



LMS RESPONSE TO 2014

OA; gold OA is not available for this journal. It does not offer a CC-BY licence that allows commercial re-use of the articles, but it does offer an exclusive licence where the author may post any version up to and including the final accepted manuscript in an institutional repository

About the LMS Response

8. In formulating this response, the Society sent a questionnaire to mathematical researchers. Vjg"Uqekgv{"kfgpvkhkgf"358"kpfkxkfwcnu"dcugf"cv"WM"JGku"yjq"jcf"rwdnkujgfkp"vjg"NOUøspublications within the previous 12 months. These 136 individuals were contacted by e-mail on 15th August and a total of 14 responses were received. The responses received represent a good cross-section of UK academic mathematical science, as regards seniority, subject field within the mathematical sciences, and range of HE institutions represented.
9. The Research Policy Committee of the Society has led work on this response and developed the questionnaire. In doing so, the Committee was mindful that the review is about the implementation of RCUK policy, rather than about the principle of Open Access. As such, the questionnaire was structured to get responses from individuals about their experience as researchers with respect to open access.
10. The collated responses to the questionnaire are given in the annex. The names and institutional affiliations of the respondents have been removed to preserve confidentiality.

Conclusions

11. A summary of the main conclusions which the LMS believes can be drawn from the responses to our questionnaire is as follows.
Understanding of the policies of RCUK and the UK Funding Councils with regard to Open Access amongst current UK-based authors of papers in the mathematical sciences is patchy at best.
In particular, there is a lack of clarity within the mathematical science community in the UK about the differences between RCUK and Funding Council policy on Open Access.
Implementation of the policy has so far made very little difference to the behaviour of most UK-based research mathematicians. This is primarily because many (if not a majority) were already routinely using the arXiv.
There would be considerable value to be gained from the provision, in a single location, of a comprehensive and reliable listing of mathematical science journals, with brief but complete information regarding their compliance or otherwise with RCUK and Funding Council policies on Open Accessⁱ.

In connection with the first two points above, it is important to bear in mind that most research in the mathematical sciences carried out by UK-based researchers is done without the support of RCUK grant income.

ⁱ The existing database, Sherpa, is in our view not always completely reliable, and does not always cover more complex cases in full detail. Moreover, as the responses show, it is not very well known in the community.

Author A: Documents from RCUK. Session run by LMS at British Mathematical Colloquium.

Author B: I don't understand what this is about, and I don't wish to. My research output is available from the arXiv preprint server or from my website or other (often multiple) sources, so I assume that there is no future impact on my work. My papers for the recent REF had doi numbers attached to them by other people. I have never sought advice or guidance, and have never listened when it was available. To that extent, I am entirely satisfied.

Author C: The paper was submitted to the LMS in June 2013; at the time I was unsure of how the rules regarding open access would be in the next REF, which was unsatisfactory. I have only later
⊞
will be accepted for REF submissions.

Author D: @ @ @
advice/guidance.

Author E: I still don't have a very good grasp of UK policy on Open Access, my understanding is that everything needs to be at least on arxiv in the final (pre-edited version) and, if it is funded by EPSRC, I need to ask my university to pay for full open access publishing, if available.

Our faculty has an administrator who specialises in Open Access and I fully rely on her guidance, as it is not entirely clear to me how to find out, without a doubt, whether a journal has an open access policy (short of emailing every editor-in-chief).

Author F: No

Author G: Some advice was provided at an hour workshop put on by library staff put on in the department. I left feeling somewhat confused. There are various statements about it on our university website.

Author H: No

Author I: [INSTITUTION] Library

Author J:

Author C: No. In particular, I have received some very negative comments from colleagues after
u
reen
M @

Author D: I felt that the rationale, if any, was poorly explained.

Author E: Both too little and too much. There were several emails from various sources, but none of them written in a language that I could fully understand.

Author F: No

Author G: No

Author H: No

Author I: Yes

Author J: Communication is always a difficult matter, and I suspect that many people may still not be fully aware. At the same time, I have the feeling that the information has been available for people looking for it.

No

No

Author G: The extra bureaucracy is certainly a discouragement to publish in journals. Instead there is an incentive just to put material on the arXiv, as in any case most research in my area is now read from arXiv papers rather than in journals which now usually do no more than provide an assurance that a paper has had some sort of refereeing. It also gives a disincentive to apply for grants or take on research council funded PhD students.

Author H: No

Author I: No

Author J: V @
copyright policies in deciding where to submit. Following the recent HEFCE decisions, I now make sure to upload the final accepted version of articles directly after acceptance, but it has not made a difference to how I conduct the research.

Author K: No, not at all so far.

Author L: No, at least not yet.

Author M: Not as yet.

Author A: I have formed an impression that direction and implementation of this policy has not taken sufficient account of (a) the wide availability of journals which implement generous policies of depositing versions in public archives which are equivalent in content to the final published versions, (b) the thriving culture (in my areas of mathematics, statistics, and computer science) of making work available first of all on public archives and only then via the editing / refereeing / journal publishing process. Given the overall aims of the UK policy, it seems to me that policy directors and implementors should make it an urgent priority to do all they can to encourage and to facilitate both (a) and (b), which clearly fulfil the spirit of the concerns driving this policy, at minimal expense to the funders of public science.

Author B: It seems obvious to me that publicly funded research should be available on an Open Access basis, and I believe that I am fully compliant.

Author C: This appears to be a highly controversial issue, mainly due to the clear lack of sufficient funding for author payments. As already mentioned, I found it disappointing that the authorities stated that open access to papers would be required in the next REF, but it took a long time before they clarified the exact meaning of this statement.

Author D: I think it is far too early to judge the effects. I am disappointed that there is not merely a list of maths journals, each with a corresponding open access statement. It appears that each time I wish to submit a paper I have to research the possible journals.

As it is, I have always put my papers on the arXiv, which I consider to be a far better way of ensuring open access, and one which imposes no financial burden on my institution. This makes me very unhappy about the imposition of a scheme which I consider completely unnecessary.

Author E: -

Author F: @

Author G: Frankly, the situation is a complete mess. Different journals have a range of different open access models and it is now even harder to decide to which journals to submit papers. There is