whereas 74 publishers did not allow. Restrictions were mentioned for post print archiving by 13 publishers.

226 publishers allowed for publishers pdf archiving and 36 publishers did not allow for archiving.

Thus it can be said that most of the publishers from Asia allowed for some form self-archiving. Though it can be said that publishers from Asia are more restrictive about pre-print archiving as 125 publishers are not allowing for pre-print archiving and for 41 publishers, pre print archiving policy was unclear.

Restrictions mentioned	Post print	Publisher pdf
2 weeks embargo	2	2
2 months embargo	-	2
6 months embargo	3	-
12 months embargo	4	1
2 years embargo	1	
Permission must be obtained	3	4

Table 3: Restrictions mentioned for different versions

Few publishers stated some restrictions when archiving preprint, post print and publishers' pdf. Table 3 gives restrictions mentioned by the publishers for different versions of publication. Embargo and publishers permission were two prominent conditions mentioned by the publishers. Embargo period for different versions ranged from 2 weeks to 2 years.

General Conditions	Frequency
Publisher Version/Pdf may be used	131
On open access repositories	72
Publisher source must be acknowledged	47
Publisher copyright and source must be acknowledged	42
Author retain copyright	29
must link to publisher version	29
Publisher version cannot be used	17
Publisher retains copyright	2

Table 4: General Conditions mentioned by publishers

Self-archiving policies of the publishers are generally accompanied by set of conditions. These include general instructions regarding location where document can be archived, embargo period, copyright notification etc. Table 4 gives prominent general conditions mentioned by the publishers.

Romeo Color coding of Publishers

Sherpa/Romeo classifies the publishers into four different colors based on the self-archiving policies of the publishers.

Sr. no	Colors	Self-Archiving Policies	No of Publishers	Percentage
1	Green	can archive pre-print <i>and</i> post-print or publisher's version/PDF	139	46.17
2	Blue	can archive post-print (ie final draft post-refereeing) or publisher's version/PDF	125	41.52
3	Yellow	can archive pre-print (ie pre-refereeing)	30	9.96
4	White	archiving not formally supported	7	2.32

Table 5: Romeo color coding of Publishers

Thus it can be said that only small percentage of publishers i.e. seven from Asia does not support self- archiving. 139 green publishers support archiving of two versions i.e. pre-print and either post print or publisher pdf. 125 blue publishers supports archiving of single version i.e. post print or publisher pdf and 30 yellow publishers supports archiving of pre-print only.

Licensing Clauses of publishers

Sr. no	Licensing clause	Frequency
1	Creative Commons Attribution License	28
2	Creative Commons Attribution Non-Commercial Share Alike License	13
3	Creative Commons Attribution License 4.0	12
4	Creative Commons Attribution Non-Commercial License	12
5	Creative Commons Attribution Non-Commercial No Derivatives License	12
6	Creative Commons Attribution License 3.0	6
7	Creative Commons Attribution Non-Commercial License 4.0	6
8	Creative Commons Attribution License, Creative Commons Attribution Non-Commercial Share Alike License or Creative Commons Attribution Non-Commercial No Derivatives License available	2

Table 6: Licensing clauses of publishers

Open access journals can be considered truly open access if it allows to distribute and share the content freely. It was found that many journals are using creative common license, though some publishers have used the restrictions, like no derivatives are allowed and it cannot be used commercially. These findings corroborate with findings of (Pujar 2014) which suggested that “such a rate of high adoption of CC license is a welcome sign to free the content from complex copyright regulations”.

Conclusion

During this difficult times of Covid 19, self-archiving is the fastest medium to make scholarly research available in open access for the scholarly community. The present study has shown that most of the publishers allow for some form of

archiving with restrictions. Though very few publishers are listed in the Sherpa/Romeo database, to know the self-archiving policies of the publishers, individual websites of publishers can be visited. But it has been found that these policies are not uniform and may change from journal to journal. Many a times technical jargons are used which makes it difficult for research community. Similarly it has been found that many researchers and authors are not aware of the self-archiving policies of the publishers, so there is need to increase awareness about it in the research community.

Thus Self-archiving as a green road for open access can be utilized successfully, if authors and researchers made are aware of the policies of the publishers and policies are framed in simple terms with less use of technical jargons.

References

- Antelman, Kristin. "Self archiving practice and the influence of publisher policies in the social sciences." *Learned Publishing* 19 (2006): 85-95.
- Crow, Ryan. *The case for institutional repositories: A SPARC position paper*. Washington, DC: SPARC, 2002.
- Curry, Carolann. "SHERPA Services and SHERPA/RoMEO." *Journal of Electronic Resources in Medical Libraries*. 14 (2017): 1-4.
- Fry, J., Proberts, S., Creaser, C., Greenwood, H., Spezi, V and White, S. "PEER Behavioral Research: Authors and Users vis-a-vis Journals and Repositories (Final report)." 2011.
- Gadd, E., Oppenheim, C., & Proberts, S.G. "RoMEO Studies 2: How Academics Want to Protect their Open-Access Research Papers." *Journal of Information Science* 29 (2003): 333-356.
- Gadd, Elizabeth, and Denise Troll Covey. *What does "green" open access mean? Tracking twelve years of changes to journal publisher self-archiving policies*. Loughborough University, 2017.
- Hanlon, Ann, and Marisa. Ramirez. "Asking for Permission: A Survey of Copyright Workflows for Institutional Repositories. ." *Library Faculty Research and Publications*, 2011: 11. 10.1353/pla.2011.0015.
- Harnard, S. "The self archiving initiative." *Nature*, April 26, 2001: 1024-1025.
- Pinfield, Stephen. "Self Archiving." In *International Yearbook of Library and Information Management 2004-2005: Scholarly Publishing in an electronic era*, by Stephen Pinfield, 118-145. 2005.
- Pujar, Shamprasad. "Open access journals in library and information science: a study ." *Annals of Library and Information Studies* 61 (2014): 199-202.

Singsona, M., Sevukan, R., & Marugaiyan, M. "Author self- archiving and licensing policies of open access library and information science journals: A study." *Annals of Library and Information Studies* 62 (2015): 104-109.

Swan, Alma, and S Brown. *Open Access Self Archiving: An author study*. UK: Key Perspectives Limited, 2005.

Swan, Alma, and S. Brown. "Open access self archiving: An author study." 2005. <http://cogprints.org/4385/>.

