DIAMAS

Developing Institutional Open Access
Publishing Models to Advance
Scholarly Communication

Gap analysis:
when EQSIP 1.0 meets IP practices

Authors: Victoria Brun, CSI CNRS, France ; David Pontille, CSI, CNRS, France; Didier Torny, CSI, CNRS, France.

Other contributors: Sona Arasteh, OPERAS, Germany; Drahomira Cupar, UNIZD, Croatia; Virginia de Pablo, FECYT, Spain; Ivana Morić Filipović, UNIZD, Croatia; Mateusz Franczak, IBL PAN, Poland; Marta Ivanović, UNIZD, Croatia; Irena Kranjec, FFZG, Croatia; Iryna Kuchma, EIFL, Lithuania; Ivana Kukić, University of Zagreb, Croatia; Mikael Laakso, TSV, Finland; Ignasi Labastida, Universitat de Barcelona, Spain; Danijel Mofardin, UNIZD, Croatia; Ginevra Peruginelli, CNR, Italy; Neven Pintarić, UNIZD, Croatia; Claire Redhead, OASPA, Netherlands; Pilar Rico-Castro, FECYT, Spain; Johan Rooryck, ESF-cOAlition S, Belgium; Milica Ševkušić, EIFL, Lithuania; Jadranka Stojanovski, UNIZD, Croatia; Graham Stone, JISC, United Kingdom; Iva Melinščak Zlodi, University of Zagreb, Croatia

Reviewers: Lluís Codina, UPF, Spain; Virginia de Pablo, FECYT, Spain; Pilar Rico-Castro, FECYT, Spain.

Document overview

Project Acronym:	DIAMAS
Project Name:	Developing Institutional open Access publishing Models to Advance Scholarly communication
Project No:	101058007
Start Date:	1/09/2022
End Date:	31/09/2025
Contributing WP	3
WP Leader:	Pilar Rico-Castro
Deliverable identifier:	D3.3 Report on the gap analysis results
Contractual Delivery Date: 10/2023	Actual Delivery Date: 10/2023
Nature: Report	Version: Final
Dissemination level	PU/PR
Deliverable status	Under EC review

Version history

Version	Created/Modified	Comments
0.0	1st August 2023	
0.1		
0.2		
0.3		
1.0		

DISCLAIMER

**Funded by
the European Union**

Table of Contents

**Funded by
the European Union**

Acronyms

IP	Institutional Publisher
SP	Service Provider
EQSIP	Extensible Quality Standard in Institutional Publishing

Executive Summary

This gap analysis is an important step in the collective building of standards for institutional publishing, which are a key part of the DIAMAS project. Its main aim is to help the transition from the first version of the Extensible Quality Standard in Institutional Publishing (EQSIP 1.0) to the second one (EQSIP 2.0), which will be co-constructed with stakeholders, and more specifically institutional publishers (IPs).

To perform this analysis, we aim to understand differences between EQSIP 1.0 and current IP practices. On the one hand, we took the standard built by the project based on publicly available norms and recommendations, EQSIP 1.0, as a starting point for this analysis. In order to do so, EQSIP 1.0 has been divided into 103 items. On the other hand, information on the current practices of IPs were identified via various channels and methods. Three sources were used: the data gathered through the DIAMAS survey, a specific web coding operation to systematically complement survey data, and finally, focus groups with survey respondents to raise precise points identified through quantitative data.

This report is organised in four major parts. The first one details the methodology of this gap analysis. The second one successively considers each of the seven core

Funded by
the European Union

components of EQSIP and provides an analysis of their items. It draws on the three sources we have used during our investigations. The third part develops a different view on the gaps partly identified in the descriptive section. The analysis here aims to characterise different types of gaps made explicit with regard to the EQSIP 1.0 standards. It devotes space to participants' views and judgments of the focus groups with respect to wording, misunderstanding, relevance or appropriateness of EQSIP 1.0. Based on this analysis, the final section of this report lists recommendations for the next steps of the project. It underlines current blind spots that will have to be investigated in order to build a consensual and comprehensive EQSIP 2.0.

Considering the limitations of the data, comparison was only possible for 66 of them. On that subset, there are a very few EQSIP 1.0 items (N=8) that are clearly aligned with a majority of IPs. Conversely, the remaining part is split into two groups: one group is composed of a significant portion of EQSIP 1.0 items (N=26) that are not aligned to most of IPs, and another similar share (N=26) for which the situations are contrasted (sometimes answers clearly opposing two or three groups, or being spread across a variety of positions). Some EQSIP 1.0 items (N=6) are also too poorly covered by the sources of our survey to draw any appropriate conclusions. Broadly speaking, this quantitative breakdown into four categories shows that gaps are numerous, and sometimes significant, between the EQSIP 1.0 standards and the IPs' answers to our survey, focus group discussions, or public statements on their websites.

These gaps measured via the survey are often difficult to interpret, even when completed with qualitative information from the focus group interactions. However, the valuable feedback from IP representatives brings into focus the ambiguity of words and expressions — not to mention the language barrier – as 95% of our respondents were not natively English-speaking people. It also underlines differences in framing, that is, the ways in which the entire EQSIP 1.0 is being read, socialised, and internalised. This feedback has allowed us to identify four distinct types of gaps between the stakeholders (EQSIP 1.0 on the one hand and IPs on the other):

a/ Social gaps: some practices, categories or norms existing in one stakeholder group are unknown, irrelevant, or ignored by the other stakeholder group. Here, some IPs clearly pointed out the resource-independent approach of EQSIP 1.0., while underlying their own financial and infrastructural limitations.

b/ Moral gaps: some values shared by one stakeholder group are viewed with indifference or worse by another stakeholder group. This is clearly the case of some EDI norms, which appear as either not justified or even counterproductive by some IPs.

c/ Interpretative gaps: while both stakeholder groups share a common goal, they don't agree on its interpretation, in particular due to linguistic or pragmatic

**Funded by
the European Union**

differences. That was clearly the case for some technical norms, which some IPs consider impossible to comply with in the near future,

d/ Practical gaps: there is an agreement on every other level, but actualisation of a standard is problematic, whether it is for financial, technical, staff capacity or other reasons. Question around the currently implicit timeframe of EQSIP 1.0, or relative importance and priority of its items have been raised.

Based on these results, 12 general recommendations which are aimed both at DIAMAS members who will participate in the co-construction of EQSIP 2.0, and stakeholders who will be invited to this co-construction process were made. They are formulated to frame discussion on the structure of EQSIP, its content and phrasing. To sum them up, they take into account the diversity of IP organisations and ecosystems, reflected in many contrasted situations for current gaps with EQSIP 1.0. They also present different choices that have to be made for EQSIP 2.0 (extension to service providers, specific requirements for output types, technological neutrality,...) . Finally they point out at the current unknown gaps due to data limitation, that have to be investigated into the co-construction process.

Funded by the European Union

List of Tables

Funded by
the European Union

Funded by
the European Union

**Funded by
the European Union**

Introduction

This gap analysis is an important step in the collective building of standards for institutional publishing, which are a key part of the DIAMAS project. Still, it is only a step linking the transition from the first version of the Extensible Quality Standard in Institutional Publishing (EQSIP 1.0)[1] to the second one, which will be co-constructed with stakeholders, more specifically institutional publishers (IPs).

To perform this analysis, we aim to understand differences between EQSIP 1.0 and current IP practices. On the one hand, we took the standard built by the project based on publicly available norms and recommendations, EQSIP 1.0, as a starting point for this analysis. In order to do so, EQSIP 1.0 has been divided into 103 items. On the other hand, information on the current practices of IPs were identified via various channels and methods. As detailed in the following methodology section, we mainly used three sources: the data gathered through the DIAMAS survey, a specific web coding operation to systematically complement it, and finally, focus groups with survey respondents to raise precise points that we identified through quantitative data.

By construction, this gap analysis is symmetrical in the sense that EQSIP 1.0 is not used as a yardstick to which "deviant" practices are compared before being corrected. Rather, the gap analysis aims to systematically measure and understand differences between EQSIP 1.0 and current practices, including the ignorance of certain practices due to limitations of our data, and ambiguous or problematic wording in EQSIP 1.0.

Aims of the gap analysis

While the main aim of the gap analysis is clearly to feed into the development of EQSIP 2.0, we get into more detail in this introduction by retracing the history of EQSIP and the limitations of our sources.

EQSIP 1.0 was built on 71 standards from a vast literature, including grey documents. Consequently, it was mostly built from a journal perspective, and therefore less adapted to publishing organisations *per se*, and different outputs such as books. Moreover, as our main goal is to work at the IP level, there is a major difference between standards applying to a specific output type (articles, journals, conference proceedings or books), and those applying to a publisher. EQSIP 1.0 is also ambiguous in its aims, as it both aims to represent an aspirational guideline and actual requirements. This makes a gap analysis trickier. Finally, it is a self-justified document: it does not question what is open science or provide a lot of room to

---

[1] URL: https://zenodo.org/record/8307984

explain the link between a given value and a specific recommendation. These limits are well-known both to EQSIP 1.0 authors and to all DIAMAS project members.

Capturing IPs' current practices was a challenge as they vary over time, depend on multiple outputs and business models, and are not always being put into policies at the IP level. In addition, these policies are not necessarily public or easily accessible. Obtaining all this information through a survey was beyond the scope of this project. Hence the need arose to consult other sources, which nevertheless turned out to be incoherent or even contradictory in some cases. To use a trivial example, many IPSPs mention in focus groups that they were in the process of defining some policies or changing the content and structure of their website. This means that our data points will soon no longer be valid. Put differently, we are well aware of the limitations of data on this side as well, and we will address them in the methodology section.

This report is organised in four major parts. The first one details the methodology of this gap analysis. The second one successively considers each of the seven core components of EQSIP and provides a systematic analysis of their items. It draws on the diverse sources we have used during our investigations, which are presented in the following methodological section. The third part goes further to more directly address the gaps partly identified in the descriptive section. The analysis here aims to characterise different types of gaps made explicit with regard to the EQSIP 1.0 standards. It devotes space to participants' views and judgments of the focus groups with respect to wording, misunderstanding, or appropriateness of EQSIP 1.0. Based on this analysis, the final section of this report lists recommendations for the next steps of the project. It underlines current blind spots that will have to be investigated in order to build a consensual and comprehensive EQSIP 2.0.

1. Methodology

We used three data sources to capture IPs' practices and conduct this gap analysis. These sources are intended to be complementary: each one was chosen to compensate for the limitations of the others. They have been processed quantitatively and qualitatively. In order to make our gap analysis as systematic as possible, we divided the full EQSIP 1.0 document into 103 "items", each of them covering a single aspect of a recommendation for IPs' practices.

1.1. OA Diamond and Institutional publishing landscape survey

The OA diamond and institutional publishing landscape survey was conducted by a team within the DIAMAS project in the spring of 2023 and sent to both institutional

publishers (IPs) and service providers (SPs). After an initial cleaning of the data, 685 responses were considered valid, of which 546 from IPs as it is the population targeted by EQSIP 1.0. A large range of IP activities was covered: respondents had to describe their status, their organisation, and declare their practices in terms of open access, funding, governance, editorial management, content encoding, visibility, or inclusion. Some questions received a lot of non-answers, which could be explained by several factors: the question was too difficult or ambiguous to be answered, the survey was too long, respondents did not want to share this information… When relevant, a modality 'not applicable' was available for respondents to signify that their organisation was not concerned and also a modality 'don't know' for respondents to report that they were not in a position to have this information. We chose to display the proportion of respondents who picked these modalities or did not answer because it would be informative on IPs practices as much as 'normal' modalities in certain cases.

We identified **30 EQSIP 1.0 items** that can be directly tested with the survey data. It is a little less than a third of the 103 EQSIP 1.0 items (see appendix 1). The main reason for this gap is the focal point in EQSIP 1.0: a lot of recommendations refer to the public accessibility of information, whereas the survey questions aim to collect actual practices and processes, regardless of whether they are publicly described or not for the general public. To bridge this gap, we undertook the task of manually coding information that was publicly displayed directly from the websites of the IPs.

1.2. Manual coding of IPs websites

Manual web coding is our second source: we identified 46 EQSIP 1.0 items that could be coded from the IPs' websites, from which we selected **34** in terms of their priority, in collaboration with the authors of EQSIP 1.0 (see table A). From a quantitative point of view, this web coding more than doubles the systemic information made available for the gap analysis. From a qualitative point of view, it gives us crucial information on transparency practices by IPs, on all of the 7 core components, but particularly on editorial and EDI policies. In fact, beyond actual open science practices, displaying such information publicly is one of the key issues for IPs. Weaving together this information from web coding then appears as a major improvement of the gap analysis. We decided to code the websites of the IPs who responded to the DIAMAS survey, to expand the database, and make further cross-analyses.

Table A. Distribution of EQSIP 1.0 items by survey and web coding

Items	Number
Items completed via survey data	30 (+ 3 very partially)
Items completed via web coding	36
Items that could be covered by web coding but were not coded	14
Items not in the survey and not codeable	25
Total number of items	104

As displayed in table B, some core components are less covered than others: funding (50% of EQSIP 1.0 items), technical service efficiency (47%) as well as ownership and governance (45%).

Table B. Quantitative (web coding and survey) coverage of EQSIP 1.0 core components

Core components	Number of items covered	Number of items in EQSIP	Proportion covered
Funding	3	6	50%
Ownership and governance	5	11	45%
Open science practices	9	11	82%
Editorial quality	10	15	67%
Technical service efficiency	9	19	47%
Visibility, indexation	6	9	67%
Equity, Diversity, Inclusion	24	32	75%

The manual web coding was conducted through different steps. First, we made a coding grid where some EQSIP 1.0 items were considered as a single coding variable. We tested this matrix on seven French IP websites among the survey respondents. This selection aimed for IP diversity: university presses, learned societies, mono-journal publishers, laboratories... We coded these 7 websites in order to put the variables to the test, to estimate the coding work time and problems for all the surveyed IPs' websites. We timed ourselves and wrote comments when coding a specific item was difficult. Several problems were encountered: some websites do not contain a lot of information because it is found on output websites or a separate hosting platform ; some practices and policies are different depending on IP outputs

Funded by
the European Union

(for instance, the composition of the editorial body is detailed for one journal of the publisher, but not for another). Finally some EQSIP items refer exclusively to journals: as a result, there are variables that are not suitable for those IPs that do not publish journals

This experience led us to delete two variables concerning metadata, because this content was only visible on publications, which are rarely available on the IP website itself. We also gave the following instructions for coding the IP websites:

1. Stay on the domain name given in the survey response;
2. Do not fill the cell (allow a non-answer) if the variable is not relevant for this IP-specific website (example: description of figures for the visually impaired while the website does not give access to publications' full content);
3. Do not rely on information you have about the IP but only on what is displayed on the website;
4. Do not add modalities to the coding matrix. If no modality suits the website you are coding, do not fill the cell ("non-answer").

Finally, we created a variables dictionary (see appendix 2) to make each variable and its modalities as clear as possible and to standardise coding. Thanks to the help of the multilingual consortium members of the DIAMAS project, we managed to code 527 IP websites during June 2023. After removing non-diamond IPs, **517 IPs were included (94.6% of IPs survey respondents)**.

1.3. Focus groups

Focus groups were our third source, since we knew that they provide a different framing to survey and web coding, allowing us to cover the largest number possible of EQSIP items. For a limited number of IPs, this method was intended to gather more comprehensive information about their views and practices in relation to EQSIP recommendations. Qualitative inquiry had an additional role: rather than being representative or aiming to produce quantitative results, focus groups are able to highlight elements that are not present in the quantitative information, or to help understand reasons where IPs don't comply, or even refuse, EQSIP standards. In particular, by raising debate within participants, it highlights differences in practices and enables discussion on underlying values and organisational context of the IPs[2]. In summary, focus groups had three main goals within the gap analysis, aimed at understanding:

---

[2] Acocella I. 2012. "The Focus Groups in Social Research: Advantages and Disadvantages", *Quality & Quantity*, 46: 1125-1136. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119171386.ch20

- the reasons why IPs have such practices, display such information (since survey and web coding data inform us about what IPs do, and not why they do it this way);
- the interest of IPs for EQSIP, why it could lead to improvements or difficulties (since the quantitative part of the gap analysis does not cover this aspect);
- the role of SPs in enabling IPs compliance with EQSIP recommendations.

As we know, national contexts are crucial to explain IP practices. Consequently, we organised national focus groups conducted in the mother tongue of their representatives to facilitate communication, hosted by DIAMAS members from these countries. We selected countries with the most respondents in the DIAMAS survey, in order to stay consistent with the data we obtained from the survey and web coding: Spain (2 focus groups), France (1), Great Britain (1), Croatia (1), Serbia (1). The selection criteria for IPs were as follows:

- only "*bona fide*" IPs, with no SPs and no (mono-)journal respondents;
- diamond OA IPs (at least for books or journals), as stated in the survey data;
- A diversit of outputs was favoured (books, journals, conference proceedings) between IPs.

Two additional focus groups were conducted. One of these was with mono journal IPs and learned societies in Scandinavia, to address their specific stakes and issues. The other one involved three representatives of two SPs, to address their role in helping IPs to understand, implement, and appropriate policies and recommendations, and particularly to explore their role in enabling compliance with EQSIP recommendations for the IPs they work with.

Focus groups brought together between 3 and 5 people in addition to the DIAMAS team members involved (table C), to allow for discussion via online video conferencing. Sessions were designed to last 1 hour and a half.

Table C. Focus group distribution among countries and representatives

Focus group	Geographical area	Number of IPs	Number of representatives
#1	France	3 IPs	4
#2	Great Britain	3 IPs	3
#3	Spain	3 IPs	4
#4	Spain	3 IPs	3
#5	Croatia	3 IPs	5
#6	Serbia	2 IPs	2
#7	Scandinavia	4 IPs	3
#8	Europe	2 SPs	3

An interview matrix was devised (see appendix 3). Two broad questions, concerning all components and with particular visibility, were designed to begin the discussion. Then several questions followed relating to specific EQSIP 1.0 items that were not sufficiently covered by quantitative data. These questions had no specific order, and were covered according to what the participants brought to the discussion. By contrast, the last thirty minutes were systematically dedicated to feedback on EQSIP 1.0: participants were encouraged to express their misunderstandings of the elements of EQSIP 1.0, to express their opposition to certain aspects, and to voice their various criticisms, either to express their convergence or to reveal a different opinion.

Specific follow-up questions (in brackets in appendix 3) were also prepared by the team of each focus group, based on the responses of the IPs into the DIAMAS survey. Prior to focus groups, each interviewee had access to the interview matrix and the EQSIP document, and signed a consent form for data collection. Focus groups were conducted during September 2023. They were returned in the form of synthetic reports that referred to the main themes addressed and some of the verbatim comments of the people present at the meetings.

1.4. Data processing

The three data sources were processed differently. Survey and web coding data were statistically treated with the software R, primarily through simple, filtered and crossed tables. Focus group data were qualitatively treated, by identifying recurrent themes

and issues that were raised, and by acknowledging convergent and contrasting positions on the part of participants.

2. Gaps with the EQSIP 1.0 core components

2.1. Funding

The first EQSIP 1.0 core component addresses financial resources from which IPs run their activities. It deals as much with Diamond OA business models as with financial support in general.

> EQSIP item 1: Clear OA policy that covers the Diamond OA business model and compliance with funder and institutional OA policies (if they exist).

The survey contains a very useful question on OA policies, which considers the source of the policy. Table 1 below details responses from IPs, the most striking being the existence of policies in almost every case of journal publishing, regardless of whether IPs publish only journals or journals as well as books. However, looking at book publishing alone, more than a third of respondents indicated they had no policy. Some of them reported marginal activity in OA books, but responses show the under-development of policies in that sector, which is reflected in the origin and scope of standards used in the construction of EQSIP, but which is being addressed in the PALOMERA project. We cannot know however if this OA policy covers the diamond business model, as EQSIP suggests.

Table 1. The policies of open science/open access followed by the IP (in %)

	National policy	Parent organisation policy	Own policy	No policy	Don't know
Non-answer	53,7	61	49,6	91,4	94,1
Books only	2,2	3,1	4,2	4,9	2
Journals and books	19,4	18,3	20,3	2,2	2
Journals only	24,7	17,6	25,8	1,5	1,8

N=546

Source: DIAMAS survey on OA Diamond and Institutional publishing (2023)

Funded by
the European Union

That being said, the table also provides us with the normative landscape in which IPs live: most of their own policies depend on external ones, whether these come from the government, their publishing platform, or their parent organisation. The focus groups also showed the influence of other actors that formulate requirements for IPs, for example: "as we want to be a COPE publisher, we have revised all our policies, including OA policies, to comply with their standards" or mentions of the Coalition S influence in the choice of the licence. So, even when they declare that they follow their own OA policies, that does not mean that they can design it starting with a clean sheet, but rather they tinker with different policies originating with various actors.

To summarise, while this EQSIP 1.0 item may not be problematic for journal IPs, the lack of shared OA policies for book publishing should be taken into account.

> EQSIP item 6: Funded by long-term sustainable financial support from academic institutions that have either performing research or funding it as their goal. Contributions are not tied to individual outputs or groups of authors.

EQSIP 1.0 takes financial stability as a goal for organisations, excluding APCs/BPCs as a model. Table 2 examines two main sources and tests their importance in relation to the IP's budget, respectively the parent organisation and public funding. In the landscape report[3], it was indeed shown that national and local public funding was the most frequent revenue stream for IPs outside of their parent organisation, confirming previous literature[4].

[3] Institutional Publishing in the ERA: results from the DIAMAS survey. 'D2.3 Final IPSP landscape Report
[4] Laakso M., Anna-Maija Multas A.-M. 2023. "European Scholarly Journals from Small- and Mid-size Publishers: Mapping Journals and Public Funding Mechanisms". *Science and Public Policy*, vol. 50(3): 445–456, https://doi.org/10.1093/scipol/scac081

Funded by the European Union

Table 2. Distribution of funding forms followed by IPs over the last three years (in %)

	Fixed and permanent subsidy from the parent organisation	Permanent public/ government funding (international, national, local)
Non-answer	6,4	9,5
Not applicable	38,5	52,9
Very low	3,3	7,0
Low	3,5	2,9
Neither high nor low	5,7	7,0
High	11,4	7,5
Very high	31,3	13,2

N=546

Source: DIAMAS survey on OA Diamond and Institutional publishing (2023)

Yet, although it is the main funding source in some countries (Serbia, Croatia, France…), this monetary stream concerns only a minority of IPs, and with various levels of reliance. The existence of parent organisations also concern a minority of IPs, but for those who have one, 3 out of 4 strongly depend on them.

The IPs interviewed during the focus groups testify that they have several revenue streams: mainly public funds from the Ministry or the State, but also donations, and only a minority of sales revenue.

> EQSIP item 2: Transparency about the types of revenue streams (e.g. Voluntary Author Contributions (VAC) can be considered as an optional revenue stream).

As part of the web coding we searched for information about revenue streams on the IP website. Table 3 clearly shows that a vast majority of IPs don't share this information. Nevertheless, a minority publish the list of their "funders", or at least their main one. We use "funder" as it is often not clear whether their support was financial or in-kind (personnel, infrastructures…).

Table 3. Transparency of the revenue streams on the IP website (in %)

	Proportion
Non-answer	16,1
Multiple	19,7
Only one	15,9
None	48,4

N=517
Source: DIAMAS web coding of IPs websites

During the focus groups, questions about the necessity and interest of financial transparency were raised. While some were reluctant about it, other IPs embraced it: "as a user, having as much information as possible about funding, who is funding it and how, I find that this gives us information about the confidence or reliability we can place in a journal".

2.2. Ownership and governance

Ownership and governance are a key part of institutional publishing. As the last half century has taught us, successive decisions to outsource publishing have led to the loss of control over academic publishing by communities and scholarly institutions, and has accelerated the commercialisation of scholarly communication[5].

> EQSIP item 7: Transparent ownership structure, controlled by and responsive to the scholarly community (e.g. a controlling scholarly organisation, not a commercial publisher, owns the journal title, so that a change of the service provider can be achieved without changing the title).

To test this item, we shall only use indirect information coming from two questions. The following table 4 is one of the most accurate images of the diversity of IPs that responded to the survey. First, it underlines how the "parent organisation" scheme only applies to about half of the respondents. Second, if there is such a parent organisation, the position of the IP inside or outside of it takes various shapes..

---

[5] Fyfe A., Coate K., Curry S., Lawson S., Moxham N., Røstvik C.M. 2017. "Untangling Academic Publishing: A History of the Relationship between Commercial Interests, Academic Prestige and the Circulation of Research". Zenodo. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.546100

Table 4. The IP relationship to its parent organisation (in %)

	Proportion
Non-answer	47,6
Don't know	0,5
Department of the parent organisation	15,6
Operating independently but owned or governed by the parent organisation	16,7
Part of a library in the parent organisation	7,5
Part of department of the parent organisation	7,9
Other (please describe)	4,2

N=546

Source: DIAMAS survey on OA Diamond and Institutional publishing (2023)

Table 5 shows us that two types of legal and financial status dominate our population : the public organisation and the private non-profit, which both fulfil the underlying criteria of item 7.

Table 5. Distribution of IPs according to the type of legal entity (in %)

	Proportion
Company (owned by Directors; limited liability)	2,4
Corporation (owned by Shareholders)	0,7
Private not-for-profit organisation, (e.g. Charity, Foundation, Learned Society, or Association)	27,8
Public organisation (e.g. university, research institute, laboratory, research organisation)	64,1
Other	4,4
Don't know	0,5

N=546

Source: DIAMAS survey on OA Diamond and Institutional publishing (2023)

However, we have no direct information about the transparency of that ownership. Furthermore, the item considers that decisions made by ownership would be enough for a given IP to change service providers, while we know from anecdotal evidence that technical dependency and organisational culture hamper that market flexibility.

Funded by the European Union

EQSIP item 8: Strategic governance that allows community input on the direction of the publishing service and operational governance with community representation and decision making power.

The following table 6 shows a very divided landscape between participation and absence of participation from the scholarly community, taking in consideration there is no definition of "community input" in EQSIP (for example, does it include editorial boards members?).

Table 6. Representation from the wider scholarly community outside of your parent organisation into the IP governance model (in %)

	Proportion
Non-answer	3,9
Don't know	11,5
No	47,2
Yes	37,3

N=546
Source: DIAMAS survey on OA Diamond and Institutional publishing (2023)

During the focus group discussions, some IPs highlighted the importance of letting scholarly editors and authors decide what they wish for their publications. But from an IP policy point of view — the one embraced by EQSIP 1.0 – it could be seen as a weakness. Let us give an example: a university press has a University publishing committee without decision-making power (only grants approval), and individual scholars (authors or editors) invite reviewers and make publication decisions. Concerning books, there is no pre-set criteria, each book is different in terms of content, financial plan, target, etc. They only adhere to the criteria set by a Ministry for providing financial support to books, and the only requirement is having at least two reviewers. Concerning journals, the only requirement at the institutional level is for indexation, all the rest is within the hands of the editorial scholar committee.

EQSIP item 9: Openly available procedures for the selection of members of governance and editorial bodies together with details of a regular renewal process.

This EQSIP 1.0 item is clearly currently not adopted by IPs. As table 7 shows, less than 1 out of 10 institutions display such procedures on their websites. We consider this absence a strong indication of the lack of such formal procedures.

Funded by
the European Union

Table 7. Open procedures for selection of governance/editorial bodies on the IP website (in %)

	Proportion
Non-answer	6,0
Displayed	8,7
Not displayed	85,3

N=517

Source: DIAMAS web coding of IPs websites

> EQSIP item 30: Names and affiliations for all editors and editorial board members. It is important that the journal's editorial board is composed of recognised and active experts in their field. Editor roles and responsibilities are clearly described, but at the very least, editor roles include the selection of reviewers for the papers assigned to them, providing authors with advice on how to improve their papers, and negotiating disagreements between authors and reviewers.
>
> EQSIP item 11: Clearly defined and publicly displayed composition and constitution of the journal's/platform's editorial bodies: the names of the members of the editorial team, their current functions and roles; the names of the members of the Editorial Board and their current affiliations. PIDs (such as ORCID) and links to institutional profiles are provided to unambiguously specify the identity and affiliation of individual editorial Team and Board members.

EQSIP 1.0 items 11 and 30, which are related, had very accurate answers from the web coding source. The 93% IPs for which information was found are spread out in roughly three equal parts: the first one does not display this information at all, the second group offers limited information, and finally the third group displays almost all the information mentioned in EQSIP 1.0 items 11 and 30. It means that most IPs do display the composition of their editorial bodies, but with an asymmetrical degree of information. Of all types of information, table 8 shows that editors' PID is clearly the least common. Its systematic adoption by big publishers is, at best, very recent, but considering recent literature[6] and table 8 data, it should not be a problem for the IPs who are already displaying some information about their editorial committees online.

---

[6] Porter S. J. 2022. "Measuring Research Information Citizenship across ORCID Practice". *Frontiers in Research Metrics and Analytics,* 7: 779097. https://doi.org/10.3389/frma.2022.779097

Table 8. Public composition of editorial bodies on the IP website (in %)

	Proportion
Non-answer	6,4
Not displayed	32,5
Yes, with names	5,4
Yes, with names and affiliations	16,8
Yes, with names and functions	7,5
Yes, with names, affiliations and PID	0,2
Yes, with names, functions and affiliations	28,6
Yes, with names, functions, affiliations and PID	2,5

N=517

Source: DIAMAS web coding of IPs websites

EQSIP item 14: Authors retain rights without restriction, including Intellectual Property Rights (IPR).

EQSIP item 35: Author guidelines, including information on: Copyright / author's rights policy

The question of author rights has become one of the most contentious points among OA activists, now joined by funders and policy makers on the one hand, and some publishers on the other. These conflicting views sometime focus on the version of record, other times on the author accepted manuscript in reason of the Rights Retention Strategy endorsed by cOAlition S, which revived old tactics against exclusive copyright transfer[7]. The web coding represented in table 9 clearly shows the importance of local implicit conventions on the subject : almost half of the respondents do not display anything, which could mean "copyright transfer", "rights remain with authors" or anything else[8]. Moreover, the literature has shown that authors

---

[7] Moore S. A. 2023. "The Politics of Rights Retention". *Publications*, vol. 11(2): 28. https://doi.org/10.3390/publications11020028; Labastida i Juan I., Melinščak Zlodi I., Proudman V., Treadway J. 2023. "Opening Knowledge: Retaining Rights and Open Licensing in Europe". Zenodo. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.8084051.

[8] Legal clauses in copyright transfer agreements can themselves be very diverse, see Gadd E., Oppenheim C., Probets S. 2003. "RoMEO Studies 4: An Analysis of Journal Publishers' Copyright Agreements". Learned Publishing, vol. 16(4): 293-308. https://doi.org/10.1087/095315103322422053

Funded by the European Union

generally don't understand the legal terms of copyright transfer agreements[9]. Hence the importance of explicit mentions of an author rights policy, which was only present in a third of the IPs website.

Table 9. Information about authors retaining rights without restriction on the IP website (in %)

	Proportion
Non-answer	6,6
Not displayed	49,7
No	12,2
Yes	31,5

N=517
Source: DIAMAS web coding of IPs websites

The focus groups enriched this divided landscape: some IPs were cautious about copyright, even if the authors and scholars they work with are often not particularly interested in these issues as long as their work is published and indexed. Some IPs tend to consider the transfer of rights to publishers as a good way to reward their own work in addition to the one of the authors and reviewers. Moreover, they fear that "author-only" rights would enhance "OA piracy", where other IPs would simply copy the content of entire journals or even sell them. In contrast, an IP who publishes STEM journals insists on not exercising copyright for research data, for replicability reasons, while another one in SSH has no problem assuming all traditional tasks for a publisher (ownership, dissemination, in-house technical platform…) while not taking any form of property on the content they produce and disseminate.

> EQSIP item 17: The General Terms and Conditions of the use of the infrastructure or platform are publicly displayed.

The general terms and conditions of the use of the infrastructure or platform are displayed on 26% of IP websites, at least in a sufficiently visible place that allowed the encoders to find them.

---

[9] Kohn A., Lange J. 2018. "Confused about Copyright? Assessing Researchers' Comprehension of Copyright Transfer Agreements". *Journal of Librarianship and Scholarly Communication*, vol. 6(1): eP2253. doi: https://doi.org/10.7710/2162-3309.2253

Table 10. Public General Terms and Conditions
of platform on the IP website (in %)

	Proportion
Non-answer	6,8
Displayed	25,7
Not displayed	67,5

N=517
Source: DIAMAS web coding of IPs websites

2.3. Open science practices

The following EQSIP 1.0 core component relates to various practices of open science. A first set of questions concerns the status of published information in IPs' outlets or managed through SPs' services.

Published information status

EQSIP item 19: IPSPs provide their users with complete and reliable information about the terms of use of IPSPs' content and services. Users' rights, conditions of reuse and redistribution of content are clearly described and labelled in human and computer-readable form, using standardised systems of open licences and rights statements.

In terms of providing users with the ability to share and redistribute their published content, table 11 shows a division in practice, indicating a clear gap from EQSIP 1.0 standards. While almost half of the website sample does not display users' rights, conditions of redistribution and/or reuse of content, 45% of respondents do display these elements. This means that even though published work is made freely available, a large share of it does not come with information displaying the appropriate ways in which it may be used, redistributed, or reused. Once again, it is possible that information is on the websites of IP's outputs, or even at the publication level, but the data shows that there is no publicly stated policy at the IP level.

Table 11. Information about users' rights, conditions of redistribution and reuse of content on the IP website (in %)

	Proportion
Non-answer	6,8
Displayed	45,1
Not displayed	48,2

N=517
Source: DIAMAS web coding of IPs websites

> EQSIP item 20: Authors retain moral and exploitation rights, and contributions are published under a Creative Commons licence (preferably CC-BY) to ensure further reuse without restrictions.

Considering more specifically the reuse of published content, a small majority (55%) of the IPs who answered the survey declare they use a CC-BY licence (table 12), the most liberal for publications and preferred by many funders. Interestingly, all other creative commons licences are also mentioned, though to a slightly lesser extent. CC-BY-NC-ND reaches 33%, followed by CC-BY-NC with 27,5%, CC-BY-SA representing almost 24%, CC-BY-SBD at 12% and finally CC0 at 6%. It should be noted that 6% mention a non-CC open licence.

Table 12. Distribution of used or recommended licence(s) (in %)

	Proportion
CC-BY	55,5
CC-BY-NC	27,5
CC-BY-NC-ND	33,4
CC-BY-NC-SA	15,4
CC-BY-ND	11,8
CC-BY-SA	23,9
CC0	5,9
Other open licence (please specify)	5,9

N=444
Source: DIAMAS survey on OA Diamond and Institutional publishing (2023)
Note: the total exceeds 100% since the question allowed multiple choices

So more than a quarter of responding IPs use a portfolio of licences, despite knowing that the preference of many stakeholders is for CC-BY. There are, however, legitimate reasons for more restrictive licences. Conversely, if we consider CC-licences as a

Funded by the European Union

whole, they are now largely adopted and don't raise questions for material published as open access. Furthermore, almost three quarters of IPs use only one licence. Most IPs interviewed during the focus groups have chosen a CC-BY licence for all their publications, but it remains possible to negotiate on a case-by-case basis, especially for cases where confidentiality is a concern — even if requests have been very rare.

To sum it up, CC-licences have strong support, but even the most popular licence, CC-BY, is far from being a universal choice.

> EQSIP item 21: IPSPs have an output-level policy on data availability. They encourage the use of reporting guidelines, the registration of clinical trials and other study designs according to standard practice in their discipline. Data underlying publications are available to editors and reviewers when the manuscript is submitted for review, and to all others by the time of publication at the latest. Data are made available in trusted repositories under FAIR principles with publicly available metadata.

Another aspect of the published information focuses on the research data sharing policy that IPs have set for their publications. As table 13 shows, what is particularly striking here, in terms of the gap with EQSIP 1.0, is the proportion of IPs (31%) who do not have any policy in this regard. However, this trend can be relativized since more than half of the respondents to the survey state that they have a policy dedicated to research data sharing, whether it is as part of the institutional policy (26%), at the journal level (21%), or to a lesser extent at the publisher level (7%).

Table 13. Implementing a research data sharing policy (in %)

	Proportion
Non-answer	4,2
Don't know	9,2
Not applicable	8,4
No	30,6
Yes, as part of the institutional Open Science/Open Access policy	26,2
Yes, at the journal level	21,4
Yes, at the publisher level	6,8
Other (please specify)	3,3

N=546

Source: DIAMAS survey on OA Diamond and Institutional publishing (2023)

Note: the total exceeds 100% since the question allowed multiple choices

Funded by the European Union

Forms of peer review

A second set of questions is more directly related to peer review and its modalities.

> EQSIP item 22: Editorial teams will consider encouraging open reviewing policies that are in line with the NISO Peer Review Terminology Standardization guidelines. These policies and guidelines ideally provide reviewers with the possibility of: (a) signing their reviews either with their identity only visible to the editor, author, and the other reviewers, or with their identity visible to all readers; (b) publishing either review summaries or the full content of their review reports with identities visible or not, either alongside the published article with a separate DOI or in an open preprint repository. Such policies can also allow the corresponding author to opt for publishing either review summaries or the full content of review reports of their article or chapter. [...] They manage the peer review process with the understanding that there is no value in hiding the identity of authors.

In line with open science practices, any form of open peer review is promoted by EQSIP 1.0 standards. However, as displayed in table 14, this is far from being the case, with only 17% of respondents to the survey declaring that they enable any form of open peer review. A large number of negative answers (44%) indicate a clear deviation from EQSIP 1.0 here. On a more positive note, the remaining answers may be encouraging: if only 4% of the respondents declare to currently experiment with open peer review, 29% of IPs indicate they would consider this kind of peer evaluation in the future.

Table 14. Distribution of any form of open peer review (in %)

	Proportion
Non-answer	3,7
Don't know	2,9
No	44,0
No, but we would consider implementing open peer review at a later stage	28,8
Yes, we are experimenting with open peer review	4,0
Yes	16,7

N=546

Source: DIAMAS survey on OA Diamond and Institutional publishing (2023)

The previous result gives a limited indication of the types of peer review actually in use by IPs for their journals or book series. The distribution of answers displayed in table 15

**Funded by
the European Union**

is clear-cut in this regard. Three main forms of peer review stand out very distinctly. Firstly, as an established quality-standard in the humanities and social sciences, double-blind peer review comes out as a strong preference (75%) among the respondents to the survey. Secondly, single-blind peer review, historically favoured in the experimental sciences, represents more than a third (34%) of the answers, a slightly higher proportion than editorial reviews (30%). Finally, the other "open" options hardly amount to one fifth of IPs' answers. Such a skewed distribution of current forms of peer evaluation in use by IPs presents an unambiguous signal: if open peer review can be experimented or considered a standard to be met at a later stage, the current gap is telling on this matter.

Table 15. Distribution of peer review types in use in journals that the IP publishes or provides services to (in %)

	Proportion
Double-anonymised peer review (both authors and reviewers are anonymous to each other)	74,7
Editorial review	29,9
Open identities of the reviewers, authors and editors	11,8
Open participation in the peer review process (community)	2,4
Open reviewers' reports	6,5
Single-anonymised peer review (authors do not know who the reviewers are)	33,7
Don't know	0,7
Other (please specify)	2,7

N=415
Source: DIAMAS survey on OA Diamond and Institutional publishing (2023)
Note: the total exceeds 100% since the question allowed multiple choices

Manuscript versions

A third set of questions concerns the version of texts and their multiple locations.

ESQIP item 23: IPSPs accept the submission of unreviewed preprints that are already available on preprint servers or in open repositories.

As manuscripts typically circulate among peers for comments and critics to be improved or peer-reviewed, they can also be made publicly available before their submission to a journal. Hence, the issue of the potential reluctance to assess a

Funded by the European Union

document already available for the sake of its newsworthiness[10]. Interestingly, the respondents to the survey are nuanced about accepting submissions of preprints or working papers (table 16). While the strongest trend goes to a negative position (28%), an almost equal positive attitude (27,5%) is represented. Moreover, the acceptance for preprint or working paper submissions grows when specific positive answers are considered: for some journals (6%) and even for books (12%). Yet, it is important to note that more than 20% of IPs' answers are distributed between "I don't know" and "not applicable", underlying the deviation from EQSIP 1.0 standards.

Table 16. Welcoming submissions already publicly shared as a preprint or working paper (in %)

	Proportion
Non-answer	11,2
I don't know	13,4
Not applicable	10,3
No	28,0
Yes, for some journals	6,4
Yes, for all journals	27,5
Yes, for books	11,7

N=546
Source: DIAMAS survey on OA Diamond and Institutional publishing (2023)
Note: the total exceeds 100% since the question allowed multiple choices

An IP that we interviewed for the focus groups was not in favour of publishing preprints, because it complicates the process of double-blind peer review: the authors are easily found with a search engine query. In any event, the need for authors to disclose during the submission process that a paper is already published as a preprint was raised.

---

[10] The rule stipulating that any findings that have already been published, in other media or in other journals, would not be considered for publication, originates with Franz J. Ingelfinger, then editor-in-chief of *The New England Journal of Medicine*. See: Ingelfinger F.J. 1969. "Definition of 'Sole Contribution'". *New England Journal of Medicine*, 281(12): 676–677. Subsequently adopted by a large number of scientific journals, the eponymous form, the "Ingelfinger rule", was coined by his successor: Relman A.S. 1981. "The Ingelfinger Rule." *New England Journal of Medicine*, 305(14): 824–826.

> EQSIP item 24: IPSPs allow dissemination of the preprint version of published outputs. Authors can deposit any version of the work (preprint, Author Accepted Manuscript (AAM) or Version of Record (VoR)) to an open repository of the authors' choice before or after publication. The work and its supplementary material are deposited in public repositories, through unique and persistent identifiers.

When discussing the various versions of texts, the issue of self-archiving in open repositories by authors of published work arises. As shown in table 17, a large share (60%) of IPS declare to allow such a practice. A slight difference is however noticeable about what is considered an appropriate candidate for self-archiving, as books (31%) are more likely to be self-archived in open repositories than journal articles (24%).

Table 17. Allowing the self-archiving of published content
in open repositories (in %)

	Proportion
Non-answer	8,1
I don't know	5,7
No	4,4
Not applicable	3,1
Yes, for some journals	6,0
Yes, for all journals	24,0
Yes, for books	30,6

N=546
Source: DIAMAS survey on OA Diamond and Institutional publishing (2023)
Note: the total exceeds 100% since the question allowed multiple choices

A significant result from the survey is that a majority (70%) of IPs declare that they set a policy which addresses the issue of self-archiving. But what does this mean? Table 18 provides some details that help to elicit this aspect. It shows that IPs encourage authors of published content to circulate it via academic sharing services (such as Academia.edu or ResearchGate). If this position is more pronounced for journals (58%), than for books (23%), it clearly contrasts with the low rate of negative answers (10%).

**Funded by
the European Union**

Table 18. Allowing the sharing of published content via academic sharing services (in %)

	Proportion
Non-answer	9,7
I don't know	7,1
Not applicable	7,3
No	10,3
Yes, for some journals	4,0
Yes, for all journals	58,1
Yes, for books	22,9

N=546
Source: DIAMAS survey on OA Diamond and Institutional publishing (2023)
Note: the total exceeds 100% since the question allowed multiple choices

> EQSIP item 25: IPSPs are encouraged to post output-level editorial policies that ensure the publication of negative scientific results, or unexpected results and data that do not bear out the initial hypotheses and experimental designs of the authors.

Data sets, protocols and methods are fully part of the research process reported in publications. In parallel to the practices related to text versions (e.g. preprint or working paper, submission for publication, self-archiving), making publicly available other aspects of the production conditions is a part of open science practices. Two of these aspects have been investigated in our inquiry.

First, the survey includes a question about the publication of negative research results. Unsurprisingly, only a few IPs (7%) state that they disclose editorial policies that encourage the publication of unexpected results and data that do not bear out the initial hypotheses and experimental designs of the authors. Whether in open science or not, publication remains focused on discovery and groundbreaking results. This could partially be explained by the disciplinary nature of publishing: the majority of IPs in the sample publish works from Humanities, and in these disciplines there are less experimental designs and quantifiable methods that can lead to negative results. In such a context, despite some willingness for change, the gap with open science standards could last a long time.

**Funded by
the European Union**

EQSIP item 26: IPSPs have output-level policies that make associated research protocols and methods available. This is a good open science practice that allows others to replicate and build on published work.

ESQIP item 27: IPSPs encourage the sharing of research software in a similar way to research data. As part of their policy in making available any material underpinning published research results, IPSPs ask for a software and code availability statement. Authors are expected to provide access to software and make code available in suitable repositories to enable reproducibility by facilitating access and reuse.

EQSIP item 59: Publications hosted on the platform […] provide links to data, code, and other research outputs that underlie the publications and are available in external repositories.

Second, our manual coding of IPs websites takes into account the sharing of diverse data underlying publications, as part of open science practices. Even though such a call for transparency has been pushed for almost 20 years, a massive share (82%) of the journals/IPs' website sample do not explicitly encourage the need for making available extra documents with publication (table 19). When digging into the answers with low percentages, data sharing is by far (9%) the most encouraged of the documents with the potential to be made public.

Table 19. Access to extra documents with publication (in %)

	Proportion
Non-answer	7,7
Data	9,1
Data and code	0,6
Research protocol	0,4
Software	0,2
None	82,0

N=517

Source: DIAMAS web coding of IPs websites

Funded by the European Union

2.4. Editorial quality, editorial management and research integrity

The fourth EQSIP core component addresses how information made available on journals/IPs websites and published in outlets is actually managed, assessed and validated. It also concerns the way in which this information complies with research integrity standards.

> EQSIP item 29: Information about the journal's/IPSP's mission (a journal/IPSP mission statement), aims, and scope is publicly available on the website, and the languages in which manuscripts can be submitted are clearly indicated.

As shown in the next two tables, information displayed on journals/IP websites regarding their mission and author charging fees barely meet EQSIP 1.0 standards. While a large share of IPs do make information about their mission publicly available on their respective websites (table 20), 23% of the journals/IP websites sampled do not provide it. Among those displaying such information, they tend to emphasize "aims and scope", either together (31%) or separately (5% and 9% respectively). When it comes to languages in which manuscripts can be submitted for reviewing, only a quarter of the websites sampled make such information available.

Table 20. Public information about scope, aim and language(s) on the IP website (in %)

	Proportion
Non-answer	7,0
Yes : aim	5,2
Yes : scope	9,3
Yes : aim and scope	31,1
Yes : languages	0,4
Yes, aim and languages	1,5
Yes, scope and languages	3,9
Yes, aim, scope and languages	19,0
No	22,6

N=517
Source: DIAMAS web coding of IPs websites

Funded by the European Union

Half of the websites sampled do not display any explicit information about author charging (table 21). The other half is divided further into two roughly equal groups. First, those providing explicit information that no obligatory fees are charged to the authors amount to 18%. Second, those stating that they do not charge authors but encourage them to make a Voluntary Author Contribution (VAC), represent 21% of the respondents. This last result is quite striking, showing the symbolic, if not financial, importance of author support for a lot of IPs. But to come back to the heart of the gap analysis, this item, as many other ones, is currently only partly fulfilled.

Table 21. Explicit information about author charges on the IP website (in %)

	Proportion
Non-answer	7,4
No APC	18,2
No APC and VAC	21,1
VAC	2,3
Not displayed	51,1

N=517

Source: DIAMAS web coding of IPs websites

Editors and reviewers are not paid by the majority of IPs we interviewed during the focus groups, in contrast to the work of proofreading and translating that sometimes is financially compensated. VAC was not a common revenue stream among our diamond IPs. Even if they can administratively receive money, they would have to devise a policy which ensures equitable treatment of authors and a fee of an appropriate amount. But for books especially, even if there are no BPCs, authors often have to juggle between public program-contracts, financial residues from research projects, and volunteer work.

Funded by
the European Union

EQSIP item 36: Author guidelines include information on the nature of the evaluation process used, including expected timeframe.

EQSIP item 41: All submitted manuscripts undergo a rigorous evaluation process before or after publication that is in line with accepted practices in the relevant discipline. This evaluation process can involve peer review, or another type of evaluation by at least one person who has no conflict of interest with the author(s). The type and details of the evaluation process are stated clearly on the website and explained in detail. Evaluation can take place before or after publication, depending on the review model adopted (pre-publication peer review, post-publication peer review (Publish, Review, Curate (PCR) models), overlay journals, etc).

Regarding the evaluation process itself, the journals/IP website sample also shows important deviations from the EQSIP standards. As table 22 makes clear, only 55% of journals/IP websites display information on the evaluation process actually used to handle the submitted manuscripts (e.g. peer review, taking place before or after publication; conflict of interest...). Conversely, this means that 38% do not include such information on their website, whether in a specific 'author guidelines' section or not.

Table 22. Description of the evaluation process on the IP website (in %)

	Proportion
Non-answer	6,6
Displayed	55,5
Not displayed	37,9

N=517

Source: DIAMAS web coding of IPs websites

EQSIP item 37: Author guidelines include information on submission information (such as the article types the journal will accept, the stylesheet that contributions should adhere to and the templates or tools that should be used).

The deviation from EQSIP 1.0 here is similar to that regarding information about manuscript submission, relating to the types and formats of articles the journal publishes, the stylesheet, and the templates or tools that should be used. Even though 41% of the websites sampled make such submission information available, 39% do not (table 23). Only 11% of journals/IPs display submission information either with a stylesheet or a template to be used for submitted manuscripts.

Funded by the European Union

Table 23. Description of the submission format on the IP website (in %)

	Proportion
Non-answer	6,6
Described	41,2
Displayed with stylesheet or template	10,8
Not displayed	39,1
Stylesheet or template	2,3

N=517
Source: DIAMAS web coding of IPs websites

EQSIP item 38: The IP states its publishing timelines or the declaration of continuous publication. The publication date declared on the publication is the actual date when the publication became available online.

Information about the publishing timelines is found to be displayed even less often. As table 24 shows, more than half of the journals/IPs' website sample (52%) do not display information regarding any declaration of continuous publication, nor the publication date.

Table 24. Publication of timelines or declaration of continuous publication on the IP website (in %)

	Proportion
Non-answer	6,8
Displayed	40,8
Not displayed	52,4

N=517
Source: DIAMAS web coding of IPs websites

EQSIP item 43: The IP's editorial policies and procedures are transparent and easy to find on the IP's website. They cover the publication ethics adhered to (for example, COPE's core practices or the IPSP's own publication ethics statement), address authorship and contributorship, explain how complaints and appeals/allegations of research misconduct and conflicts of interest are handled.

The relatively low transparency of information displayed on journals/IPs websites is particularly important with regard to publication ethics statements. This is notably the case for authorship, either when it comes to the ways in which authorship has been decided and ascribed to contributors, or the concerns and complaints raised about credit attribution. Firstly, just over a third (32%) of journals/IPs provide transparent information regarding authorship and the respective contribution of names in the byline (table 25). Secondly, the gap with EQSIP 1.0 standards on this matter is even greater when it comes to complaints and allegations: even though we have no information about misconduct and conflicts of interest, 70% of the websites sampled do not make information publicly available on how such issues are actually handled (table 26).

Table 25. Statement about authorship and contributorship on the IP website (in %)

	Proportion
Non-answer	5,8
Displayed	32,3
Not displayed	61,9

N=517
Source: DIAMAS web coding of IPs websites

Table 26. Statement about complaints and allegations on the IP website (in %)

	Proportion
Non-answer	5,8
Displayed	24
Not displayed	70,2

N=517
Source: DIAMAS web coding of IPs websites

Funded by the European Union

Unlike most of the information displayed on their website that comes with more or less important variations from EQSIP 1.0 standards, a large share (63%) of journals and IPs declare that they have a privacy policy compliant with the GDPR (table 27). However, the survey does not provide any information on the public statement of this compliance. Interestingly, about one fifth of the respondents do not know about the compliance with these particular regulations or non-EU equivalent ones.

Table 27. Setting up a privacy policy per the GDPR guidelines (or non-EU equivalent) (in %)

	Proportion
Non-answer	4,2
Don't know	18,9
No	14,3
Yes	62,6

N=546
Source: DIAMAS survey on OA Diamond and Institutional publishing (2023)

During focus groups, the IPs' positions differed enormously: some take charge of GDPR compliance (for example with a systematic reviewing and a requirement to fill in a form before publication); while other IPs consider that it is the authors' responsibility and not the publisher's. Some disciplinary fields also do not work with personal data.

Regarding data more generally, the issue of their preservation and archiving is key. In this regard, a significant proportion (70%) of journals and IPs also state they have implemented an archiving/backup policy (table 28). Such a high proportion should be viewed with caution however, since the survey does not provide any information about the public display of such a policy. Similarly, the survey does not cover the protection

Funded by the European Union

of the publishing infrastructure from viruses and malware, nor the provision of documentation to its users.

Table 28. Setting up an archiving/backup policy (in %)

	Proportion
Non-answer	4,4
Don't know	11,9
No	13,9
Yes	69,8

N=546
Source: DIAMAS survey on OA Diamond and Institutional publishing (2023)

2.5. Technical service efficiency

Another EQSIP core component is more particularly focused on information infrastructures, from software, interoperability, and metadata to content formats and their preservation.

Software and interoperability

> EQSIP item 45: The publishing platform is based on free and open-source software, with publicly available code, while the Institutional Publisher (IP) or Service Provider (SP) (see footnote 1) uses free and open-source software as much as possible in its editorial and publishing workflows. The platform is developed and regularly updated to conform to current interoperability standards (OpenAIRE Guidelines, KBART, COUNTER), accessibility guidelines (e.g. W3C Web Content Accessibility Guidelines – WCAG) and open science principles.

The software used in publishing platforms is a key element of IP infrastructure. As the following table 29 shows, there are clearly three different situations. The first one, which includes the majority of IPs, uses PKP-developed software (OJS and OMP). The second one is an archipelago of different types of software, all open source, knowing that a given IP can use multiple softwares. And finally, there is a minority of IPs that use in-house developed software, unknown software or closed software. A detailed analysis is available in the landscape report on the respective use of repository software and CSS[11]. What is important for this gap analysis is that at least 71% of IPs

---

[11] Institutional Publishing in the ERA: results from the DIAMAS survey. 'D2.3 Final IPSP landscape Report

Funded by
the European Union

currently only use systems that comply with this part of the EQSIP 1.0 item, and 5% more use them in combination with non-OSS systems.

Table 29. Distribution of publishing systems used by the IP (in %)

	Proportion
Customisation or own development (please specify)	12.1
Dataverse	1.3
Drupal	3.6
DSpace	6.5
Editorial manager	1.9
Janeway	1.3
Lodel	5.7
Manifold	0.8
Open Journals System (OJS)	60.9
Open Monograph Press (OMP)	7.0
Pressbooks	0.4
PubPub	0.6
Scholar One	2.3
WordPress	11.0
Don't know	8.9
Other commercial software (please specify)	8.3
Other open source software (please specify)	5.7

N=527
Source: DIAMAS survey on OA Diamond and Institutional publishing (2023)
Note: the total exceeds 100% since the question allowed multiple choices

> EQSIP item 46: The publishing platform supports widely adopted metadata formats for harvesting (e.g. Dublin Core, OpenAIRE, etc.) and metadata exchange protocols (OAI-PMH, APIs), and indicates which interoperability protocol is used and how to access it. It also supports massive metadata export (as CSV files, ONIX XML feeds or in any other established format) and provides MARC records to libraries.

Interoperability and openness is also relevant for metadata (table 30). 36% of respondents publish their metadata under a CC licence and 9% under a CC0 one. 28%

do not know the licence of the IP metadata: we cannot know here if this is because the specific person who filled in the survey does not have this information, or the IP as a whole has not tackled this issue. In total, more than half of the respondents do not share metadata, have no information about it, or didn't answer. Consequently, in total, more than half of the respondents do not share metadata, have no information about it, or didn't answer. Consequently,we have no information, as EQSIP recommends, on whether IP platforms support massive metadata export or not.

Table 30. Opening metadata with a standard description schema (in %)

	Proportion
Non-answer	4,6
Don't know	27,8
No	19,2
Yes, under CC BY or another Creative Commons licence	35,7
Yes, under Creative Commons Public Domain Dedication (CC0)	8,6
Other	4,0

N=546

Source: DIAMAS survey on OA Diamond and Institutional publishing (2023)

> EQSIP item 47: Text and data mining (automatic downloading, extraction and indexing of the full texts and the associated metadata) is supported and this is stated in the relevant policy.

The support of text and data mining is, for the vast majority of IPs (89%), not displayed on their website (table 31). It does not mean it is not supported at all, but it would be unusual to not display such information related to the computing environment. It is also possible that the content of IPs publications is available on dissemination platforms which support this kind of operation.

Table 31. Displaying that text and data mining is supported on the IP website (in %)

	Proportion
Non-answer	6,0
Displayed	4,6

Funded by
the European Union

Not displayed	89,4

N=517
Source: DIAMAS web coding of IPs websites

Metadata

EQSIP item 48: Each published item (article, chapter, book, etc.) has a dedicated unique URL (landing page) and persistent identifier (preferably DOI).

EQSIP item 50: Standard numbers (ISSN, eISSN, ISBN) and other persistent identifiers for the publication (DOI), authors and contributors (ORCID), author affiliations (ROR), and funding organisations (Funder DOIs), as well as other relevant persistent identifiers, are provided in human- and machine-readable formats.

As shown in table 32, the vast majority of IPs assign a unique persistent identifier for each published output: 9% do not do it, 50% do it for all publications, 23% for all journals, 4% only for some journals. Thus, assigning if PIDs for online documents is already commonplace, it is not yet systematic.

Table 32. Assignment of unique persistent identifiers (PIDs) to published content (in %)

	Proportion
Non-answer	3,5
Don't know	10,6
No	9,2
Yes for some journals	3,8
Yes for all journals	23,3
Yes for all publications	49,6

N=546
Source: DIAMAS survey on OA Diamond and Institutional publishing (2023)

The most frequently used PIDs are CrossRef-DOI (76%) and ISSN (75%), the ISBN being less frequent as more IPs don't publish books. This thus represents a monopoly situation for articles, journals and books (the other DOI probably being issued by Datacite for some journals/books).

Funded by the European Union

Table 33. Persistent identifiers (PIDs) used

	Proportion
ARK	0,5
CrossRef-DOI	75,8
Datacite-DOI	13,9
Handle	7,4
ISBN	54,5
ISSN	74,6
URN	5,3
Other (please specify)	3,8
Other DOI	10,3

N=418
Source: DIAMAS survey on OA Diamond and Institutional publishing (2023)
Note: the total exceeds 100% since the question allowed multiple choices

> EQSIP item 51: CRediT tags are used to indicate contributions of the authors (coded in JATS XML).

Systematically ascribing contribution roles to the authors of a scientific article has been a growing concern in the biomedical sciences since the 1990s. With the further elaboration and introduction of a standardised vocabulary of 14 research contributions, namely CRediT (Contributor Roles Taxonomy), the willingness for most academic disciplines to adopt it has also grown[12]. However, its actual spread into academia is far from being achieved. This is clearly shown in table 34, with only 17% of respondents declaring to use CRediT and 43% who do not. The other answers are distributed among those who don't know (26%) or consider it not applicable (11%), indicating a big gap in relation to this EQSIP 1.0 requirement.

---

[12] Brand A., Allen L., Altman M., Hlava M., Scott J. 2015. "Beyond Authorship: Attribution, Contribution, Collaboration, and Credit". *Learned Publishing*, vol. 28(2): 151–155.

Funded by
the European Union

Table 34. Distinguishing contributor roles (in %)

	Proportion
Non-answer	3,8
Not applicable	10,6
Don't know	25,6
No	43,0
Yes	16,8

N=546
Source: DIAMAS survey on OA Diamond and Institutional publishing (2023)

> EQSIP item 54: Complete metadata about publications, including bibliographic references, are regularly deposited in a registration agency (e.g. CrossRef) in line with the Initiative for Open Citations (I4OC) and Initiative for Open Abstracts (I4OA).

Open metadata has a long story, in particular for repositories through OAI-PMH. The openness of the data had a very direct aim: to share it through harvesting of these repositories. On the publishing side, metadata has more often been framed as an object of commercial primary and secondary markets, hence remaining closed. This commodification has become a public issue in the last decade, notably with the Open Citations initiative in 2010 and I4OC in 2014[13]. Table 35 certainly shows a lack of widely shared knowledge on the topic, with a very high rate (42%) of cumulated 'non-answer', 'I don't know' and 'not applicable'. Considering that almost 95% of IPs declare a shared PID (Crossref, Datacite,...) as shown in the landscape report, the actual rate of IPs who are able to comply with this EQSIP 1.0 item is certainly higher than declared. Nevertheless, the actual data to be sent to these PID agencies can be tricky (structured references...), and would require some training and technical adjustments depending on software used in order to be fully appropriated by IPs.

---

[13] Di Giambattista C., Heibi I., Peroni S., Shotton D. 2022. "OpenCitations, an Open e-Infrastructure to Foster Maximum Reuse of Citation Data". *International Journal of Digital Curation*, vol. 17(1): 1-5. https://doi.org/10.2218/ijdc.v17i1.818

**Funded by
the European Union**

Table 35. Making references openly available according to the principles of I4OC (in %)

	Proportion
Non-answer	12,3
I don't know	22
Not applicable	7,5
No	13,4
Yes, for some journals	3,5
Yes, for all journals	39,9
Yes, for books	11,7

N=546
Source: DIAMAS survey on OA Diamond and Institutional publishing (2023)
Note: the total exceeds 100% since the question allowed multiple choices

Content formats and preservation

> EQSIP item 56: Full-text content is tagged in the XML JATS or equivalent (e.g. TEI) format and provided in multiple digital formats (PDF, HTML, XML, ePub, etc.), at least one of which is suitable for preservation.

The survey has clearly shown a divided picture (table 36). On the one hand, a quasi-universal format, PDF, is the basic way to disseminate texts in digital form. On the other hand, 'additional formats' are not shared : if HTML is still relatively common, XML and EPUB are almost outliers with less than 20% of IPs using them. Moreover, considering the wording of the question, that does not mean that all content is disseminated through these formats, but at least a small part of it is.

**Funded by
the European Union**

Table 36. Distribution of formats used to make content available (in %)

	Proportion
Data formats, e.g. csv	6,6
EPub	18,6
HTML	39,5
Image or video formats (e.g. mp4, .mov)	11,4
JSON	1,3
PDF	98,3
Sound files (e.g. mp3, .wav)	7,0
XML	18,0
Don't know	0,9
Other (please specify)	2,8

N=527

Source: DIAMAS survey on OA Diamond and Institutional publishing (2023)

Note: the total exceeds 100% since the question allowed multiple choices

The focus groups have confirmed this division among IPs/platforms: "PKP has been trying to work this for years, nothing has happened". IPs underlined difficulties in terms of technical and staff resources to implement XML, even if they all recognise its added value. Another interesting concern they shared is regarding the Word literacy of authors: the quality of XML automatically produced on the stylesheet depends on the quality of the text formatting in docx by the authors. An IP suggested stopping the use of Word.

More generally, it is the question of technological neutrality that is raised. Some EQSIP items mention properties, such as conservation in this case, and give examples of standards, while others seem to impose one standard or another, at the risk of dividing people: "If JATS is required for a service to be considered 'high quality' but we don't provide free tools for its use, we'll be dividing the community of publishers between the rich (those who can afford external markup services) and the poor (those who can't)."

2.6. Visibility, indexation, communication, marketing and impact

The next EQSIP 1.0 core component is dedicated to the circulation of the published content and its presence or display in various media.

**Funded by
the European Union**

As table 37 shows, only a small portion of IPs (19%) actually display an explicit statement on their websites that encourage authors to make their publications available in open repositories. By contrast with EQSIP 1.0 standards in this respect, a large share of IP websites (75%) do not comply with this recommendation.

Table 37. IP encourages authors to publish in open repositories (in %)

	Proportion
Non-answer	6,0
No	75,4
Yes	18,6

N=517
Source: DIAMAS web coding of IPs websites

Regularly informing the community of users is another important aspect. In this regard, two tiers of IPs (66%) who responded to the survey declare to have a newsletter or a social media profile (table 38). Although such a result is rather encouraging regarding the gap with EQSIP 1.0 standards, the survey only investigates the presence of a newsletter or a social media profile without asking for its actual use and posting frequency.

Table 38. Informing community with a newsletter, social media or networking profiles (in %)

	Proportion
Non-answer	4,0
Don't know	2,2
No	28,0
Yes	65,8

N=546

**Funded by
the European Union**

> EQSIP item 66: IPSPs make sure that the visibility of publications in search engines (general and academic) and aggregators is improved by using search engine optimization techniques, by providing structured metadata and XML sitemaps, by implementing metadata exchange protocols, such as OAI-PMH, or by enabling APIs. The information about APIs and OAI-PMH endpoints is indicated on the website.

A related key aspect of the visibility of IP activities is the indexation of publications in search engines (general and academic) and aggregators. As table 39 shows, the IPs' answers are clearly split, with 42% considering the published content to be already well indexed, whereas 51% would like to benefit from optimization techniques that would allow for a better indexation. This relative satisfaction shows that there is room for improvement in order to fill the gap with EQSIP 1.0 standards. In an additional question, IPs could indicate what the main challenges are to improve their indexation: satisfying technical participation criteria (50% considered it 'very important' or 'important') and non-technical (52%) ones, along with meeting metadata requirements (50%), were chosen as the greatest challenges they face. IPs also pointed out finance-related challenges: paying for memberships (37%) and recurring charges (35%). The technical nature of the service requirements and paperwork is also a challenge for 29% of IPs. Finally, language-related challenges were the least prominent ones: 21% of IPs reported struggling with the paperwork only in English, and 17% of them with filing documents in another language.

Table 39. Satisfaction regarding the inclusion of published content in scholarly search engines and different indexes (in%)

	Proportion
Non-answer	6,6
Our content is already very well indexed	42,1
We would like to see (better) indexing in these search engines	51,3

N=546

When it comes more specifically to the indexation of published outputs into scientific information databases that are internationally recognised, the views are even more positive (table 40). A majority of respondents (61%) state that the IP manages the indexation of outputs. However, a quarter of respondents do not provide that service, and almost 9% don't know if such management is satisfactory. The gap with this EQSIP 1.0 requirement is thus partly filled via indexation in scientific information databases.

Funded by
the European Union

The participants in the focus groups highlighted that indexation is an important issue for visibility, and also attractive for authors and for securing funding.

Table 40. Management of outputs indexation in scientific information databases (in %)

	Proportion
Non-answer	4,8
Don't know	8,8
No	25,5
Yes	61,0

N=546

Source: DIAMAS survey on OA Diamond and Institutional publishing (2023)

> EQSIP item 72: IPSPs provide metric indicators that are an important source of information about content usage. The following information is useful and interesting for users: article/chapter-level metrics, such as visits, views, downloads, citations ; publication-level metrics ; altmetrics indicators ; geographical spread of visitors ; analytics software and methods used to generate and collect metrics.

By contrast, the gap widens with EQSIP 1.0 standards where metric indicators are concerned (table 41). Only 40% of respondents declare that they publicly display some metrics, and over half of the answers contain those stating that they do not display metric indicators (43%) and those that do not know (12%).

Table 41. Publicly displaying metrics (in %)

	Proportion
Non-answer	4,8
Don't know	11,9
No	43,4
Yes	39,9

N=546

Source: DIAMAS survey on OA Diamond and Institutional publishing (2023)

As soon as the focus is put on the kind of metrics publicly displayed (table 42), the low response rate (n=217) is particularly striking. This may mean many things: a lack of knowledge about metrics indicators, a weak interest in this matter, or the complexity of suggested categories. When we dig into the metrics, two of them aggregate more than two thirds of answers: 70% for 'submission, acceptance, publication dates', and 64,5% for 'article-level usage metrics'. The following are 'publication-level impact

Funded by the European Union

metrics'" (41%), 'publication-level usage metrics' (40%), and 'article-level impact metrics' (37%). Broadly speaking, the gap with EQSIP 1.0 standards is greater regarding many kinds of metrics than with traditional indicators related to the submission process ("Submission, acceptance, publication dates") or the ones for article uses (visits, views, downloads).

Table 42. The kind of metrics for IPs who display metrics (in %)

	Proportion
Altmetrics, such as Altmetric	22.6
Article-level impact metrics, such as citation counts	37.3
Article-level usage metrics, such as visits, views, downloads	64.5
Dimensions citation badges	9.7
Plum X Metrics	22.6
Publication-level impact metrics, such as Impact Factors	41.0
Publication-level usage metrics, such as visits, views, downloads	39.6
Publication level impact metrics	0.5
Rejection rates	17.1
Submission, acceptance, publication dates	69.6
Widget showing geographical spread of visitors	13.4
Other (please specify)	5.1

N=217
Source: DIAMAS survey on OA Diamond and Institutional publishing (2023)
Note: the total exceeds 100% since the question allowed multiple choices

EQSIP item 69: IPSPs support publishing impact statements or simple (multi-)language summaries alongside published content to bring the content of scholarly publications closer to the general audience.

EQSIP item 70: IPSPs support the promotion of published content (e.g. by inviting post-publication reviews of outputs, inviting and moderating post-publication online comments, organising events like book promotions, sending out copies, writing press releases, working with the media) in order to reach broader sectors of society.

Supporting the promotion of published content is a practice directly connected to the kind of metrics used and the way they may be displayed. However, the answers are clearly at odds with the EQSIP 1.0 standards in this regard. As shown in table 43, a large majority of IP websites (83%) do not encourage such a promotion of publication.

Among the remaining categories, 'posting on social media' is the only one that barely emerges (5%).

Table 43. Encouragement to promote publication on the IP website (in %)

	Proportion
Non-answer	6,0
Moderating post-publication comments	0,8
Organising or participating to events	2,3
Posting on social media	4,8
Events and post-publication comments	0,2
Social media and events	2,1
Social media, events and post-publication comments	0,8
None	83,0

N=517
Source: DIAMAS web coding of IPs websites

Still, it is possible that other forms of dissemination/content promotion exist beyond the scope of that question, in particular around 'simple language'.

2.7. Equity, Diversity and Inclusion: Multilingualism, Gender Equity

The last core component of EQSIP 1.0 gathers different aspects of equity and the ways in which they are taken into consideration on IP websites. It concerns diversity and inclusion as much as multilingualism and gender.

Equity, Diversity and Inclusion

EQSIP item 73: IPSPs and/or journals display on their website a policy statement that submissions within the thematic scope and language of the journal are accepted from all potential authors and that decision-making concerning content is without regard to their race, gender, age, sexual orientation, religious belief, ethnic origin, citizenship, or the political philosophy.

As table 44 shows, 29% of IPs established a code of conduct or a non-discrimination or positive discrimination policy for the services they provide. 7% are implementing it,

and 8% are considering putting it in place. One fifth of IPs responded that this question was not applicable to their case: it is likely that this issue suffers from being underestimated.

Table 44. The IP established a code of conduct / non discrimination / positive discrimination policy (in %)

	Proportion
Non-answer	12,6
Don't know	8,8
Not applicable	20,9
Not planning	13,0
Considering	8,4
In progress	7,3
Implemented	28,9

N=546
Source: DIAMAS survey on OA Diamond and Institutional publishing (2023)

There is a huge gap between this declaration and the actual public display of this policy (table 45). Only between 11 and 17% of respondents display any EDI statement, although 29% declared having implemented such a policy (33% if non-answers are not taken into account). Gender is the most addressed discrimination (17%), compared to race, sexual orientation, political philosophy or citizenship (between 11 and 13%).

Table 45. EDI public statement on the IP website (in %)

	Gender	Race	Sexual orientation	Political philosophy	Citizenship
Non-answer	5,8	5,8	5,8	5,8	5,8
Displayed	16,8	12,6	12,2	11,0	12,6
Not displayed	77,4	81,6	82,0	83,2	81,6

N=517
Source: DIAMAS web coding of IPs websites

Funded by the European Union

One fifth of IPs declared that they implemented the recommendation of the use of inclusive language (see table 46). 17% more consider or are currently implementing it. Yet only 4% of IPs display this policy on their website (see table 47). But a quarter already use gender impartial language in all their communications, and 18% are considering or are currently implementing it (see table 48).

Table 46. The IP recommends the use of inclusive language (in %)

	Proportion
Non-answer	14,3
Don't know	11,0
Not applicable	23,3
Not planning	13,9
Considering	10,4
In progress	7,1
Implemented	20,0

N=546
Source: DIAMAS survey on OA Diamond and Institutional publishing (2023)

Table 47. Policy about bias-neutral language on the IP website (in %)

	Proportion
Non-answer	5,8
Displayed	4,3
Not displayed	89,9

N=517
Source: DIAMAS web coding of IPs websites

Funded by
the European Union

Table 48. The IP uses gender impartial language in all communications (in %)

	Proportion
Non-answer	11,7
Don't know	9,9
Not applicable	21,6
Not planning	14,5
Considering	11,4
In progress	6,4
Implemented	24,5

N=546

Source: DIAMAS survey on OA Diamond and Institutional publishing (2023)

> EQSIP item 75: IPSPs and/or journals display on their website a policy requiring authors to inform whether the research data are sensitive to age, disability status, sex, gender identity, racial and ethnic identity, sexual orientation, and /or socioeconomic status.

Concerning research data, only 9% of IPs implemented a policy requiring authors to declare whether they are gender-sensitive or not (table 49). 3% of respondents are currently implementing it, and 14% consider doing so. We have no further information about other sensitive subjects mentioned in EQSIP 1.0 (age, disability status, racial identity, etc.). We also don't know whether this policy is displayed on their websites.

Table 49. Implementing a policy requiring authors to inform whether the research data are gender-sensitive (in %)

	Proportion
Non-answer	14,7
Don't know	11,9
Not applicable	28,0
Not planning	20,3
Considering	13,7
In progress	2,6
Implemented	8,8

N=546

Funded by the European Union

> EQSIP item 77: IPSPs and/or journals display on their website a Gender Equity Plan (GEP) regarding the composition of editorial staff and boards, policies that strive for gender balance among peer reviewers, and a set of commitments and actions that aim to promote gender equality, all publicly available on the website.

A fifth of IPs have a gender equality plan (GEP), although we do not know what proportion of them display it on their website (table 50). 6% are currently working on it and 10% are considering implementing it. Once again, an important proportion of respondents (23%) consider themselves as not concerned, because they responded 'not applicable': it could be interesting to understand why, since GEP covers the collaboration with authors (which not all IPs are managing) as well as the internal functioning (which probably concerns all IPs).

Table 50. The IP has a gender equality plan (in %)

	Proportion
Non-answer	12,8
Don't know	11,5
Not applicable	22,5
Not planning	17,6
Considering	10,3
In progress	5,7
Implemented	19,6

N=546

Funded by the European Union

> IPs assess and monitor progress in EDI by collecting and making the following data available:
>
> EQSIP item 79: – Gender balance of editorial board members, peer-reviewers, authors, and staff ;
>
> EQSIP item 80: – Proportion of editorial board members, peer-reviewers, authors, and staff by country ;
>
> EQSIP item 82: – Proportion of editorial board members, peer-reviewers, authors, and staff that are early career researchers' (1-7 years from degree)

A very small proportion of IPs self-monitor and display metrics about their EDI performance in the editorial board composition (table 51). 2% of IPs display gender balance, 0,2% the gender balance and country distribution, and 0,2% the early-career prevalence within the editorial board.

Table 51. IP self-monitors and displays progress in EDI about editorial board members, peer-reviewers, authors, and staff (in %)

	Proportion
Non-answer	6,2
Displaying early-career prevalence	0,2
Displaying gender balance	1,9
Displaying gender balance and country repartition	0,2
None	91,5

N=517

Source: DIAMAS web coding of IPs websites

> EQSIP item 83: IPs assess and monitor progress in EDI by collecting and making the following data available: Proportion of outputs authored by members of editorial bodies

As table 52 shows, 0,8% of IPs display on their websites the proportion of outputs authored by members of editorial bodies and 1% have a statement about limiting it. It is, as EDI metrics, very low.

Funded by the European Union

Table 52. The IP self-monitors and displays the proportion
of outputs authored by members of editorial bodies (in %)

	Proportion
Non-answer	9,1
Data	0,8
Statement	1,0
Not displayed	89,2

N=517

Source: DIAMAS web coding of IPs websites

Inclusive/Accessible website, content and metadata

EQSIP item 86: IPSPs and/or journals will display the following statements on their websites: an accessibility statement, which is a public information page that describes organisational policies and accessibility goals, shortcomings concerning accessibility standards, and provides information on feedback channels.

Accessibility has become an important topic for those who provide online services, such as IPs. After some specific web regulations, a decade-long European regulation, derived from the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, the European Accessibility Act will come into effect in mid-2025, based on Member States implementation regulations mostly passed in the last two years. Consequently, the survey has shown a diverse level of readiness : 32% of IPs have an accessibility policy, and 21% have published it online. We note that a lot of respondents do not know whether their organisation has an accessibility policy (21%).

Table 53. Providing a published accessibility policy (in %)

	Proportion
Non-answer	5,9
Don't know	20,5
No	41,8
There is an accessibility policy, but it's not published	11,2
Yes	20,7

N=546

Source: DIAMAS survey on OA Diamond and Institutional publishing (2023)

The focus group underlined the contrast between the current situation and the concern for future implementation. The majority of IPs we interviewed during the focus group discussions were very concerned with accessibility matters. In fact, even if they do not yet have an accessibility policy. But, in practice, some have no idea yet how they will manage to do this, because of an avowed lack of competence in this area.

EQSIP item 88: The WCAG 2.1 accessibility standard applied

The two most implemented accessibility standard are OpenAIRE (9%) and WCAG (4%). More are considering or currently implementing it. A lot of respondents also do not know if their organisation plans to do it (around 45% for each standard).

Table 54. Distribution of accessibility requirements met by the IP's platform (in %)

	ATAG	DINI	Open Aire	UAAG	WCAG	Other
Non-answer	23,4	23,6	19,2	23,4	19,8	82,1
Don't know	48,9	47,4	44,9	48,7	47,1	12,1
Not applicable	12,8	12,1	10,1	12,6	12,3	3,7
Not planning	8,4	8,1	6	8,4	7	0,7
Considering	5,7	6,2	7,3	5,5	6,2	0,4
In progress	0,2	1,3	3,8	0,5	3,3	0,5
Implemented	0,5	1,3	8,6	0,7	4,4	0,5

N=546
Source: DIAMAS survey on OA Diamond and Institutional publishing (2023)

Accessibility statements contain at least the following:

EQSIP item 88: contact information in case users encounter problems

EQSIP item 89: any known limitations, to avoid the frustration of users

The coding of IP websites shows also that a large majority of IPs do not display an accessibility statement on their website (table 55), maybe because it is still in process. It is comparable with the proportion of IPs who declare having published their accessibility policy online: 19% for web coding, and 21% for the survey. Concerning the content of these accessibility statements, 9% include contact information, 1% known limitations, and 4% both. The web coding did not measure the other information

Funded by
the European Union

recommended by EQSIP (technical prerequisites, references to applicable national or local laws and policies), but we can assume that there would also be a few IPs who would display this information.

Table 55. Public accessibility statement on the IP website (in %)

	Proportion
Non-answer	5,8
Displayed	5,0
Displayed with contact information	8,7
Displayed with known limitations	0,8
Displayed with contact info and known limitations	4,4
Not displayed	75,2

N=517
Source: DIAMAS web coding of IPs websites

EQSIP item 95: Accessibility of the content, with all images and tables in publications and on the website having a description for the visually impaired.

Aside from the existence of an accessibility policy, we see that 91% of figures and tables were not audio-described on the IPs websites (table 56). Nevertheless, it is possible that the publications cannot be consulted on the IPs websites, and that the encoders coded it as 'not available' rather than as 'non-answer'.

Table 56. Description of figures and tables in IP website content and publications (in %)

	Proportion
Non-answer	7,5
Available	1,7
Not available	90,7

N=517
Source: DIAMAS web coding of IPs websites

Some IPs interviewed during the focus groups explained that they were relying on the work of the dissemination platform, but in most cases that platform only provides accessibility for metadata and not the whole content.

Funded by the European Union

Multilingualism

As displayed in table 57, 70% of IPs support multilingual publishing of abstracts. 22% do not support it, and we can see that 53% of them publish mostly in English. Therefore, 81% of IPs who publish mostly in English do not support multilingual publishing of abstracts. It is thus a matter of the dominant language in a given discipline or region.

Table 57. The IP supports multilingual publishing of abstracts (in %)

	Proportion
Non-answer	5,7
Don't know	2,4
No	21,6
Yes	70,3

N=546

Source: DIAMAS survey on OA Diamond and Institutional publishing (2023)

When abstracts of IP outputs are available on their websites — they are not on 37% of them – the abstract is available in only one language on 58% of websites, and in two languages on 26% of them. When available, 6% of IPs websites display their abstracts in three languages or more.

Table 58. Number of linguistic versions of abstracts (in %)

	Proportion
Non-answer	36,8
1	36,6
2	22,6
3 and more	4,0

N=517

Source: DIAMAS web coding of IPs websites

Funded by the European Union

We see in table 59 that few IPs choose to improve machine translation literacy to promote language diversity and reduce language bias: 7% already do so, 3% are implementing it, and 11% are considering it. One third do not plan to do it at all.

Table 59. Improving machine translation literacy (in %)

	Proportion
Non-answer	16,7
Don't know	10,4
Not applicable	18,9
Not planning	33,0
Considering	10,8
In progress	3,3
Implemented	7,0

N=546

Source: DIAMAS survey on OA Diamond and Institutional publishing (2023)

As table 60 shows, the preferred option by IPs to support multilingual publishing of full text output is the bilingual one: 31% of IPs propose to include different versions of the publication in the same document, and 10% are considering or currently implementing it. The simultaneous option (i.e. publishing different language versions as separate documents) is much less implemented, but it is gaining ground: 3% of IPs have implemented it, and 23% are making progress in doing it, while 8% are considering this choice. The sequential option which consists of publishing different language versions in different journals is more fully implemented that the simultaneous one (12% against 3%) but is less common: only 5% are considering or currently implementing it. We also note that 13%, 14% and 20% of IPs consider that these solutions are not applicable for their organisation: do they not provide the relevant publishing service, or do they face too many technical challenges?

Table 60. Supporting multilingual publishing of full text output (in %)

	Bilingual (different language versions in the same document)	Simultaneous (different language versions as separate documents)	Sequential (different language versions in different journals)
Non-answer	9,3	13,4	17,4
Don't know	4,2	4,4	6,2
Not applicable	13,2	13,9	19,6
Not planning	32,1	34,4	39,9
Considering	7,7	8,1	3,8
In progress	2,9	22,7	1,3
Implemented	30,6	3,1	11,7

N=546

Source: DIAMAS survey on OA Diamond and Institutional publishing (2023)

During focus group discussions, IPs mentioned that when they authorised the publication of one of their manuscripts into another language, they preferred to be informed and negotiate with the other press directly. Some IPs also accept the submission into another language than their own, and if the publication is of good quality, they pay for the translation.

IPSPs and/or journals support multilingualism by implementing any of the following measures:

EQSIP item 102: – metadata available in English when the language of the text is not English.

EQSIP item 103: – employ toolkits or training to address language bias in peer-review.

EQSIP item 104: – support human translation and language-check services to authors.

The most popular measures to promote language diversity and reduce language bias is, as shown in table 61, translating metadata in English when publication is not in English (32% of IPs are implementing it), and providing translation of language checking services (30% of IPs are implementing it). While machine translation is used more and more for editorial activities, 7% of IPs are improving its literacy, and 24% more are considering or are already setting it up. In addition, 7% of IPs provide toolkits

Funded by the European Union

and training to promote language diversity, but not especially for peer review as EQSIP 1.0 suggests.

More surprisingly, 18% of IPs are not planning to translate metadata in English when publication is not in this language: the English standard for indexation is not totally shared in our sample. We also note that there is a high 'non-answer' or 'don't know' rate: it is possible that these IPs are not considering these linguistic matters, or the person who responded to the survey was not aware of it.

Table 61. Promoting language diversity and reducing language bias (in %)

	Improving machine translation literacy	Metadata in English when publication is not in English	Toolkit and training	Translation or language check services
Non-answer	16,7	13,7	16,1	14,1
Don't know	10,4	6,8	9	5,7
Not applicable	18,9	15,8	21,4	13,9
Not planning	33	18,3	34,2	25,5
Considering	3,3	7,5	9	7
In progress	10,8	5,5	2,9	3,5
Implemented	7,0	32,4	7,3	30,4

N=546
Source: DIAMAS survey on OA Diamond and Institutional publishing (2023)

Some IPs explained during the focus group discussions that there are technical barriers to multilingualism, especially when the publication language is not in the latin alphabet: the dissemination platform may simply not support other alphabets.

EQSIP item 100: IPSPs and/or journals support multilingualism by implementing any of the following measures: multilingual website and content, where relevant, with a minimum of 2 languages included. The information given on the site is the same in all languages.

53% of IP websites were only available in one language, 35% in two languages, and 11% in three or more. Therefore, almost half of IP websites are translated: we can see in table 62 that this is, once again, more likely for the IPs who do not publish only in English (82% of them are only in one language), but also in another economically and

Funded by the European Union

linguistically dominant country: 60% of IPs who publish only in French do not translate their website, and neither do 67% of Finnish IPs, contrary to IPs who publish only in Dutch or Croatian who systematically translate their websites. Nonetheless, we were unable to check whether the information was exactly the same in all languages. It could be interesting to code an artificial intelligence tool to compare the translated content and identify where there is a loss of information.

Table 62. Number of linguistic versions of the IP website

	Proportion
1	53,4
2	35,2
3 and more	11,4

N=517

Source: DIAMAS web coding of IPs websites

2.8. Synthetic view of the 7 core components

The previous sections describe and identify the gaps with respect to EQSIP 1.0 items from a combination of distinct sources (survey, web coding, focus groups), in the order in which they appear in EQSIP 1.0. To provide a more comprehensive overview of this descriptive work, we have coded them into four categories: EQSIP 1.0 items that are in line with IP practices (more than 70% of IPs currently comply), those that are largely not in line (less than 30% of IPs comply), those for which the practices are contrasted, and lastly those that do not display enough information to conclude if EQSIP 1.0 items are in line with our IP population practices. Interestingly, as shown in table 63, the distribution of these four categories is very unequal.

Table 63. Quantitative distribution of EQSIP items based on IP compliance

EQSIP items	In line with IP practices (>70%)	Not in line (<30%)	Contrasted situations	Too little information
N	8	26	26	6
%	12	40	40	8

There are a very few EQSIP items (N=8) that are clearly aligned with a majority of IPs. Conversely, the remaining part is split into two groups: one group is composed of a significant portion of EQSIP 1.0 items (N=26) that are not aligned to most of IPs, and

Funded by the European Union

another similar share (N=26) for which the situations are contrasted (sometimes answers clearly opposing two or three groups, or being spread across a variety of positions). Some EQSIP 1.0 items (N=6) are also too poorly covered by the sources of our survey to draw any appropriate conclusions.

Broadly speaking, this quantitative breakdown into four categories shows that gaps are numerous, and sometimes significant, between the EQSIP 1.0 standards and the IPs' answers to our survey, focus group discussions, or public statements on their websites.

3. EQSIP 1.0 feedback and gap types

As can be seen in many instances of the previous section, the gaps measured via the survey are often difficult to interpret, even when completed with qualitative information from the focus group interactions. Nevertheless, this latter method enabled the DIAMAS teams to establish different types of gaps, their particular extent, and to understand the argumentation and values associated with such gaps. Not only were IP representatives able to give some feedback on specific questions, but, as we wrote in the methodology section, they were given ample time to elaborate their views on EQSIP 1.0. Their feedback has enabled us to make a typology of these gaps and analyse specific examples of such gaps as they appeared in one or more of the eight different focus groups.

This valuable feedback from the targeted audience for EQSIP 1.0 brings into focus the ambiguity of words and expressions — not to mention the translation barrier – as 95% of our respondents were not natively English-speaking people. It also underlines differences in framing, that is, the ways in which the entire EQSIP 1.0 is being read, socialised, and internalised. This feedback has allowed us to identify four distinct types of gaps between the stakeholders (EQSIP 1.0 one the one hand and IPs on the other), which are defined below:

a/ Social gaps: some practices, categories or norms existing in one stakeholder group are unknown, irrelevant, or ignored by the other stakeholder group. For instance, this would have been the case for "open peer review " less than a decade ago.

b/ Moral gaps: some values shared by one stakeholder group are viewed with indifference or worse by another stakeholder group. For example, is financial transparency a necessity when you don't charge authors? Is anonymity to protect authors in non-democratic regimes compatible with open science standards? Is CC-BY-NC-ND a problem or a necessity to protect IP work?

c/ Interpretative gaps: while both stakeholder groups share a common goal, they don't agree on its interpretation, in particular due to linguistic or pragmatic differences. As the IPSP world targeted by DIAMAS is much more multilingual than the for-profit commercial one, these gaps are very important to pinpoint. For instance, which XML standards have to be favoured? How to measure financial sustainability?

d/ Practical gaps: there is an agreement on every other level, but actualisation of a standard is problematic, whether it is for financial, technical, staff capacity or other reasons. Here, the question of the nature of recommendations and their time frame are key elements to grasp in order to address and fill these gaps.

3.1. Social gaps

A critical point comes with the isolated presentation of EQSIP 1.0: compliance would imply considerable changes in practices, and should be accompanied by training and courses. More generally, the question of resources – infrastructural, financial and educational – is viewed as essential by some IPs, against the 'one size fits all' approach perceived in their reading of EQSIP 1.0. As is often the case with topics of regulation, applying uniformly the same criteria or, by contrast, taking into account the resources and context in which the IP develops its activities, is a political choice with lots of consequences.

Another aspect is the multiplicity of configurations in which an IP may exert its agency. There are some for which 'IP policies' do not really exist, meaning that policies are at play in institutions distinct from the IP. This institution could be its independent dissemination platform, different bodies in journals they publish but do not own, funders, sponsors and donors, or even standardisation institutions like COPE. It does not mean that a publisher who has full responsibility (governance, funding,...) is non-existent, but rather that the IP is only one configuration among many others. Other IPs use multiple dissemination platforms, do not own the journals they publish, or rely on outsourced service providers. This puts them less in the position of a governing body and more in that of a broker among many ruling partners.

Even when IPs own outputs, dissemination and technical systems, they can have various considerations on the distribution of norms and standards among their inner organisation and communities. For example, in the eyes of some IPs, certain norms are not their responsibility, but that of editorial committees. This is notably the case for the organisation of peer review and editorial decisions. Whatever their judgement on open peer review, some IPs clearly do not see it as a publisher policy, but as a policy

on the journal level. By contrast, there is an almost unanimous consensus that peer review organisation for books is a central part of the IP's role.

3.2. Moral gaps

Some IPs criticised the EQSIP 1.0 document as not being technology-neutral. By explicitly mentioning specific institutions or technical agencies rather than stating general properties or aims, this choice gave the impression of favouring particular norms without justification. As examples, Crossref and ORCID were mentioned, but also JATS. So while these IPs could in principle share the underlying aims, they thought that EQSIP 1.0 wording and choices were more political than technical.

Conversely, some EDI standards were considered problematic, especially the "Gender equity plan". One IP representative said "if I have 60% female authors: is this a quality criterion? A plus? It's not something you can master and that I would like to master". In this case, there is a double gap: one about the responsibility of the IP - rather than the editorial one, and another about a view on the ways communities should be governed by 'universal' norms like parity. For example, women's studies and gender studies have been built by new journals with women-only boards (through a political or epistemic choice), and almost female-only ones (as a result of academic interest). If a parity or equity standard were enforced, the fact that this field still shows a vast majority of female authors and reviewers, with editorial boards and quasi-exclusively female editors in chief[14], would suddenly be considered problematic.

3.3. Interpretative gaps

The divided world around format dissemination has an important consequence towards all standards and demands around XML and other machine-readable formats. The problems and limitations of PDFs are well-known by IPs, but their actual infrastructural and financial situation leads them to contingent decisions about keeping the PDF format. By contrast, some IPs are completely XML-native and cannot imagine publishing content in PDF only, so they would not have any problem with very strict technical demands. But others just cannot afford to produce XML, and have to stick with PDF-only. Either they consider it a bad format but have no choice, or they believe that readers, authors, and editors are fine with it. One IP representative said: "We use PDFs and are satisfied with it. No plans to change it." In either case, we touch

---

[14] Sixto-Costoya A., Alonso-Arroyo A., Castelló-Cogollo L., Aleixandre-Benavent R., Valderrama-Zurián J. C. 2022. "Gender Presence on the Editorial Boards of Journals in the Women's Studies Subject Category". *Women's Studies International Forum*, vol. 93: 102617. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wsif.2022.102617

Funded by the European Union

here on one of the limits of the ideal-world definition of EQSIP 1.0, making it completely unrealistic for a significant share of IPSPs, at the risk of either stopping their publishing activity or marginalising it through standard implementation.

3.4. Practical gaps

Some critics of machine-readable standards, like XML JATS, would also consider that it would certainly be a good standard, but in the distant future, and surely not any time soon. The absence of a timeframe in EQSIP 1.0 allows for different interpretations in its actual implementation. Once again, depending on the current infrastructure, some standards are seen as already established by some IPs, while pushed back to the future by others. In particular, when IPs do not own the journals they publish, they may "take them where they are" and consequently have a long run, step by step, with changes of practice, even when they agree on a given standard. Even less costly standards were meeting agreement, but were seen as impossible to implement due to lack of resources or expertise.

In addition to these dimensions of timing and resources, there is the pre-existence of many different policies from outside bodies, which are sometimes incompatible with one another. Even when IPs agree with EQSIP 1.0 items, they are often not able to decide by themselves to apply them. And even if they were able to decide it, they consider it is not the most effective decision level. For example, one IP representative mentioned that a great driving force towards OA is the professional evaluation of researchers: if OA publications were scored for career advancement, scholars would prefer OA journals and books.

4. Recommendations for the co-construction of EQSIP 2.0

Based on the previous sections, we would like to make a series of recommendations which are aimed both at DIAMAS members who will participate in the co-construction of EQSIP 2.0, and stakeholders who will be invited to this co-construction process. They are formulated to frame discussion on the structure of EQSIP, its content and phrasing.

1/ EQSIP does not appear in a void, but rather in an existing ecosystem made of norms, standards, technical constraints, public and private OA policies made by third parties. Its elaboration based on a portfolio of publicly shared standards should guarantee some continuity with the preexisting normative landscape. Yet, we recommend this to be acknowledged in its presentation and provide information and resources to IPs in

order to integrate EQSIP 1.0 as easily as possible in their intertwined web of pre-existing norms.

2/ There are different conceptions of what is an IP and, consequently, of the scope and nature of its responsibility and ability to meet EQSIP 1.0 standards. We therefore recommend that the IP would either directly aim at/follow/comply with a given EQSIP 1.0 item, or delegate this responsibility to a third party involved in the publishing process as a whole. This delegation would at least include service providers, editorial committees, parent organisations, and other stakeholders.

3/ EQSIP 1.0, as an early production of the DIAMAS project, appeared as an isolated standard, rather than a component of a larger production. We consider that EQSIP 2.0 should be explicitly framed within the toolkit and self-assessment tools and other pieces of training and action scheduled in WP6 and WP7, to be better appropriated by IPs.

4/ EQSIP 1.0 was, according to WP3 members, a set of standards for publishers, hence the limitation of the analysis to IP data. Yet, in its phrasing, all EQSIP 1.0 items include Service Providers through the acronym IPSP. We recommend that either the wording would be changed to IP, or, if the scope really includes IPSP, to consider standards that could be both relevant to IPs and SPs.

5/ EQSIP 1.0 structure is somewhat "flat", meaning that each item is valued the same way. Considering the diversity of current gaps, we recommend discussing it with stakeholders. Among many possibilities, we suggest questioning the interest of mentioning the different core components, providing a more hierarchical structure between key items and other ones, designing timeframes or intermediary goals within some items. The 8 current EQSIP 1.0 items where the gaps are minimal (see conclusion of section 2) could be considered as a minimal basis for this new structure.

6/ EQSIP 1.0 does not include a justification framing, apart from its construction based on an encompassing corpus of standards. Yet, it is clear that some, if not most, EQSIP 1.0 items should not be presented as simple statements, but rather be justified in the context of open science. Why is open peer review essentiel while many communities have favoured anonymisation processes and as there is no evidence of its positive effects[15]? Why is JATS XML a key part of technical norms, despite the costs it may generate for small or underfunded organisations? What is the aim of displaying all policies — including governance ones — on the IP website? These justifications could also play a key role in the structural changes mentioned in the previous paragraph.

---

[15] Ross-Hellauer T., Bouter L.M., Horbach SPJM .2023. "Open Peer Review urgently Requires Evidence: A Call to Action". *PLoS Biololgy*, vol. 21(10): e3002255. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pbio.3002255

Funded by
the European Union

7/ EQSIP 1.0 mentions specific infrastructure (Crossref, ORCID) or technologies (JATS XML). They should either be kept as such in EQSIP 2.0 by justifying these exclusive choices, or replaced with technology-neutral terms such as PID for outputs and authors, or machine-readable outputs. We recommend that this would be debated both as a general rule and, if necessary, for each specific entity.

8/ Considering major differences between output types, first and foremost between books and journals, the question of keeping a single EQSIP with a selection of items or phrasing, or even designing different EQSIP for each output type, should be raised. In case EQSIP 2.0 remains output-neutral, its relevance for books and conferences publishing should be carefully checked and properly adjusted.

9/ We recommend reopening the list of current EQSIP 1.0 Items: the survey analysis has shown that 26 requirements were met by a very minority of respondent IPs. We suggest reconsidering these items, either adopting long-term timeframes or completely reframing/abandoning them, in order to avoid EQSIP 1.0 rejection by IPs.

10/ The gap analysis was possible on only 66 of 103 EQSIP 1.0 items. In order to keep the other items in EQSIP 2.0, we recommend that specific knowledge production and discussion be planned in order to determine the current level of agreement and compliance of IPs to these EQSIP 1.0 items (see list in appendix 1). This is especially the case for many technical items.

11/ Independently of structure choices, there are currently some redundant items in EQSP 1.0 (APC/VAC, open peer review...). This is minor work, but we recommend avoiding such redundancies in EQSIP 2.0.

12/ The question of the language(s) chosen for EQSIP 2.0 should be discussed during its elaboration. As with any international standard, the choice of a unique language of reference has advantages and drawbacks compared to a portfolio of languages. Considering that multilingualism items are part of EQSIP 1.0 and the diversity of linguistic skills within DIAMAS members and partners, we would recommend the more possible diverse linguistic choices, while acknowledging the difficulties and consequences of such a choice, as the translations of the DIAMAS survey has reminded us.

Funded by the European Union

References

- Acocella I. 2012. "The Focus Groups in Social Research: Advantages and Disadvantages", *Quality & Quantity*, 46: 1125-1136. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119171386.ch20

- Di Giambattista C., Heibi I., Peroni S., Shotton D. 2022. "OpenCitations, an Open e-Infrastructure to Foster Maximum Reuse of Citation Data". *International Journal of Digital Curation*, vol. 17(1): 1-5. https://doi.org/10.2218/ijdc.v17i1.818

- Fyfe A., Coate K., Curry S., Lawson S., Moxham N., Røstvik C.M. 2017. "Untangling Academic Publishing: A History of the Relationship between Commercial Interests, Academic Prestige and the Circulation of Research". Zenodo. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.546100

- Gadd E., Oppenheim C., Probets S. 2003. "RoMEO Studies 4: An Analysis of Journal Publishers' Copyright Agreements". *Learned Publishing*, vol. 16(4): 293-308. https://doi.org/10.1087/095315103322422053

- Ingelfinger F.J. 1969. "Definition of 'Sole Contribution'". *New England Journal of Medicine*, 281(12): 676–677. https://www.nejm.org/doi/full/10.1056/nejm196909182811208

- Kohn A., Lange J. 2018. "Confused about Copyright? Assessing Researchers' Comprehension of Copyright Transfer Agreements". *Journal of Librarianship and Scholarly Communication*, vol. 6(1): eP2253. doi: https://doi.org/10.7710/2162-3309.2253

- Laakso M., Anna-Maija Multas A.-M. 2023. ""European Scholarly Journals from Small- and Mid-size Publishers: Mapping Journals and Public Funding Mechanisms". *Science and Public Policy*, vol. 50(3): 445–456, https://doi.org/10.1093/scipol/scac081

- Labastida i Juan I., Melinščak Zlodi I., Proudman V., Treadway J. 2023. "Opening Knowledge: Retaining Rights and Open Licensing in Europe". Zenodo. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.8084051.

- Moore S. A. 2023. "The Politics of Rights Retention". *Publications*, vol. 11(2): 28. https://doi.org/10.3390/publications11020028

- Porter S. J. 2022. "Measuring Research Information Citizenship across ORCID practice". *Frontiers in Research Metrics and Analytics*, 7: 779097. https://doi.org/10.3389/frma.2022.779097

- Relman A.S. 1981. "The Ingelfinger Rule." *New England Journal of Medicine*, 305(14): 824–826. http://www.nejm.org/doi/full/10.1056/NEJM198110013051408

Funded by the European Union

- Ross-Hellauer T., Bouter L.M., Horbach S.P.J.M .2023. "Open Peer Review urgently Requires Evidence: A Call to Action". *PLoS Biololgy*, vol. 21(10): e3002255. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pbio.3002255

- Sixto-Costoya A., Alonso-Arroyo A., Castelló-Cogollo L., Aleixandre-Benavent R., Valderrama-Zurián J. C. 2022. "Gender Presence on the Editorial Boards of Journals in the Women's Studies Subject Category". *Women's Studies International Forum*, vol. 93: 102617. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wsif.2022.102617

Appendix 1. List of EQSIP 1.0 items and their data coverage

Component	#	EQSIP text	Survey	Web coding	Focus group
Funding	1	Clear OA policy that covers the Diamond OA business model and compliance with funder and institutional OA policies (if they exist).	x		
	2	Transparency about the types of revenue streams and their destination (donations are possible e.g. Voluntary Author Contributions (VAC) can be considered as an optional revenue stream).		x	
	3	Consistent workflow allowing authors, editors and reviewers to disclose financial conflicts of interest (in the Conflict of Interest statement and the metadata) and disclose all sources of funding (in the Funding acknowledgements /statements and the metadata).			
	4	Formal, explicit, written policies for advertising in both print and digital versions and for accepting other types of funding.			
	5	Sustainability plan, i.e. a strategy for the medium-term economic viability described on the website; and/or describing OA sustainability through cooperative work schemes and costs shared across actors.			
	6	Funded by long-term sustainable financial support from academic institutions that have either performing research or funding it as their goal. Contributions are not tied to individual outputs or groups of authors.	x		x
Ownership and governance	7	Transparent ownership structure, controlled by and responsive to the scholarly community (e.g. a controlling scholarly organisation, not a commercial publisher, owns the journal title, so that a change of the service provider can be achieved without changing the title).	x		
	8	Strategic governance that allows community input on the direction of the publishing service and operational governance with community representation and decision making power.	x		x
	9	Openly available procedures for the selection of members of governance and editorial bodies together with details of a regular renewal process.		x	
	10	Direct lines of communication between the IPSP, the owner, and any publication oversight body.			

	11	Clearly defined and publicly displayed composition and constitution of the journal's/platform's editorial bodies: the names of the members of the editorial team, their current functions and roles; the names of the members of the Editorial Board and their current affiliations. PIDs (such as ORCID) and links to institutional profiles are provided to unambiguously specify the identity and affiliation of individual editorial Team and Board members.		x	
	12	Editors-in-chief and/or Editorial Teams have full authority over the entire editorial content of their journal and the publication timing of that content.			
	13	Reviewers retain copyright of their reviews, and editorial bodies and institutions retain ownership of all correspondence and mailing lists compiled on the electronic submission system put at their disposal by the publisher (if commercial publishers are involved).			
	14	Authors retain rights without restriction, including Intellectual Property Rights (IPR).			x
	15	A publishing agreement, or terms of use, describes the content ownership and reuse rights.			
	16	The editorial team and the IP confer about any political, commercial, or other incidents that could impair the scientific credibility of the publication and agree to collaboratively take measures necessary to ensure that such incidents do not affect the decisions of the editor.			
	17	The General Terms and Conditions of the use of the infrastructure or platform are publicly displayed.		x	
Open science practices	18	A defined statement on Open Access and Open Science and how publishing services support them is publicly available, which includes the elements below:			
	19	**Authors' rights, Intellectual Property Rights and licensing** IPSPs provide their users with complete and reliable information about the terms of use of IPSPs' content and services. Users' rights, conditions of reuse and redistribution of content are clearly described and labelled in human and computer-readable form, using standardised systems of open licences and rights statements.		x	
	20	Authors retain moral and exploitation rights, and contributions are published under a Creative Commons licence (preferably CC-BY) to ensure further reuse without restrictions.	x		x
	21	**Research data sharing and data availability policies** IPSPs have an output-level policy on data availability. They encourage the use of reporting guidelines, the registration of clinical trials and other study designs according to standard practice in their discipline. Data underlying		x	

		publications are available to editors and reviewers when the manuscript is submitted for review, and to all others by the time of publication at the latest. Data are made available in trusted repositories under FAIR principles with publicly available metadata. (…)			
	22	**Open peer review** Editorial teams will consider encouraging open reviewing policies that are in line with the NISO Peer Review Terminology Standardization guidelines. These policies and guidelines Editorial teams will consider encouraging open reviewing policies that are in line with the NISO Peer Review Terminology Standardization guidelines. These policies and guidelines ideally provide reviewers with the possibility of: (a) signing their reviews either with their identity only visible to the editor, author, and the other reviewers, or with their identity visible to all readers; (b) publishing either review summaries or the full content of their review reports with identities visible or not, either alongside the published article with a separate DOI or in an open preprint repository. Such policies can also allow the corresponding author to opt for publishing either review summaries or the full content of review reports of their article or chapter. [...] They manage the peer review process with the understanding that there is no value in hiding the identity of authors.	x		
	23	**Preprints** IPSPs accept submitted manuscripts that are already available on preprint servers or in open repositories.	x		
	24	**Repository deposits** IPSPs allow dissemination of the preprint version of published outputs. Authors can deposit any version of the work (preprint, Author Accepted Manuscript (AAM) or Version of Record (VoR)) to an open repository of the authors' choice before or after publication. The work and its supplementary material are deposited in public repositories, through unique and persistent identifiers.	x		
	25	**Publication and sharing of negative scientific results** IPSPs are encouraged to post output-level editorial policies that ensure the publication of negative scientific results, or unexpected results and data that do not bear out the initial hypotheses and experimental designs of the authors.	x		
	26	**Research protocols and methods sharing and publishing** IPSPs have output-level policies that make associated research protocols and methods available. This is a good open science practice that allows others to replicate and build on published work.		x	

	27	**Open research software** IPSPs encourage the sharing of research software in a similar way to research data. As part of their policy in making available any material underpinning published research results, IPSPs ask for a software and code availability statement. Authors are expected to provide access to software and make code available in suitable repositories to enable reproducibility by facilitating access and reuse.		x	
	28	**Incentives and rewards** IPSPs provide reviewers with acknowledgement letters when asked to do so. They reward reviewers by publishing an annual list of reviewers to thank them, and they encourage reviewers to publish their reviews in accordance with Open Peer Review policies that make the work of reviewers visible.			
Editorial quality, editorial management and research integrity	29	Information about the journal's/IPSP's mission (a journal/IPSP mission statement), aims, and scope is publicly available on the website, and the languages in which manuscripts can be submitted are clearly indicated.		x	
	30	Names and affiliations for all editors and editorial board members. It is important that the journal's editorial board is composed of recognised and active experts in their field. Editor roles and responsibilities are clearly described, but at the very least, editor roles include the selection of reviewers for the papers assigned to them, providing authors with advice on how to improve their papers, and negotiating disagreements between authors and reviewers.		x	
	31	Author charges. The journal provides explicit information that no (obligatory) fees are charged to the authors, or that authors who have access to institutional funding (grants, library funds) for Open Access fees are given the opportunity to make a Voluntary Author Contribution (VAC).		x	
	32	Author guidelines, including information on:			
	33	- The journal's or the IP's Open Access policy	~		
	34	- Licensing policy	~		
	35	- Copyright / author's rights policy		x	
	36	- The nature of the evaluation process used, including expected timeframe.		x	
	37	- Submission information (such as the article types the journal will accept, the stylesheet that contributions should adhere to and the templates or tools that should be used).		x	
	38	Publishing timelines: The IP states its publishing timelines or the declaration of continuous publication. The publication date declared on the publication is the actual date when the		x	

		publication became available online.			
	39	The IP has a publicly displayed archival, digital preservation policy, which is consistently implemented.	~		
	40	Compliance with the GDPR and relevant regulations is clearly stated and ensured.	x		x
	41	All submitted manuscripts undergo a rigorous evaluation process before or after publication that is in line with accepted practices in the relevant discipline. This evaluation process can involve peer review, or another type of evaluation by at least one person who has no conflict of interest with the author(s). The type and details of the evaluation process are stated clearly on the website and explained in detail. Evaluation can take place before or after publication, depending on the review model adopted (pre-publication peer review, post-publication peer review (Publish, Review, Curate (PCR) models), overlay journals, etc).		x	
	42	Endogeny (i.e. manuscripts being reviewed by a closed circle of people who are well acquainted with each other or work in the same institution) is minimised, and the proportion of published papers where at least one of the authors is an editor, editorial board member, or reviewer does not exceed 25%.			
	43	The IP's editorial policies and procedures are transparent and easy to find on the IP's website. They cover the publication ethics adhered to (for example, COPE's core practices or the IPSP's own publication ethics statement), address authorship and contributorship, explain how complaints and appeals/allegations of research misconduct and conflicts of interest are handled.		x	
	44	The IP also has a policy on chatbots and other writing assistance tools, referring to industry-agreed best practice in this area (such as COPE) to inform authors and help them understand the responsibility they have regarding the accuracy and originality of their work and the transparency of the writing process.			
Technical service efficiency - Software and interoperability	45	The publishing platform is based on free and open-source software, with publicly available code, while the Institutional Publisher (IP) or Service Provider (SP) (see footnote 1) uses free and open-source software as much as possible in its editorial and publishing workflows. The platform is developed and regularly updated to conform to current interoperability standards (OpenAIRE Guidelines, KBART, COUNTER), accessibility guidelines (e.g. W3C Web Content Accessibility Guidelines - WCAG) and open science principles.	x		
	46	The publishing platform supports widely adopted metadata formats for harvesting (e.g. Dublin Core , OpenAIRE , etc.)	x		

		and metadata exchange protocols (OAI-PMH, APIs), and indicates which interoperability protocol is used and how to access it. It also supports massive metadata export (as CSV files, ONIX XML feeds or in any other established format) and provides MARC records to libraries.			
	47	Text and data mining (automatic downloading, extraction and indexing of the full texts and the associated metadata) is supported and this is stated in the relevant policy.		x	
Technical service efficiency - Metadata	48	Each published item (article, chapter, book, etc.) has a dedicated unique URL (landing page) and persistent identifier (preferably DOI).	x		
	49	The following metadata are provided for each published item, in human- and machine-readable formats (e.g. HTML meta tags, XML exposed via OAI-PMH, JSON and other formats downloadable from the landing page, etc.): title, full names and institutional affiliations – including country/region – of all contributing authors, abstracts and keywords, funding information (as a minimum the name of the funder and the grant number/identifier)			
	50	Standard numbers (ISSN, eISSN, ISBN) and other persistent identifiers for the publication (DOI), authors and contributors (ORCID), author affiliations (ROR), and funding organisations (Funder DOIs), as well as other relevant persistent identifiers, are provided in human- and machine-readable formats.	x		
	51	CRediT tags are used to indicate contributions of the authors (coded in JATS xml.).	x		
	52	Conflict-of-interest statements within publications are captured in the metadata using JATS XML			
	53	Human- and machine-readable information about the open access status, copyright holder and licensing is provided in each publication in a standard non-proprietary format.			
	54	Complete metadata about publications, including bibliographic references, are regularly deposited in a registration agency (e.g. CrossRef) in line with the Initiative for Open Citations (I4OC) and Initiative for Open Abstracts (I4OA).	x		
	55	There is an established protocol for the transfer of metadata to open access repositories and content aggregators.			
Technical service efficiency - Content formats and preservation	56	Full-text content is tagged in the XML JATS or equivalent (e.g. TEI) format and provided in multiple digital formats (PDF, HTML, XML, ePub, etc.), at least one of which is suitable for preservation.	x		x
	57	The published content is deposited in a digital preservation service (LOCKSS, CLOCKSS, Portico, Internet Archive and other public preservation services etc.).			

	58	Publications hosted on the platform contain high resolution figures and well-constructed tables, annotated and easy to read and interpret,			
	59	and provide links to data, code, and other research outputs that underlie the publications and are available in external repositories.		x	
Technical service efficiency - Platform functionalities	60	The publishing platform has basic functionalities (searching, browsing, navigation) and a user-friendly interface adjusted to a low bandwidth.			
	61	It also enables alerting services, sharing to social networks, post-publication evaluation and commenting, support for multimedia and open peer review (where relevant).			
	62	Tables of contents or structures that allow direct access to articles/chapters in as few clicks as possible are provided.			
	63	The publishing infrastructure is well maintained, regularly backed up and protected from viruses and malware, and it is also supplied with user instructions and documentation for editorial staff and end users.			
Visibility, indexation, communication, marketing and impact	64	All information provided on the website is accurate, reliable, regularly updated and not misleading in any way.			
	65	The community of users is regularly informed (e.g. through newsletters, blogs, social media, direct emails, mailing lists, content alerts, notifications, RSS/Atom feed or other mechanism) of developments, policy changes, updates, new features and functionalities, as well as about new publications. Active use and regular updates of social media or social networking help to reach out to academia and society.	x		
	66	IPSPs make sure that the visibility of publications in search engines (general and academic) and aggregators is improved by using search engine optimization techniques, by providing structured metadata and XML sitemaps, by implementing metadata exchange protocols, such as OAI-PMH, or by enabling APIs. The information about APIs and OAI-PMH endpoints is indicated on the website.	x		
	67	IPSPs increase the visibility of the published content by applying for inclusion to discovery services, aggregator databases, abstraction and indexing databases, and citation indexes.			
	68	IPSPs encourage authors to make the published content available in open repositories and sharing services in order to increase its visibility.		x	
	69	IPSPs support publishing impact statements or simple language summaries alongside published content to bring the content of scholarly publications closer to the general audience.		x	

Funded by the European Union

	#	Description			
	70	IPSPs support the promotion of published content (e.g. by inviting post-publication reviews of outputs, inviting and moderating post-publication online comments, organising events like book promotions, sending out copies, writing press releases, working with the media) in order to reach broader sectors of society.		x	
	71	IPSPs engage in appropriate and well-targeted marketing activities (including solicitation of manuscripts for their publications).			
	72	IPSPs provide metric indicators that are an important source of information about content usage. The following information is useful and interesting for users: • article/chapter-level metrics, such as visits, views, downloads, citations • publication-level metrics • altmetrics indicators • geographical spread of visitors • analytics software and methods used to generate and collect metrics.	x		
	73	IPSPs and/or journals display the following policies on their websites: a) Policy statement that submissions within the thematic scope and language of the journal are accepted from all potential authors and that decision-making concerning content is without regard to their race, gender, age, sexual orientation, religious belief, ethnic origin, citizenship, or the political philosophy.	x	x	
	74	b) Policy on bias-free language related to age, disability, gender, racial and ethnic identity, sexual orientation, and socioeconomic status in all communications.	x	x	
	75	c) Policy requiring authors to inform whether the research data are sensitive to age, disability status, sex, gender identity, racial and ethnic identity, sexual orientation, and /or socioeconomic status.	x		
	76	d) EDI guidelines setting principles, commitments and actions for promoting diversity in terms of linguistic, cultural, academic, geographical, institutional, economic backgrounds and disabilities.			
	77	e) Gender Equity Plan (GEP) regarding the composition of editorial staff and boards, policies that strive for gender balance among peer reviewers, and a set of commitments and actions that aim to promote gender equality, all publicly available on the website.	x		
	78	IPSPs and/or journals also: f) Set a goal to increase stakeholder representation based on gender identity, race/ethnicity, disability status, and country.			

	79	g) Assess and monitor progress in EDI by collecting and making the following data available: - Gender balance of editorial board members, peer-reviewers, authors, and staff		x	
	80	- Proportion of editorial board members, peer-reviewers, authors, and staff by country		x	
	81	- Proportion of editorial board members, peer-reviewers, and authors by organisational affiliation			
	82	- Proportion of editorial board members, peer-reviewers, authors, and staff that are early career researchers' (1-7 years from degree)		x	
	83	- Proportion of outputs authored by members of editorial bodies		x	
	84	- Amount of feedback received relating to shortcomings in accessibility standards			
	85	- Proportion of abstracts and full-texts which are multilingual			
	86	IPSPs and/or journals will display the following statements on their websites: a) Accessibility statement, which is a public information page that describes organisational policies and accessibility goals, shortcomings concerning accessibility standards, and provides information on feedback channels. Accessibility statements contain at least the following:	x		x
	87	- A commitment to accessibility for people with disabilities			
	88	- The WCAG 2.1 accessibility standard applied	x		
	89	- Contact information in case users encounter problems		x	
	90	- Any known limitations, to avoid the frustration of users		x	
	91	- Measures taken by the organisation to ensure accessibility			
	92	- Technical prerequisites, such as supported web browsers			
	93	- Environments in which the content has been tested to work			
	94	- References to applicable national or local laws and policies			
	95	b) Accessibility of the content, with all images and tables in publications and on the website having a description for the visually impaired.		x	
	96	IPSPs and/or journals support multilingualism by implementing any of the following measures: a) Abstracts in at least two languages, where relevant.	x	x	
	97	b) Machine-translation friendly abstracts.	x		
	98	c) Enabling abstracts and full-texts in two or more languages in the same document or as separate	x		

		documents, if the authors provide translations.			
	99	d) Policy allowing publishing of different language versions in another journal	x		
	100	e) Multilingual website and content, where relevant, with a minimum of 2 languages included. The information given on the site is the same in all languages.		x	
	101	f) Integrate machine translation tool/solution on the website where relevant.			
	102	g) Metadata available in English when the language of the text is not English.		x	
	103	h) Employ toolkits or training to address language bias in peer-review.		x	
	104	i) Support human translation and language-check services to authors.		x	

Appendix 2. Variables dictionary for coding IPs websites

	Variable name	EQSIP item
1	**Transparency revenue streams**	Transparency about the types of revenue streams (e.g. Voluntary Author Contributions (VAC) are possible as a revenue stream).
2	**Author charges**	The journal provides explicit information that no (obligatory) fees are charged to the authors, or that authors who have access to institutional funding (grants, library funds) for Open Access fees are given the opportunity to make a Voluntary Author Contribution (VAC).
3	**Open procedures for selection of governance/editorial bodies**	Openly available procedures for the selection of members of governance and editorial bodies together with details of a regular renewal process.
4	**Public composition of editorial bodies**	Clearly defined and publicly displayed composition and constitution of the journal's/platform's editorial bodies: the names of the members of the editorial team, their current functions and roles; the names of the members of the Editorial Board and their current affiliations. PIDs (such as ORCID) and links to institutional profiles are provided to unambiguously specify the identity and affiliation of individual editorial Team and Board members. Names and affiliations for all editors and editorial board members. It is important that the journal's editorial board is composed of recognised and active experts in their field. Editor roles and responsibilities are clearly described, but at the very least, editor roles include the selection of reviewers for the papers assigned to them, providing authors with advice on how to improve their papers, and negotiating disagreements between authors and reviewers.
5	**Authors retain rights without restriction**	Authors retain rights without restriction, including Intellectual Property Rights (IPR). If a registry in mentioned but not detailed on the website, choose "not displayed".
6	**Public General Terms and Conditions of platform/infra**	The General Terms and Conditions of the use of the infrastructure or platform are publicly displayed.
7	**Info about users' rights, conditions of redistribution and reuse of content**	**Authors' rights, Intellectual Property Rights and licensing** IPSPs provide their users with complete and reliable information about the terms of use of IPSPs' content and services. Users' rights, conditions of reuse and redistribution of content are clearly described and labelled in human and computer-readable form, using standardised systems of open licences and rights statements.

8	**Access to extra documents with publication**	**Research data sharing and data availability policies** IPSPs have an output-level policy on data availability. They encourage the use of reporting guidelines, the registration of clinical trials and other study designs according to standard practice in their discipline. Data underlying publications are available to editors and reviewers when the manuscript is submitted for review, and to all others by the time of publication at the latest. Data are made available in trusted repositories under FAIR principles with publicly available metadata. (…) **Research protocols and methods sharing and publishing** IPSPs have output-level policies that make associated research protocols and methods available. This is a good open science practice that allows others to replicate and build on published work. **Open research software** IPSPs encourage the sharing of research software in a similar way to research data. As part of their policy in making available any material underpinning published research results, IPSPs ask for a software and code availability statement. Authors are expected to provide access to software and make code available in suitable repositories to enable reproducibility by facilitating access and reuse.
9	**Public information about scope**	Information about the journal's/IPSP's mission (a journal/IPSP mission statement), aims, and scope is publicly available on the website, and the languages in which manuscripts can be submitted are clearly indicated.
10	**Description of evaluation process**	Author guidelines include: The nature of the evaluation process used and the time it generally requires.
11	**Description of submission format**	Author guidelines include: Submission information (such as the article types the journal will accept, the stylesheet that contributions should adhere to and the templates or tools that should be used).
12	**Publishing timelines or continuous publication**	Author guidelines include: Publishing timelines: The IP states its publishing timelines or the declaration of continuous publication. The publication date declared on the publication is the actual date when the publication became available online.
13	**Publication ethics: statement on authorship**	The IP's editorial policies and procedures are transparent on the IP's website. They [...] address authorship and contributorship
14	**Publication ethics: statement on complaints and allegations**	The IP's editorial policies and procedures are transparent on the IP's website. They [...] explain how complaints and appeals/allegations of research misconduct and conflicts of interest are handled, [...] Also included are policies on [...] corrections and retractions.

15	**Text and data mining supported**	Text and data mining (automatic downloading, extraction and indexing of the full texts and the associated metadata) is supported and this is stated in the relevant policy.
16	**Encouragement to publish in open repositories**	IPSPs encourage authors to make the published content available in open repositories and sharing services in order to increase its visibility.
17	**Encouragement to promote publication**	IPSPs support publishing impact statements or simple language summaries alongside published content to bring the content of scholarly publications closer to the general audience. IPSPs support the promotion of published content (e.g. by inviting post-publication reviews of outputs, inviting and moderating post-publication online comments, organising events like book promotions, sending out copies, writing press releases, working with the media) in order to reach broader sectors of society.
18	**Public statement about EDI: gender**	Policy statement that submissions within the thematic scope and language of the journal are accepted from all potential authors and that decision-making concerning content is without regard to their race, gender, age, sexual orientation, religious belief, ethnic origin, citizenship, or the political philosophy.
19	**Public statement about EDI: race**	
20	**Public statement about EDI: sexual orientation**	
21	**Public statement about EDI: religious belief**	
22	**Public statement about EDI: citizenship**	
23	**Public statement about EDI: political philosophy**	
24	**Policy about bias-free language**	Policy on bias-free language related to age, disability, gender, racial and ethnic identity, sexual orientation, and socioeconomic status in all communications.
25	**IP self-monitors and displays progress in EDI**	Assess and monitor progress in EDI by collecting and making the following data available: - Gender balance of editorial board members, peer-reviewers, authors, and staff ; - Proportion of editorial board members, peer-reviewers, authors, and staff by country ; - Proportion of editorial board members, peer-reviewers, authors, and staff that are early career researchers' (1-7 years from degree)
26	**Proportion of outputs authored by members of editorial bodies**	Assess and monitor progress in EDI by collecting and making the following data available: Proportion of outputs authored by members of editorial bodies

Funded by
the European Union

27	**Accessibility statement**	Accessibility statement, which is a public information page that describes organisational policies and accessibility goals, shortcomings concerning accessibility standards, and provides information on feedback channels. Accessibility statements contain at least the following: - Contact information in case users encounter problems - Any known limitations, to avoid the frustration of users
28	**Description of figures and tables for visually impared**	Accessibility of the content, with all images and tables in publications and on the website having a description for the visually impaired.
29	**Number of linguistic versions of the abstracts (numeric variable)**	IPSPs and/or journals support multilingualism by implementing any of the following measures: Abstracts in at least two languages, where relevant.
30	**Number of linguistic versions of the website (numeric variable)**	IPSPs and/or journals support multilingualism by implementing any of the following measures: Multilingual website and content, where relevant, with a minimum of 2 languages included. The information given on the site is the same in all languages.

Appendix 3. Interview matrix for focus groups

Core components	Questions
All	Who has to decide the publishing policies? Should it be the IP, or the different editorial boards of outputs (book collection editors, journal editors) or the owners or the hosting platform if separate? Examples: formats, peer review policy, funding schemes, author rights and licensing, publication ethics, encouragement to publish in open repositories, publishing timelines, promotion of the published content...) (What is the distribution of responsibilities on editorial quality between the journals, the IP and the technical infrastructure/service provider)
All/Visibility	What kind of information shall be displaced on the IP website? Should it be the same or different from journals/book collection websites (if relevant)? Are any of them problematic (financial disclosure, EDI information,...)?
Funding	Have you considered any kind of financial support from authors (which we call Voluntary Author Contribution)?
OS practices	- Are open licences a standard for your content? Is licence choice being debated with authors, editors, owners? Would you consider a portfolio of licences or do you prefer a single one? (Have you observed positive or negative side-effects of your choices?) - Open science practices bring to the fore other content than articles, chapters or books such as data, figures, protocols, methods, softwares,... What issues come with their integration into the publication process? (Authors compliance? funders diverse standards?...)
Editorial quality	Has compliance with the GDPR raised changes into your practices and how have you solved these new demands? Are there other regulations (european or national) that weighs on your activity?
Technical	Questions about the XML production, its technicalities.
EDI	- How do you address the accessibility of your content (reading and visual impairment, color-blind figures...)? - How do you consider multilingualism? Shall it concern metadata, IP website, content? (Have you considered automatic/online translation?)

All	- Are there any EQSIP recommendations that seem impossible to meet? For which reasons? - Are there any EQSIP recommendations with which you disagree? For which reasons? - Any other comments on EQSIP or the project?

Funded by the European Union

Consortium overview

AMU	UNIVERSITÉ D'AIX MARSEILLE	FR
PVM	PROTISVALOR MEDITERRANEE SAS	FR
OPERAS	OPEN ACCESS IN THE EUROPEAN RESEARCH AREA THROUGH SCHOLARLY COMMUNICATION	BE
CNRS	CENTRE NATIONAL DE LA RECHERCHE SCIENTIFIQUE CNRS	FR
EIFL	STICHTING EIFL.NET	NL
FECYT	FUNDACIÓN ESPAÑOLA PARA LA CIENCIA Y LA TECNOLOGIA, F.S.P., FECYT	ES
TSV	TIETEELLISTEN SEURAIN VALTUUSKUNNASTA	FI
LIBER	STICHTING LIBER	NL
UB	UNIVERSITAT DE BARCELONA	ES
UniZD	SVEUČILIŠTE U ZADRU	HR
FFZG	SVEUČILIŠTE U ZAGREBU FILOZOFSKI FAKULTET	HR
Science Europe	SCIENCE EUROPE	BE
EUA	ASSOCIATION EUROPÉENNE DE L'UNIVERSITÉ	BE
OASPA	STICHTING OPEN ACCESS SCHOLARLY PUBLISHERS ASSOCIATION	NL
UiT	UNIVERSITETET I TROMSØ – NORGES ARKTISKE UNIVERSITET	NO
CNR	CONSIGLIO NAZIONALE DELLE RICERCHE	IT
UGOE	GEORG-AUGUST-UNIVERSITAT GOTTINGEN STIFTUNG OFFENTLICHEN RECHTS	DE
SPE	STICHTING SPARC EUROPE	NL
UU	UNIVERSITEIT UTRECHT	NL
EKT	ETHNIKO KENTRO TEKMIRIOSIS KAI ILEKTRONIKOU PERIECHOMENOU	EL
IBL PAN	INSTYTUT BADAŃ LITERACKICH POLSKIEJ AKADEMII NAUK	PL
ESF	FONDATION EUROPÉENNE DE LA SCIENCE	FR
JISC	JISC LBG	UK
DOAJ	INFRASTRUCTURE SERVICES FOR OPEN ACCESS C I C	UK