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Why

- IRs are here, and growing
- Self-archiving is here, and growing
- Mandates are here, and growing
They are here, and growing
Postprint content

- Australia 9%
- Belgium 15%
- France 70%
- Germany 20%
- Italy 10%
- Norway 30%
- Sweden 30%

- Netherlands: (DARE) 20%
- Netherlands: (CoS) 96%
- UK 60%
- US DK (but around 35 institutions currently collecting or planning to collect postprint content)

Key Perspectives Ltd
The self-archiving habit is here, and developing

% respondents
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Why researchers publish their work

- Communicate results to peers
- Advance career
- Personal prestige
- Gain funding
- Financial reward

% respondents
Recognition and anticipation of hand motions using a recurrent neural network

For this eprint: [Past four weeks] [This year] [Last year] [All years]

Most viewed eprints: [Past four weeks] [This year] [Last year] [All years]
Repository-wide statistics: [by Year/month] [by Country]

Abstract views and document downloads for past 4 weeks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Views</th>
<th>Abstracts</th>
<th>Downloads</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Views by country (derived from IP address of query) for past 4 weeks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Abstracts</th>
<th>Downloads</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saudi Arabia</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

History of views for this ePrint

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Abstracts</th>
<th>Downloads</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005 Jan</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004 Dec</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004 Nov</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004 Oct</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Open access increases citations

- Lawrence 2001 (computer science)
- Kurtz 2004 (astronomy)
- Brody & Harnad (2004) (all disciplines)
- Antelman 2005 (philosophy, politics, electrical & electronic engineering, mathematics)
“Self-archiving in the PhilSci Archive has given instant world-wide visibility to my work. As a result, I was invited to submit papers to refereed international conferences/journals and got them accepted.”
The mandates are arriving

- NIH
- Wellcome Foundation
- CNRS
- Max Planck
- RCUK
- Individual institutions – QUT, CERN, Minho….
The experimental evidence from computer science and physics

- CiteSeer: c725K articles
- arXiv: c300K articles
“How many subscriptions have you lost as a result of arXiv?”

- APS: “None”
- IOPP: “None”
“Do you view arXiv as a threat?”

APS:
“We don't consider it [arXiv] a threat.

We expect to continue to have a symbiotic relationship with arXiv. As long as peer review is valued by the community (and it seems to be), we will be doing peer review.”
IRs do not threaten added value

- Not doing peer review
- Only research articles are self-archived:
  - not publishers’ front-end material
  - not letters, editorials, book reviews, news, conference notices, etc
- Currently-accepted brands remain in the hands of brand owners
“What do the download figures show?”

- **APS:** “*Physical Review D* and *Physical Review C* are a bit below the average for our other journals.”

- **IOPP:** “Download figures [for those journals] are not as high as average, because people are downloading from arXiv.”
Researcher-based threats

- Cash value of the content of a research paper will approach zero
- The iPod analogy
Overall proportion of people using these

- ‘Traditional’ bibliographic services: 98%
- OAI search services: 30%
Are they using OAI search engines?

- Not much!
- 30% respondents
- Computer scientists use them most
Do they do this often?

- Several times per week
- At least once per week
- At least once per month
- < once per month

% respondents
“The future is not just about the access itself but new models of organising and adding value to that content.”
Authors…

- Want to make an impact
- Want to make an immediate impact
- Value journal branding
- Value ‘the front-end stuff’
Authors....

- Want to cooperate with a cooperative publisher
- Expect to be able to move easily between articles
- Want things served on a plate (pointers here, there and everywhere..)
- Want simple access to relevant data
(Primary) publisher value I ...

- New impact metrics, especially those measuring immediate impact
- Opportunity to drive traffic to publisher site
- New levels of reference-linking
- Linking between versions (back to preprint, forward to updated versions)
(Primary) publisher value II …

- Inclusion of post-publication commentary
- Opportunity to solicit new content (articles)
- Links to relevant data
- Opportunity to incorporate and organise new content
A sophisticated example: H-Net

H-Net is an international interdisciplinary organization of scholars and teachers dedicated to developing the enormous educational potential of the Internet and the World Wide Web. Our edited lists and web sites publish peer reviewed essays, multimedia materials, and discussion for colleagues and the interested public. The computing heart of H-Net resides at MATRIX: The Center for Humane Arts, Letters, and Social Sciences Online, Michigan State University, but H-Net officers, editors and subscribers come from all over the globe. Tell me more.
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Thank you for listening

- aswan@keyperspectives.co.uk
- aswan@keyperspectives.com
- www.keyperspectives.co.uk/OpenAccessArchive/