



DIAMAS

Developing Institutional Open Access
Publishing Models to Advance
Scholarly Communication

IPSP Database

Authors: Tommaso Agnoloni (Consiglio Nazionale delle Ricerche, Italy); HYPERLINK "https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5796-2727" [Jeroen Bosman](#) (Universiteit Utrecht, Netherlands); HYPERLINK "https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3413-8799" [Jan Erik Frantsvåg](#) (UiT The Arctic University of Norway, Norway); HYPERLINK "https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0521-912X" [Iraklis Katsaloulis](#) (National Documentation Centre, Greece); HYPERLINK "https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5965-6560" [Bianca Kramer](#) (Sesame Open Science, Netherlands); HYPERLINK "https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6477-2016" [Iva Melinščak Zlodi](#) (University of Zagreb Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, Croatia); HYPERLINK "https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9581-8301" [Virginia de Pablo](#) (FECYT, Spain); HYPERLINK "https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7214-7405" [Johan Rooryck](#) (cOAlition S, Belgium); HYPERLINK "https://orcid.org/0009-0008-5715-0233" [George Ross](#) (Jisc, UK); HYPERLINK "https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9875-7196" [Irakleitos Souvialtzoglou](#) (OPERAS, Belgium); HYPERLINK "https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7399-522X" [Jadranka Stojanovski](#) (University of Zadar, Croatia); HYPERLINK "C:\\\\Users\\\\j.james\\\\Downloads\\\\0000-0002-5189-373X" [Graham Stone](#) (Jisc, UK).

Reviewers: HYPERLINK "https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4033-9119" [Joanna Ball](#) (Directory of Open Access Journals, UK); HYPERLINK "https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9260-4941" [Ronald Snijder](#) (OAPEN Foundation, Netherlands).



Funded by
the European Union

DISCLAIMER

The project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon -WIDERA-2021-ERA-01 research and innovation programme.

Disclaimer- "Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or [name of the granting authority]. Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them."

This deliverable is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License



**Funded by
the European Union**

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	WP2
WP Leader:	UiT
Deliverable identifier:	D2.2 IPSP Database
Contractual Delivery Date: 08/2023	08/2023
Nature: Dataset	Version: 1.0 Final
Dissemination level	PU
Status	Approved by the European Commission

Version history

Version	Created/Modifier	Comments
0.0	Authors	First draft (documentation and dataset)
0.1	Ronald Snijder (OAPEN)	Review
0.2	Jan Erik Frantsvåg (UiT), Irakleitos Souyioulzoglou (OPERAS), Graham Stone (Jisc)	Second draft (documentation)
0.3	Joanna Ball (DOAJ)	Review
0.4	Jan Erik Frantsvåg (UiT), George Ross (Jisc), Irakleitos Souyioulzoglou (OPERAS), Graham Stone (Jisc)	Third draft (documentation and dataset)
0.5	Pierre Mounier (AMU), Johan Rooryck (ESF-cOAlition S)	Internal review
1.0	Jan Erik Frantsvåg (UiT), Graham Stone (Jisc)	Final

Table of Contents

Document overview	2
Version history	2
Table of Contents	3
Acronyms	4
Executive Summary	5
List of Tables	6
Introduction	7
Description of the IPSP Database	7
Survey Design	7
Data cleaning	8
IPSP Registry	11
Lessons learned from the IPSP Dataset	12
Building the IPSP Registry	14
References	16
Consortium overview	17
Appendix 1. IPSP Dataset*	18



Acronyms

CAP	Common Access Point
CCO	Creative Commons Public Domain Licence
EOSC	European Open Science Cloud
ERA	European Research Area
EQSIP	Extensible Quality Standard for Institutional Publishing
IFLA	International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions
IP	Institutional Publisher
IPSP	Institutional Publishing Service Providers
RI	Research Infrastructure
ROR	Research Organization Registry
SP	Service Provider
URL	Uniform Resource Locator
WP	Work Package



Executive Summary

This report provides a documentation of the dataset of Institutional Publishing Service Providers (IPSP) who responded to the 2023 DIAMAS survey. This 'IPSP database' is openly accessible as a dataset on Zenodo with a CCO licence. The survey's aim was to map the current landscape of IPSPs in the European Research Area (ERA). The IPSP Scoping Report defines an Institutional Publishing Service Provider as a service unit that provides services to authors and publishers for institutional academic publishing. These services may be provided by the institutional publisher itself (in which case the institutional publisher is also the IPSP) or by other entities inside or outside the institution.

The final IPSP dataset, which this documentation accompanies contains completed and nearly completed surveys where respondents authorised the DIAMAS project to include that information. The design of the DIAMAS survey is fully discussed in the forthcoming Landscape Report (D2.3). This yielded a total of 704 responses included in the IPSP dataset. 44 IPSPs did not give permission to display their name or URL and were removed. Further cleaning yielded a final set of 651 IPSPs. Data from Turkey will be added at a later stage. Further checking led to the correction of nine IPSP names. IPSP names are rendered in various languages. All IPSP URLs were tested with a Google Apps script, resulting in changes to 149 URLs, and the removal of three that did not resolve. IPSPs were further subdivided into ERA regions: Eastern Europe, Northern Europe, Southern Europe, Western Europe, Northern Africa, and Southwest Asia. IPSP responses from outside the ERA are out of scope for the report but included in the dataset in the region 'rest of the world'.

Cleaning the IPSP database provided some important insights for the development of the IPSP registry: a publicly available registry of IPSPs who have authorized the DIAMAS project to use their information. The IPSP Registry will store and publish IPSP profile data in a structured and searchable manner. Lessons learned were that IPSP names should refer to the service and not to individuals; the IPSP Registry will have to contain the IPSP's name in its native language as well as in English; the IPSP's authority will have to be checked; contact emails and unambiguous URLs will have to be established in some cases. A number of instructions appeared to be ambiguous for survey respondents, and respondents did not always correctly self-identify as Institutional Publisher (IP) or Service Provider (SP).

The dataset provides the groundwork for the IPSP Registry to be built in WP4, identifying the IPSP profile details, delineating specifications for the platform hosting the registry, and allowing for a communication strategy to invite IPSPs to update their profile.





List of Tables

Table 1. Data cleaning workflow for the IPSP Database.



**Funded by
the European Union**

Introduction

The 'IPSP database' (see Appendix 1) is an openly accessible dataset of Institutional Publishing Service Providers (IPSP) who responded to the 2023 DIAMAS survey. The survey aimed to map the current landscape of IPSPs in the European Research Area (ERA). The IPSP scoping report (Bargheer et al., 2023) defines an Institutional Publishing Service Provider as a service unit that provides services to authors and publishers for institutional academic publishing. These services may be provided by the institutional publisher itself (in which case the institutional publisher is also the IPSP) or by other entities inside or outside the institution.

This report is a documentation of the accompanying dataset. It describes the design of the dataset as part of the DIAMAS survey, as well as the structure of the data. It also details how the final version was assembled using a combination of survey data and external sources, and it reflects on lessons learned, especially with respect to the quality of the data. In addition, the report details how these lessons learned are being turned into actionable recommendations for the IPSP Registry, which will store and publish IPSP profile data in a structured and searchable manner. The IPSP Registry is due to be delivered in M34 as part of Work Package 4 of the project: Building capacity through knowledge-sharing.

Description of the IPSP Database

Survey Design

The design of the DIAMAS survey will be discussed in depth as part of the forthcoming Landscape Report (D2.3). Although primarily intended to map the current IPSP landscape to inform the report and the future work of the project work packages, the opening questions of the survey were also designed to be used as the basis for the IPSP database.

The opening questions of the survey for the Library Publishing Directory (2023) informed the design of this part of the DIAMAS survey, particularly as this is a good example of a survey's opening questions being used to create a database of publishers (in this case, the global library publishing map (n.d.), maintained by the IFLA Library Publishing Special Interest Group (n.d.)). These questions were designed to be relatively easy to complete, and they are gathered and made fully or partially publicly available depending on the permission of the respondents to the survey.

With this in mind, respondents were asked the following question regarding the specific opening questions asked within the DIAMAS survey:

"One of the planned outputs of this project is a publicly available registry of Institutional Publishing Service Providers (IPSP). We ask your permission to

make the information that you have provided above publicly available. Please tick 'Yes' or 'No' per type of information to give your authorisation."

The opening questions covered the following points:

- User Language
- IPSP name
- Service contact email
- URL (Uniform Resource Locator)
- Country
- Publication languages
- Parent organisation
- Parent organisation name
- Parent organisation URL
- Does the IPSP only provide services to its parent organisation?
- IPSP/parent organisation legal entity
- Type of IPSP
- Services provided
- Publish or provide service
 - Academic Journals
 - Academic Books
 - Conference outputs
 - Grey literature
 - Other research products (e.g., media, digital)
 - Non-academic outputs
 - Other (e.g., datasets, digital scholarship, software)
- Disciplines

IPSPs that withdrew permission for particular questions are noted as 'withdrawn' in the specific cell of the IPSP database. Where no answer was received for a particular question or sub-question, cells have been noted as 'no response'.

Data cleaning

In a project blog ('Early Impressions from the DIAMAS survey' 2023), we describe the process of obtaining the final dataset from the survey results. Data for use in the 'IPSP database' dataset followed the same methodology: we included completed survey responses and also unsubmitted surveys where we had contacted those who had not properly submitted their questionnaires but were nearly (or actually) finished to ask permission to include their information.

Because inclusion in the IPSP database involved an additional question around permission, this gives us a slightly different final number for the dataset being used in the Landscape Report. For example, one IPSP that did not complete the survey



permitted their data to be made public in the IPSP database, but not to be analysed in the dataset used in the forthcoming landscape report.

704 respondents provided their consent to include their responses in the IPSP database. However, 39 did not give permission to display their name, and a further five did not give permission to display their URL. A decision was taken to exclude these IPSPs from the public dataset as it was agreed that removing either the IPSP name or IPSP URL effectively anonymised the dataset, which was not within the scope. After the removal of one Turkish IPSP, which will be added later to the Turkish dataset (see below), we were left with 659 IPSPs before additional cleaning. After deduplication of the data and removal of three IPSPs with bad data, a further eight responses were removed, resulting in a total of 651 responses in the IPSP database (Table 1).

It should be noted that due to the earthquake in Turkey at the time of the survey, no Turkish data is included in this dataset. The Turkish survey will take place in September/October 2023. The cleaned data from the Turkish responses will then be appended to this dataset to create a version 2.0. It is anticipated that this will be done in early 2024.

Table 1. Data cleaning workflow for the IPSP Database.

Survey responses	Total
Complete responses	657
Incomplete responses (removed)	1370
Incomplete but subsequently included with permission	47
Total number of responses (raw data)	704
IPSP Database	
Removed - Turkey (to be added to Turkish dataset)	1
Removed - No IPSP name permission	39
Removed - No IPSP URL permission	5
Removed duplicates	5
Removed bad data	3
Final number of records in the IPSP Database	651

In addition to the data cleaning used for the dataset as a whole, the IPSP database also went through a light-touch cleaning process. Internal columns relating to whether the

IPSP Database

survey was completed and what permission was granted were removed, as was the internal ID.

The IPSP name field was checked after work using external sources and web scraping on the forthcoming Extensible Quality Standard for Institutional Publishing (EQSIP) Gap Analysis deliverable found that a number of personal names had been entered in error. After double-checking with country experts, a total of nine IPSP names were corrected in this way. However, a decision was taken not to translate the IPSP name, but to leave data input in the national language as input by the IPSP. This has resulted in a dataset that represents IPSP name in a raw, untranslated form with a mix of languages, some in their national language and some in English. Some of these responses use Cyrillic script. This will be discussed further in the Lessons Learned section below.

A decision was taken to completely remove the column ‘Service contact email’ as this would likely result in the email addresses being used to spam the contacts due to the dataset being an open resource.

All of the IPSP URLs were tested to ensure that they all resolved at the time of cleaning. URLs were tested using a Google Apps script (see below) which returned the HTTP status code for each URL. URLs that returned a status code other than 200, or returned an error, were manually checked.

```
function HTTPRESPONSE(url) {  
  var options = {  
    'muteHttpExceptions': true,  
    'followRedirects': false  
  };  
  var url_trimmed = url.trim();  
  var response = UrlFetchApp.fetch(url_trimmed, options);  
  return response.getResponseCode();  
}
```

Google Apps script used to check URLs

A total of 149 URLs were altered using this method. Many of the tested links redirected to web pages with slightly modified URL strings (e.g., different or additional prefixes), or the international version of the publisher’s website. Most of the corrected URLs were either mistyped or initially blocked by the browser for security reasons.

A further three IPSPs were removed from the dataset. In all three cases, the IPSP name was clearly incorrect (two personal names and one comment) and all three URLs did not resolve and could not be tracked down.

A decision was made to remove the column ‘Parent organisation URL’ as many of these URLs were also broken, and work carried out on the forthcoming EQSIP gap analysis report suggested that many of the descriptions of parent organisations may not be



**Funded by
the European Union**

entirely accurate. Therefore, it was decided to keep the parent organisation name as declared by the IPSP, but remove the URL.

A new column was added to the dataset from the external data sources used to define the regions of the respondents ('UNSD – Methodology' n.d.). The regions, which represent sets of countries in the ERA, are the following:

- **Eastern Europe:** Bulgaria, Czechia, Hungary, Moldova, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Ukraine
- **Northern Europe:** Denmark including Faroe Islands, Estonia, Finland including Åland Islands, Iceland, Ireland, Latvia, Lithuania, Norway, Sweden, United Kingdom
- **Southern Europe:** Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Cyprus, Greece, Italy, Kosovo, Malta, Montenegro, North Macedonia, Portugal, Serbia, Slovenia, Spain
- **Western Europe:** Austria, Belgium, France, Germany, Luxemburg, Netherlands, Switzerland
- **Northern Africa:** Tunisia and Morocco
- **Southwest Asia:** Armenia, Georgia, Israel, Turkey.

A number of responses are also included from countries outside of the ERA. All IPSPs from outside of the ERA were given the region 'rest of the world' due to the low number of respondents. Some of these IPSPs are out of scope for the landscape report as they do not all provide services for IPSPs in the ERA, but all are included in this dataset for completeness.

Seven IPSPs chose to have the 'country' data withdrawn from the IPSP database. Therefore, in order to protect these IPSPs wishes for the country to remain anonymous, the region cell has been marked 'no response', as the country could be inferred from the region.

These final 651 IPSPs are included in the dataset, which this documentation accompanies (Agnoloni et al., 2023).

IPSP Registry

Work package 4 of the DIAMAS project: "Building capacity through knowledge-sharing" will design the project's Common Access Point (CAP), a web portal providing access to resources and services to facilitate the implementation of the EQSIP and enable knowledge exchange among IPSPs, journal editors, librarians, and other stakeholders. As part of the CAP, the forthcoming IPSP Registry will store and publish IPSP profile data in a structured and searchable manner. This section presents the synergies between this dataset and the registry; it also outlines the methodology of survey data analysis, which will inform decisions on the registry components and the strategy to keep the public IPSP profiles up to date.

The information presented in the registry will make IPSPs more visible and foster networking and collaboration. The implementation process will focus on developing an information organisation framework and workflows (description, discovery, selection) enabling stakeholders to identify publishers and service providers based on a set of predefined criteria.

Lessons learned from the IPSP Dataset

The IPSP dataset gives a snapshot of IPSPs in the ERA based on data obtained as part of the survey. As such, it is a static dataset that will soon become outdated. Indeed, this may be evidenced by some of the URLs in the dataset, which failed to resolve within weeks of the survey results being received.

The IPSP Registry will use some of the data in this dataset as inspiration. Therefore, this report will document some of the lessons learned in cleaning the IPSP database data to inform the registry's design.

- **Personal names:** On a number of occasions the IPSP name field was completed using a personal name. In one particular instance, this was the name of the general secretary of the association that publishes the journal. As such it could be that this is a legal responsibility. It should be made clear that IPSP name refers to the commonly used name of the IPSP and not the name of any personal identity.
- **Language:** The survey was made available in 10 languages. Although free text sections of the results of the dataset have been translated for the analysis and landscape report, the IPSP name was not translated. This has resulted in a variety of languages being used in the IPSP name field - all technically correct (with the exception of personal names). A key lesson learned for the IPSP Registry is to include at least two fields for data collection, one in the IPSPs native language and one in English.
- **Name authority:** In addition to lessons learned on the use of personal names and different languages in the IPSP name field, it will be important for the IPSP Registry to implement a light touch name authority process. For example, the dataset includes:
 - Sub units, e.g., faculties and institutions, where the original data is very confusing
 - Organisations such as National History Museum, which could be confusing without the country to identify which particular entity
 - Abbreviated forms, which would make searching, and browsing difficult
 - Use of "The" (and probably other definite articles) in the registry to help browsing.
- **Contact email (1):** 112 IPSPs did not give permission to publicly display their contact email. Although this was not a particular issue for this dataset after the



decision was taken to remove all contact information to prevent use of the database for spamming, it does have implications for the IPSP Registry as a ‘shop window’ for IPSPs to be contacted. On a related note, of the IPSPs that gave permission to include them in the database, 14 did not give permission to follow up with them, this is another issue that the IPSP registry needs to address.

- **Contact email (2):** To prevent the possibility of spamming email addresses, email addresses could be displayed as an image within the IPSP Registry.
- **URL field:** Data in the URL field was of varying quality. Many did not include https:// and did not resolve when tested. As noted above, 149 URLs needed to be edited and three were removed as they did not resolve and manual checking could not identify the IPSP. In addition, some IPSPs stated multiple URLs (without clear reasons), some referred to their journals on the publishing platforms instead of their own institutional domain, or to the institutional library. For the IPSP Registry, the URL field should specify that it must begin with https:// or have data entry validation built in, and there should be clearer instructions on which URL should be used.
- **Withdrawn fields:** A number of the IPSPs that give permission to publicly display their data went on to withdraw permission for crucial fields such as IPSP name and URL. These IPSPs were subsequently removed from this dataset. The IPSP Registry needs to consider the use of mandatory fields to collect essential data for the registry. For example, IPSP name, URL, country, and IPSP type should probably be mandatory.
- **Clear and unambiguous instructions:** External data retrieved as part of the web scraping task for the EQSIP Gap Analysis has shown that even basic questions were not clear enough. For example, where IPSPs were asked how many journals they published in the last year, some IPSPs answered two, while it appeared that they in fact published a single journal consisting of two volumes. Each question in the future registry has to come with very clear instructions, automatic quality checks where possible, and maybe consider some form of light national/regional editorial oversight, to ensure the data is of high quality. An additional consideration could be to implement a mechanism for IPSPs to perform or suggest corrections/updates to their record, with an accompanying workflow for authorization and propagation of changes. The Research Organization Registry (ROR)(2023) could serve as an example of how to implement this.
- **Institutional Publishers vs. Service Providers:** During the data cleaning process, a number of internal remarks were made about self-identification of IPSPs as either an Institutional Publisher (IP) or Service Provider (SP) and whether this was correct under the project’s definition of an IPSP. It was decided that it was not within the scope of this deliverable to ‘correct’ self-identification. Anecdotally, one IPSP has since indicated that it sees itself as moving from being an SP to becoming an IP. However, the IPSP Registry needs to more clearly define the differences between an IP and SP, and also take into account that there are occasions where an IPSP can be both an IP and an SP – there is at least one example of this in the full dataset. One possible solution would be for the registry to have a different entry point, potentially asking about specific services provided, and for each service to answer if this is provided only for themselves/their parent institution, or if they offer it to others.

Building the IPSP Registry

The registry will initially be populated with information provided by the survey respondents, according to the permissions given, on a case by case basis, to make the IPSP identification details publicly available. The IPSP profile components that the database will feed into are the following:

- IPSP name
- IPSP website URL
- IPSP contact email
- Country
- Supported languages
- Information on the IPSP parent organisation (if applicable)
- Type of IPSP/parent organisation legal entity
- IPSP type (publisher/service provider)
- Services offered
- Output types the IPSP publishes or provides a service for (academic/scholarly journals, scholarly articles, academic books, conference outputs)
- Discipline coverage

WP4 will further analyse the database contents against the lessons learned and recommendations suggested in this report. To this end, the database will serve as a basis to:

- Identify the IPSP profile details to be included in the registry
- Delineate specifications for the platform that will host the registry (e.g., profile components, controlled vocabularies, name authority)
- Formulate a communication strategy and design a follow-up campaign inviting IPSPs to update their profile information.

The planned tasks can be summarised as follows:

- Quantitative analysis of the responses withdrawn per question
- Analysis of IPSP geographical distribution and supported languages
- Qualitative analysis to assess the relevance of responses to the type of information requested
- Qualitative analysis of free text responses (e.g., IPSP name, parent organisation name, services provided).

The data analysis will help identify the complete set of information fields to be included in the public IPSP profiles. As already suggested in the previous section of the report, additional elements (such as, translations of the IPSP name, and a brief description of



its status and operations) will be introduced to further support content search and information retrieval.

The contents of the dataset will also contribute to conceptualising the registry's information structure framework and workflows. Controlled vocabularies and advanced search functionalities will be designed based on the questionnaire's predefined response options as well as respondents' input to free text fields. These, in turn, will be used to identify the technical specifications for the platform that will host the registry, and the requirements to achieve semantic interoperability with the other components of the CAP.

When the technical implementations are completed, WP4 will launch a follow-up campaign inviting IPSPs to review and update their profiles in the registry. As part of the preparatory tasks for the campaign, the quantitative (e.g., proportion of responses withdrawn per case) and qualitative analysis of the database contents will indicate specific questions respondents may have faced challenges in answering, and help formulate clear messages and further explain the concepts in use.

The IPSP Database is available as a dataset on Zenodo with a CC0 licence (Agnoloni et al., 2023).

The IPSP Registry is due to be delivered in June 2025 as part of Work Package 4: Building capacity through knowledge-sharing.

References

- Agnoloni, Tommaso, Bosman, Jeroen, Frantsvåg, Jan Erik, Katsaloulis, Iraklis, Kramer, Bianca, Melinščak Zlodi, Iva, de Pablo, Virginia, Rooryck, Johan, Ross, George, Irakleitos, Souyioultzoglou, Stojanovski, Jadranka, and Stone, Graham. (2023). D2.2 IPSP Dataset_under EC review (V2.0). Zenodo. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.8296708>
- Bargheer, Margo, Bosman, Jeroen, Drahomira, Cupar, Frantsvåg, Jan Erik, Klaus, Tabea, Kramer, Bianca, Laakso, Mikael, Manista, Frank, Melinščak Zlodi, Iva, Peruginelli, Ginevra, Proudman, Vanessa, Rooryck, Johan, Souyioultzoglou, Irakleitos, Stojanovski, Jadranka, Stone, Graham, & Verheusen, Astrid. (2023). D2.1 IPSP Scoping Report_under EC review (V1.1). Zenodo. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.7890793>
- Early Impressions from the DIAMAS survey. 2023. Accessed 25 July 2023. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.8249582>
- 'Global library publishing map'. n.d. Accessed 25 July 2023. <https://lib-pub.org/>
- 'IFLA Library Publishing Special Interest Group'. n.d. Accessed 3 August 2023 <https://www.ifla.org/units/library-publishing/>
- 'Library Publishing Directory'. 2023. Accessed 25 July 2023. <https://librarypublishing.org/lp-directory/>
- 'Research Organization Registry: Submitting registry updates'. n.d. Accessed 25 July 2023. <https://ror.org/registry/#submitting-registry-updates>
- 'UNSD – Methodology'. 2023. Accessed 25 July 2023. <https://unstats.un.org/unsd/methodology/m49/>



Consortium overview

AMU	UNIVERSITE D'AIX MARSEILLE	FR
PVM	PROTISVALOR MEDITERRANEE SAS	FR
OPERAS	OPEN ACCESS IN THE EUROPEAN AREA THROUGH SCHOLARLY COMMUNICATION	BE
CNRS	CENTRE NATIONAL DE LA RECHERCHE SCIENTIFIQUE CNRS	FR
EIFL	STICHTING EIFL.NET	NL
FECYT	FUNDACION ESPANOLA 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	SVEUCILISTE U ZADRU	HR
FFZG	SVEUCILISTE U ZAGREBU FILOZOFSKI FAKULTET	HR
Science Europe	SCIENCE EUROPE	BE
EUA	ASSOCIATION EUROPEENNE DE L'UNIVERSITE	BE
OASPA	STICHTING OPEN ACCESS SCHOLARLY PUBLISHERS ASSOCIATION	NL
UiT	UNIVERSITETET I TROMSOE - NORGE'S 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 BADAN LITERACKICH POLSKIEJ AKADEMII NAUK	PL
ESF	FONDATION EUROPEENNE DE LA SCIENCE	FR
Jisc	Jisc LBG	UK
DOAJ	INFRASTRUCTURE SERVICES FOR OPEN ACCESS C I C	UK

Appendix 1. IPSP Dataset*

*As a reminder, the CSV file of the IPSP Dataset is available at the following DOI link: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.8296708>.