

The important 30 minutes most researchers do not spend

Open Access is for most researchers the first and best-known exposure to Open Science principles and practices, and concerns the final visible product: the peer-reviewed publication.

The research lifecycle, from idea to publication, commonly spans multiple years. Time is spent on obtaining research funding, conducting the research project, and finally reporting on the findings through publications in peer-reviewed scientific journals. The return for all this effort is not royalties, but **impact**. So are researchers using all the tools and strategies available to them to ensure that their peer-reviewed publication is widely read, understood, used and ultimately cited by peers?

Selecting the publication outlet that will ensure optimum impact is a skill. For many authors, whether their journal of choice is Open Access or not, can be an additional layer of confusion in making the right choice in the interest of research impact. While the list of respectable Open Access journals grows (doaj.org), the vast majority of the top prestigious journals still function on a subscription-basis. Should this really matter to authors?

If impact is optimal in a subscription-based journal, authors can now get the best of both worlds by choosing the most impacting journal, while self-archiving their peer-reviewed and corrected manuscript copy (**postprint**) to either institutional repositories, or the EC-funded Orphan Repository www.zenodo.org. Modern search engines like Google Scholar have become increasingly good at making parallel copies of articles discoverable and retrievable just as easy as the paid alternative.

Over 80% of the 1.1 million articles published by the top 100 largest scientific journal publishers could be made available either as accepted manuscripts or publisher versions at institutional or subject repositories, within a year from publication ([Laakso, 2014](#)). The current best estimate is that only around 20% of all articles are self-archived by the authors, leaving a significant unexplored potential for authors to disseminate their research findings.

It could be argued that spending half an hour on self-archiving a published article manuscript can be the most productive time of the 18 months (on average) that it takes to produce and publish a manuscript. The likelihood of someone else finding it, reading it and citing it increases simply as a factor of quick and free access on the web.

The Open Access movement, although initiated decades ago by the Physics and Astronomy communities, has just recently gathered strength. Open Access is now mandated by all EC funding instruments ([Horizon 2020 Grant Agreement Article 29](#)). But Open Access is just a one of the Open Science tools that can optimise the societal impact of research. Open Data is another, and EC is following up with an Open Data Pilot that is likely to become a mandate too.

Finland has understood the benefits of Open Science and has proactively followed with publication of an Open Science strategy for 2014-2017 in order to be the leading country for openness in science and research by 2017.

Link: Laakso M (2014). Green open access policies of scholarly journal publishers: a study of what, when, and where self-archiving is allowed. *Scientometrics*. 99 (2), 475-494.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11192-013-1205-3>

Link: [EC Horizon 2020 Mandate, Grant Agreement article 29.1-6](#)

Link: [The Ministry of Education and Culture's Open Science and Research Initiative 2014–2017](#)

Dr. Mikael Laakso is a researcher in Information Systems Science at Hanken School of Economics. His area of research has been Open Access publishing and aspects related to business models and web-innovation with regards to scientific journal publishing.

Dr. Ivo Grigorov, Project Coordinator for EU programs. Research Secretariat, DTU Aqua, Technical University of Denmark, Institut for Akvatiske Ressourcer, Denmark