



DIAMAS

Developing Institutional Open Access
Publishing Models to Advance
Scholarly Communication

D3.1 IPSP Best Practices

Quality evaluation criteria, best practices, and assessment systems for Institutional Publishing Service Providers (IPSPs)

Authors: [Milica Ševkušić](#); EIFL, Lithuania; [Iryna Kuchma](#); EIFL, Lithuania

Other Contributors: [Virginia de Pablo](#); FECYT, Spain; Melanie Heeley; Jisc, United Kingdom; [Iva Melinščak Zlodi](#); University of Zagreb Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, Croatia; [Pilar Rico-Castro](#); FECYT, Spain; [Johan Rooryck](#); cOAlition S, Belgium

Reviewers: [Reme Melero](#); Instituto de Agroquímica y Tecnología de Alimentos-CSIC, Spain



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	WP3 - Setting standards and assessing quality gaps
WP Leader:	FECYT
Deliverable identifier:	D3.1 IPSP Best Practices Report
Contractual Delivery Date: 11/2023	Actual Delivery Date: 13/03/2023
Nature: Report	Version: 0.2 Final version
Dissemination level	Public

Version history

Version	Created/Modified	Comments
0.0	Created by WP3	Under review of WP leaders
0.1	Updated version following an internal review	Under external review by Reme Melero
1.0	Final version (under the European Commission review)	

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. 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](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)



**Funded by
the European Union**

Table of Contents

Document overview	1
Version history	1
Table of Contents	2
Acronyms	4
1. Executive Summary	6
2. Scope	7
3. Methodology	8
4. Best practices analysis based on the 7 core components	10
4.1 Funding	10
4.2 Ownership and governance	12
4.3 Open science practices	15
4.4 Editorial quality, editorial management and research integrity	18
4.5 Technical service efficiency	23
4.6 Visibility, indexation, communication, marketing and impact	25
4.7 Equity, Diversity and Inclusion (EDI): multilingualism, gender equity	27
5. Checklist	28
5.1 Funding	28
5.2 Ownership and governance	29
5.3 Open science practices	30
5.4 Editorial quality, editorial management and research integrity	31
5.5 Technical Service Efficiency	33
5.6 Visibility, indexation, communication, marketing and impact	35
5.7 Equity, Diversity and Inclusion (EDI) : multilingualism, gender equity	37
6. References	38
Appendix 1: List of analysed documents	40
Appendix 2: Analysis sheet of good practices for IPSPs	46



Acronyms

APA	American Psychological Association
APCs	Article Processing Charges
API	Application Programming Interface
BPCs	Book Processing Charges
CC0	Public Domain Dedication
CC-BY	Creative Commons Attribution licence
CC-BY-SA	Creative Commons Attribution - ShareAlike licence
CONSORT	Consolidated Standards of Reporting Trials
COPE	Committee on Publication Ethics
CRAFT-OA	Creating a Robust Accessible Federated Technology for Open Access
CRedit	Contributor Roles Taxonomy
CSV	Comma-separated values
DIAMAS	Developing Institutional Open Access Publishing Models to Advance Scholarly Communication
DOI	Digital Object Identifier
EDI	Equity, Diversity and Inclusion
EQSIP	Extensible Quality Standard for Institutional Publishing
EOSC	European Open Science Cloud
FAIR	Findable, Accessible, Interoperable, Reusable
GDPR	General Data Protection Regulation
HTML	HyperText Markup Language
I4OA	Initiative for Open Abstracts
I4OC	Initiative for Open Citations
ICMJE	International Committee of Medical Journal Editors
IPR	Intellectual Property Rights
IPSP	Institutional Publishing Service Provider
ISBN	International Standard Book Number
ISSN	International Standard Serial Number
JATS	Journal Article Tag Suite
JSON	JavaScript Object Notation
KBART	Knowledge Bases and Related Tools
LOCKSS	Lots of Copies Keep Stuff Safe
MARC	MACHINE-Readable Cataloguing
OA	Open Access
OAI-PMH	Open Archives Initiative Protocol for Metadata Harvesting
ONIX	ONline Information eXchange
OpenAIRE	Open Access Infrastructure for Research in Europe



ORCID	Open Researcher and Contributor ID
OS	Open Science
PID	Persistent IDentifier
PRISMA	Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses
RPOs	Research Performing Organisations
ROR	Research Organisation Registry
SRQR	Standards for reporting qualitative research
TOP	Transparency and Openness Promotion
URL	Uniform Resource Locator
WAME	World Association of Medical Editors
WCAG	W3C Web Content Accessibility Guidelines
XML	Extensible Markup Language



1. Executive Summary

In the transition towards Open Access (OA), institutional publishing is challenged by fragmentation and varying service quality, visibility, and sustainability. To address this issue, DIAMAS gathers 23 organisations from 12 European countries, well-versed in OA academic publishing and scholarly communication. The project will:

1. Map the current landscape of Institutional Publishing Service Providers (IPSPs) in 25 countries of the ERA with special attention for IPSPs that do not charge fees for publishing or reading. This will yield a taxonomy of IPSPs and an IPSP landscape report that will provide a basis for the rest of the project.
2. Coordinate and improve the efficiency and quality of IPSPs by developing an Extensible Quality Standard for Institutional Publishing (EQSIP). This quality standard will professionalise, strengthen, and reduce the fragmentation of institutional publishing in Europe. EQSIP will serve as a benchmark for a gap analysis of the data.

This report outlines existing quality evaluation criteria, best practices, and assessment systems for IPSPs developed by international associations, RPOs, governments, and international databases. It also analyses academic literature on research evaluation of IPSPs, assessment criteria and indicators. The analysis matrix includes the following categories, which will also be the core components of EQSIP:

- 1) Funding: description of the funding model, OA business model, transparency in listing all funding sources, etc.
- 2) Ownership and governance: legal ownership, mission, and governance.
- 3) Open science practices: OA policy, copyright and licensing, open peer review, data availability, new approaches to research assessment, etc.
- 4) Editorial quality, editorial management, and research integrity.
- 5) Technical service efficiency: technical strength, interoperability - metadata, ISSN, PIDs, machine readability, and accessible journal website.
- 6) Visibility, including indexation, communication, marketing and impact.
- 7) Equity, Diversity and Inclusion (EDI): multilingualism, gender equity.

A self-assessment checklist for IPSPs summarises the best practices outlined in the report.



2.Scope

A major task of the DIAMAS project is to benchmark current standards in institutional publishing and establish an Extensible Quality Standard in Institutional OA Publishing (EQSIP), which will introduce a flexible framework of standards to be adopted by Institutional OA Publishing Services Providers (IPSPs) across the European Research Area. EQSIP will provide the basis for a self-assessment tool enabling IPSPs to align with EQSIP standards.

EQSIP seeks to ensure the quality and transparency of governance, processes and workflows in institutional publishing.¹ It will address the seven core components of scholarly publishing outlined in the Diamond OA Action Plan (Ancion et al. 2022, 4), which were subsequently slightly revised and modified by the DIAMAS project team. EQSIP will be developed in two stages. Based on the IPSP Best Practices Report, EQSIP 1.0 will develop a high-level set of standards, best practices, evaluation criteria, guidelines and recommendations relevant for institutional publishers. It will be further tested and validated with a representative sample of IPSPs selected from the landscape survey to be conducted in the DIAMAS project. The results of the testing and validation will be used to develop EQSIP 2.0.

This document presents an overview and analysis of existing quality evaluation criteria, best practices, and assessment systems in terms of the seven core components, which were modified as explained in the section Methodology. The document provides input for EQSIP 1.0 and the DIAMAS landscape survey. It targets three types of audiences: the project participants, IPSPs, and academic journal and book editors. It is also expected to feed into the project [CRAFT-OA \(Creating a Robust Accessible Federated Technology for Open Access\)](#), which aims to consolidate the Diamond OA publishing landscape by improving its technical and organisational infrastructure.

After a brief Introduction and Methodology, the results of the analysis are presented, followed by a self assessment checklist for IPSPs, which also feeds into EQSIP 1.0. The list of the analysed documents and the analysis sheet are provided in the appendices.

¹ An 'institution' is defined in the DIAMAS context as an academic organisation or unit whose main mission and scope is to perform, fund, or promote the practice of research and scholarship. Examples of (academic) institutions are research performing organisations, research funding organisations, learned/scholarly societies, (national) academic and not-for-profit foundations, including academic communities and (groups of) editors owning journals.



3. Methodology

Desk analysis was used to identify the elements of best practices that can be adopted by IPSPs and to formulate recommendations to that effect. The initial list was crowdsourced by project team members and included 71 documents from Europe and beyond, ranging from high-level recommendations and principles, through indexation criteria, to specific assessment guidelines used on the national and institutional levels, in English (52 documents) and Croatian, Danish, French, German, Italian, Montenegrin, Romanian, Serbian, Slovenian and Spanish. After excluding the items that merely repeated information contained in other documents (7) and those focused on a specific topic going into great detail beyond the scope of the analysis (6), the remaining 58 documents were reviewed in detail by at least one team member (27 documents were independently reviewed by two team members). The list of documents is available in [Appendix 1](#). Though we believe this list of documents is sufficiently representative, it is not intended to be exhaustive. It is worth noting that relevant recent literature was taken into consideration in order to capture emerging practices that are not yet integrated into analysed recommendations, guidelines and criteria.

An analysis sheet was developed which initially included the analysis matrix with the seven core components of scholarly publishing (Ancion et al. 2022, 4):

1. Funding and business models
2. Service efficiency and quality assurance
3. Editorial management and research integrity
4. Legal ownership, mission, and governance
5. Communication and marketing
6. Equity, Diversity and Inclusion (EDI) including multilingualism and gender equity
7. Level of openness and compliance with open science principles and practices.

The matrix was tested by analysing a sample of representative documents. The results were not satisfactory, as some categories seemed to overlap. It was therefore decided to revise the matrix, so as to keep the number of categories at seven, prioritise them differently, and provide a brief explanation regarding the scope of each category. The resulting core components, which will also be used in EQSIP, are as follows:

1. Funding: description of the funding model, OA business model, transparency in listing all funding sources, etc.
2. Ownership and governance: legal ownership, mission, and governance.



3. Open science practices: OA policy, copyright and licensing, open peer review, data sharing, new approaches to research assessment, etc.
4. Editorial quality, editorial management and research integrity.
5. Technical service efficiency: technical strength, interoperability - metadata, ISSN, PIDs, machine readability, and journal website.
6. Visibility, including indexation, communication, marketing and impact.
7. Equity, Diversity and Inclusion (EDI): multilingualism, gender equity.

The analysis sheet ([Appendix 2](#)) also includes fields for the general information about the documents (title, issuing entity, scope and purpose, etc.). Controlled terms – listed as bullet points where relevant in the analysis sheet i Appendix 2 – were introduced to describe the type and scope of the documents.

The information for each of the seven core components collected in the analysis sheets was further analysed, seeking to capture all relevant recommendations regardless of the frequency of their occurrence in the documents. Similar and related topics were grouped together and summarised to formulate recommendations for IPSPs, following the same division into the seven core elements.

The analysis involved some challenges. The analysed documents are heterogeneous, and as a result the coverage of the seven core components is uneven: e.g. editorial quality in the context of journals is often covered in great detail, while Equity, Diversity and Inclusion (EDI) are addressed in few documents. Some documents were not formulated with OA publishing in mind (e.g. inclusion criteria for Web of Science, Scopus or PubMed) and contain recommendations that are not considered best practice in the context of OA publishing (e.g. a strong focus on the Journal Impact Factor or the traditional concept of journal periodicity and originality of content). Although they were captured in the initial analysis, such recommendations were not included in the [Best practices analysis](#).

The analysed documents mostly focus on the publishing contexts relating to journals, while those associated with other research outputs are less represented, but the analysis still contains recommendations that are applicable in the context of books and preprints. Current quality evaluation criteria, best practices, and assessment systems relating to books are in most cases either similar or the same as those for journals. Further developments in this area are expected, especially within the project [PALOMERA \(Policy Alignment of Open Access Monographs in the European Research Area\)](#), focusing on books and especially policies for books.



4. Best practices analysis based on the 7 core components

This best practices analysis includes major highlights from the documents analysed, literature review, and authors' experiences. Best practices are presented on the IPSP level and not on the journal/book level, as in most of the documents analysed.

This report supports the vision of the Coalition for Advancing Research Assessment ('The Agreement on Reforming Research Assessment' 2022) that the assessment of research, researchers and research organisations should recognise the diverse outputs, practices, and activities that maximise the quality and impact of research. This requires basing assessment primarily on qualitative judgement, for which peer review is central, supported by responsible use of quantitative indicators. This commitment reduces the dominance of a narrow set of quantitative journal and publication-based metrics and their inappropriate uses in research assessment. In particular, this means moving away from using metrics like the Journal Impact Factor (JIF) and Article Influence Score (AIS) as proxies for quality and impact.

4.1 Funding

Transparency and conflict of interest policies

Having a clear OA policy that covers the OA business model and compliance with funders and institutional OA policies (if they exist); and indicating on the publication homepage its funding sources, in case it receives funds from outside the publishing institution, are among the current good practices analysed.

IPSPs should be transparent about their types of revenue streams. When IPSPs are recipients of commercial sponsorships, this should be clearly indicated (i.e., to preempt relevant questions about the objectivity of the published content). The same principle applies to the funding of special and thematic issues and supplements: journal and supplement editors must not accept personal favours or direct remuneration from sponsors of such special issues and supplements.

Also, there should be a consistent workflow allowing authors, editors and reviewers to disclose financial conflicts of interest (in the Conflict of Interest statement and in the metadata) and disclose all sources of funding (in the Funding acknowledgments/statements and in the metadata).



In summary, submission and publication should not be conditional in any way on the payment of a fee from the author or their employing institution, or on membership of an institution or society. Business models or revenue sources (for example, reprint income, supplements, special issues, sponsorships) should not influence editorial decision making. Editors-in-chief should have the final say in decisions about which advertisements or sponsored content, including supplements, the publication will and will not carry, and they should have the final say concerning the use of the publication brand and on overall policy regarding the commercial use of content. IPSPs should have formal, explicit, written policies for advertising in both print and digital versions, including the following:

- a) which types of advertisements will be considered;
- b) who makes decisions regarding accepting advertisements;
- c) whether they are linked to content or reader behaviour or are displayed at random;
- d) advertisements should not be related in any way to editorial decision making and should be kept separate from the published content.

Paid editions, such as a print on demand edition, should appear simultaneously or follow the OA version; and the OA version should be made available on the IPSP's/publication service's website, if applicable, together with printed versions made available for a fee.

Non-profit and collaborative publishing models which preferably do not involve Article Processing Charges (APCs) or Book Processing Charges (BPCs)

“Supporting not-for-profit, academic and scientific community-driven publishing models as a common good” (‘UNESCO Recommendation on Open Science’ 2021)

With DIAMAS’s focus on those IPSPs that do not charge APCs/BPCs, having information about the fact that no APCs/BPCs are charged should be clearly indicated on the website of the IPSP. If the journal asks authors to consider making Voluntary Author Contributions (VAC), that information should likewise be clearly stated on the website of the IPSP or (preferably) at the journal level.

Long-term vision

In some cases, a sustainability plan is required and assessed, i.e. a strategy for the medium-term economic viability of the journal is described on the website; and/or OA sustainability through cooperative work schemes and a horizontal distribution to cover costs is outlined. Some funders require a detailed financial plan, plus a detailed financial report for the previous year at the application stage.

Some other good practices include the following:



- a) use time-limited funds only for time-limited activities and avoid operations being dependent on grants;
- b) have a goal to create a contingency fund to support operations for at least 12 months;
- c) maintain mission-consistent revenue generation and revenue based on services, rather than on the commodification of content and data.

The IPSP should develop greater awareness of the structure of their resources and costs, as well as of the role of volunteer work and open infrastructures and other data that might inform funders of their value, as used by [SCOSS](#) for example. IPSPs should ideally be funded by general contributions from universities and research funders, with these contributions not tied to individual articles or groups of authors:

“Open science infrastructures should be organised and financed upon an essentially not-for-profit and long-term vision, which enhance open science practices and guarantee permanent and unrestricted access to all, to the largest extent possible.”

“Supported and maintained by an academic institution, scholarly society, government agency or other well established not-for-profit organisation devoted to common good”

4.2 Ownership and governance

Transparent ownership structure and community governance

The IPSP should have a transparent ownership structure, and should be controlled by and responsive to the scholarly community. This means that a controlling scholarly organisation, not a commercial publisher, should own the journal title, so that a change of the service provider can be achieved without changing the title. IPSPs should be careful when entering into different contracts in order not to lose control over the journal title.

Strategic governance should allow community input on the direction of the publishing service and operational governance with community representation and decision making power. A transparent ownership structure promotes a democratic approach which includes representation of the community of readers, authors, reviewers, and editors. The community, and not just the IPSP leadership itself, should collectively drive strategic directions.

There is a recurring, strong recommendation that the governing organisation should be fully non-profit: “The open, academy-owned, non-profit, non-subordinate, without charges for publication or processing, sustainable, and with responsible metrics publishing model ought to be strengthened.” (AmeliCA Principles and Values’)



Information about the IPSP ownership and management should be clearly indicated on the website, i.e. “the publisher name must be clearly defined, and a verifiable, physical address (not P.O. Box) for the publisher’s business offices must be provided. If there is a society affiliation or ownership, this should be stated, and verifiable contact information must be provided.” (‘Web of Science Journal Evaluation Process and Selection Criteria’ 2022); “clear definition of governance institutions, their objectives, relationships and ways of functioning” (‘Exemplarity Criteria for Funding from the National Open Science Fund through Platforms, Infrastructures and Editorial Content’ 2019).

There should be direct lines of communication with the IPSP, owner, and any publication oversight body. Full contact details should be specified: a full name of contact, full name of the publishing institution or organisation, city and country of publication, institutional email, i.e. “the name of the journal’s publishing body or institution, which must be in good academic standing, as well as its full postal and e-mail address, must be provided in a visible place on the journal.” (‘Latindex - Sistema regional de información en línea para Revistas científicas de América Latina, el Caribe, España y Portugal: Metodología del Catálogo 2.0’ 2022)

The composition and constitution of the journal's/platform's editorial bodies should be defined and publicly displayed: the names, functions and roles of all members of the editorial team; as well as the names of the members of the Editorial Board and their affiliations. PIDs (such as ORCID) and links to institutional profiles may be provided to specify the identity and affiliation of the editorial staff.

Procedures for the selection of members of the governance and editorial bodies should be open and publicly available. A regular renewal of editorial bodies is recommended, i.e. the editor or editor-in-chief of the journal should have a term of service of four to five years (some recommend it to be renewable only once); all members of the journal bodies should also have a limited term of service. Editorial boards should consist of at least five people and include members from different institutions and preferably from different cities and countries as well (or there should be another international body - e.g. international editorial committee).

Organisational names should not be used in a way that could mislead potential authors and editors about the nature of the journal’s owner. If a journal is affiliated with a society, institution, or sponsor, links to their website(s) should be provided where available.

Editorial freedom



Editorial freedom is another important element: editors-in-chief have full authority over the entire editorial content of their journal and the timing of publication of that content. Editors and IPSPs, sponsoring societies, or journal owners should have signed contracts to ensure proper editorial freedom and responsibility. To secure editorial freedom in practice, the editor should have direct access to the highest level of journal ownership, not to a delegated manager or administrative officer. Journal owners should not interfere in the evaluation, selection, scheduling, or editing of individual articles either directly or by creating an environment that strongly influences decisions.

Mission, aims and scope

Information about the journal's/IPSP's mission (a journal/IPSP mission statement), aims and scope should be publicly available on the website as well as the languages in which manuscripts can be submitted.

Content ownership

Reviewers should 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).

Relations between authors and the publishing entity taking the intellectual responsibility for the publication content should be regulated and formalised (i.e. in the form of a contract and the licensing policy).

Authors should be allowed to retain copyright without restriction.

Relationship between the editor and the IPSP

The editor and the IPSP should confer about any political, commercial, or other incidents that could impair the scientific credibility of the publication and should agree to measures necessary to ensure that such incidents do not affect the decisions of the editor.

General Terms and Conditions of the use of the infrastructure or platform

The General Terms and Conditions of the use of the infrastructure or platform should be publicly displayed.

Environmental policy

It is a good practice for an IPSP to have a written environmental policy. The scope and scale of the policy will depend on the size and nature of the organisation, from a couple of short paragraphs to a major strategy. Each initiative, for instance actions to reduce single



use plastic, or schemes to enable workers to work from home, should be monitored and its effectiveness evaluated. The policy should be reviewed regularly, with the goal of gradually improving environmental performance. Consider instituting restricted printing allocation to reduce unnecessary printing (Mertens and Brown 2021).

4.3 Open science practices

Good open science practices include clear open science/OA policies:

- a) rights retention and content reuse;
- b) good data sharing practices following FAIR principles;
- c) experimenting with open peer review;
- d) supporting preprints sharing;
- e) publishing negative results;
- f) enabling open citations;
- g) making other research outputs related to publications - such as software, source code, source materials, workflows and protocols, digital representations of pictorial and graphical materials and scholarly multimedia material openly available in a suitable open repository, following appropriate technical standards that allow them to be properly linked to in publications; and supporting research assessment reform. (‘UNESCO Recommendation on Open Science’ 2021)

Open access and open science policies

An adequate OA policy, in line with UNESCO’s recommendations, should grant “an irrevocable right of access to copy, use, distribute, transmit and make derivative works in any format within certain constraints”, as the best way to protect universal access to information and knowledge for development.

Following a national, institutional, and/or funder Open Science/OA policy is a good practice.

Copyright, Intellectual Property Rights and licensing

IPSPs should provide complete information to authors and readers on IPR aspects, allowing them to retain copyright, and use Creative Common licences (e.g. CC-BY) to ensure reuse of publications.

IPSPs should commit to a patent non-assertion covenant. The organisation may obtain patents to protect its own operations, but not use them to prevent the community from replicating the infrastructure.



Research data sharing and data availability policies

IPSPs should include policies on data availability and encourage the use of reporting guidelines and registration of clinical trials and other study designs according to standard practice in their discipline. Data underlying publications should be 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 should be made available under FAIR principles with necessary metadata. Exceptions to data sharing are justified when it comes to personal and sensitive data, when no consent has been obtained for sharing, for reasons of protection of intellectual property, or to avoid revealing endangered areas, groups or species. In these cases, it is possible to share the data in an anonymised manner, or under conditions of controlled and regulated access. Exceptions and specifics for access to data should be explained by the author in the accompanying Data Availability Statement and publicly available metadata.

Open peer review

Open peer review is one of the recommended open science practices: “Promoting, as appropriate, open peer review evaluation practices including possible disclosure of the identity of the reviewers, publicly available reviews and the possibility for a broader community to provide comments and participate in the assessment process.” (‘UNESCO Recommendation on Open Science’ 2021)

Preprints

IPSPs should allow posting of manuscripts in preprint repositories: “Promoting open science from the outset of the research process and extending the principles of openness in all stages of the scientific process to improve quality and reproducibility, including the encouragement of community-driven collaboration and other innovative models, for example preprints, and respecting the diversity of scientific practices, in order to accelerate dissemination and encourage rapid growth in knowledge.” (‘UNESCO Recommendation on Open Science’ 2021)

Publication and sharing of negative scientific results

“Encouraging and valuing publication and sharing of negative scientific results and those that do not conform to the results expected by the researchers who carried them out, and data associated with them, as these results also contribute to the advancement of scientific knowledge.” (‘UNESCO Recommendation on Open Science’ 2021)

Research protocols and methods sharing and publishing

Making associated research protocols and methods available is a good open science practice that allows others to replicate and build on work published.



Open research software

IPSPs should encourage the sharing of research software available through an open repository.

Open citations, open abstracts, open metadata

Bibliographic references should be openly available according to the standards of the Initiative for Open Citations (I4OC). The aim of this initiative is to promote the availability of data on citations that are structured, separable, and open - freely accessible and reusable. IPSPs should join initiatives supporting the exchange of open metadata, such as I4OC and the Initiative for Open Abstracts (I4OA), and make sure that the metadata provided via commonly used metadata exchange protocols are available under the CC0 Public Domain Dedication.

TOP guidelines (Transparency and Openness Promotion)

TOP Guidelines include eight modular standards: 1) Citation standards, 2) Data transparency, 3) Analytic methods (code) transparency, 4) Research materials transparency, 5) Design and analysis transparency, 6) Study preregistration, 7) Analysis plan preregistration and 8) Replication, each with three levels of increasing stringency: Disclosure - the article must disclose whether or not materials are available; Requirement - the article must share materials when possible; Verification - third party must verify that the standard is being met. Journals select which of the eight transparency standards they wish to implement for transparency and reproducibility in published research and select a level of implementation for each. These features provide flexibility for adoption depending on disciplinary variation, but simultaneously establish community standards.

Journal policies can be evaluated based on the degree to which they comply with the TOP Guidelines - TOP factor, which is a metric that reports the steps that a journal is taking to implement open science practices. It helps to assess journal qualities, and is an improvement over traditional metrics that measure mean citation rates.

Incentives and rewards

IPSPs could play a role in research assessment reform:

“Combining efforts of many different stakeholders, including research funders, universities, research institutions, publishers and editors, and scientific societies across disciplines and countries, to change the current research culture and to recognize researchers for sharing, collaborating and engaging with other researchers and society,



and to support, in particular, early-career researchers in particular to drive this cultural change”;

“Encouraging funders, research institutions, journal editorial boards, learned societies and publishers to adopt policies that require and reward open access to scientific knowledge, including scientific publications, open research data, open software, source code and open hardware” (‘UNESCO Recommendation on Open Science’ 2021)

4.4 Editorial quality, editorial management and research integrity

IPSP’s editorial policies and procedures, including its procedures for evaluating submissions, should be transparent and outlined in the guidelines for authors and reviewers.

Transparency of publishing timelines

- a) The IPSP should state its publishing timelines (where appropriate, the number of issues it will publish per year, or the declaration of continuous publication), including the time required for peer review.
- b) Observe reasonable response time to authors and reasonable publication time (i.e., no more than 4 months for peer-review and 6 to 12 months for publication) - editors are responsible for monitoring the turnaround time for every publishing stage from manuscript receipt to publication or rejection.
- c) Publications should be published on time according to the declared publication timelines.
- d) The publication date (year) declared on the publication should be the actual date when the publication became available online.

Transparency of policies and guidelines

- a) Editor roles and responsibilities (towards authors, reviewers, readers and the scientific community, journal and platform owners, IPSPs, public) should be clearly described, but at the very least editor roles include the selection of reviewers for the papers assigned to them, providing the authors with advice on how to improve their paper, and negotiating disagreements between authors and reviewers. These crucial aspects of the peer review process cannot be left to publication technicians or AI.
- b) Written editorial policies, including a written job description, specifically detailing components of editorial freedom, including the degree of control regarding editorial content, acceptance and publication, and advertising content; a mechanism to prevent inappropriate influence on the editor by others and to handle



conflicts in an objective and transparent manner with the goal of conflict resolution and maintenance of trust.

- c) The IPSP should have a policy on publication ethics (for example, [COPE's Core Practice guidance](#)), addressing [authorship and contributorship](#), handling [complaints and appeals](#), handling [allegations of research misconduct](#), [conflicts of interest](#), [data sharing and reproducibility](#), [ethical oversight](#), [intellectual property](#), [post-publication discussions](#), [corrections and retractions](#). Policies should address plagiarism, citation manipulation, and data falsification/fabrication, among others.
- d) The IPSP should provide publicly available clear and detailed author guidelines. Clear policies that allow for transparency around who contributed to the work and in what capacity should be in place for requirements for authorship and contributorship, as well as processes for managing potential disputes, applying the [CRediT taxonomy](#). Full names and affiliations of each author/contributor should be displayed; author information should be complete and unambiguous, and name abbreviations are not recommended.
- e) The IPSP should have a policy regarding chatbots and other writing assistance tools to help authors understand how the use of chatbots might be attributed in their work. The IPSP should require authors to declare whether chatbots or other writing assistance tools were used in writing their outputs, and inform them that chatbots do not meet authorship criteria and cannot be considered authors. Authors should be considered responsible for the work performed by writing assistance tools. Authors must be able to assert the accuracy of the content, that there is no plagiarism, that all sources of information used by writing assistance tools are appropriately cited, and that relevant views omitted by chatbots are found, reviewed and included in the output (Zielinski et al. 2023).
- f) Criteria for the acceptance of papers, books, preprints, and other contributions should be clearly defined and displayed on the website of the IPSP or at the journal level.
- g) The IPSP should allow for deposit of the "Version of Record" or the "Publisher Version" in repositories.
- h) The most open licence possible (i.e. Creative Commons Attribution CC-BY) should be used.
- i) Metrics based on bibliometric data should be used responsibly, avoiding misleading implications regarding their connection with the quality of the published content. The IPSP should focus on the quality of the published content, avoid promoting inappropriate metrics like the Journal Impact Factor, and strive to diversify indicators improving the quality of editorial work and alignment with Open Science practices (e.g. [Open Science Badges](#), preregistration, reporting guidelines, open peer review, usage of persistent identifiers, alternative metrics). A data publication



policy stipulating "data papers", data sharing guidelines, or joint deposition of publications and data in a repository should be publicly available. Check the [re3data](#) registry of data repositories to find appropriate repositories for your discipline.

- j) The IPSP should have a publicly displayed archival, digital preservation policy, which is consistently implemented.
- k) Environmental sustainability: in light of the climate and ecological crises, IPSPs should actively take steps to advocate for and implement strategies to promote environmentally sustainable behaviour and research and mainstream these ideas into their respective fields (i.e. by inviting articles that deal with the consequences of environmental change within their discipline, or by publishing special, themed issues that tackle aspects of sustainability)(Mertens and Brown 2021).
- l) Compliance with the [GDPR](#) and relevant regulations should be clearly stated and ensured.
- m) Readers' roles and responsibilities should be stated (citing, using the content according to the licence, etc.).
- n) Policies and guidelines should be regularly reviewed and updated and the date of the last update should be publicly available and embedded in the policies and guidelines.

Quality assurance

- a) Quality assurance measures of the IPSP should be transparently described on the website.
- b) Established procedures to ensure good scientific practice before, during and after publication should be in place, and appropriate contact persons on this topic should be appointed.
- c) Compliance with generally accepted reporting guidelines (i.e. [SRQR](#), [CONSORT](#), [PRISMA](#)) and adherence to bibliographic standards adopted for citations and bibliographic references to other texts, research data, methods and computer software should be ensured.
- d) A mechanism for regular and objective evaluation of editor performance by the IPSP based on predetermined and agreed-upon measures of success should be established. Accurate and verified involvement of the editorial board, advisory board, and any other committees associated with the journal should be ensured.

Rigorous, timely, transparent and ongoing peer review

- a) Reviewer roles and responsibilities should be clearly described. A review framework and guidelines are provided to reviewers and published on the journal website with the process outline and evaluation criteria.



- b) Except for preprints, manuscripts should be subject to evaluation by more than one person, preferably one of the forms of anonymised peer review (reviewer identity is not made visible to author, author identity is not made visible to reviewer, reviewer and author identity is visible to (decision-making) editor) or [open peer review](#) (Ross-Hellauer 2017) by at least two reviewers.
- c) Peer reviewers should be external. Handling editors cannot at the same time be peer reviewers of the papers they are handling. Conflicts of interests between authors, editors, and reviewers (e.g. working at the same institution, previous co-authorships, hierarchical dependencies) should be avoided.
- d) Endogeneity (i.e. papers being reviewed by a closed circle of people who are well acquainted with each other or work in the same institution) should be minimised. The IPSP should strive to minimise the share of publications where at least one of the authors is an editor, editorial board member or reviewer. According to some guidelines, it should not exceed 20%. Other guidelines also set a minimum of the published works that should come from authors who are external to the publishing entity (from one third to at least 50%).
- e) It is recommended to introduce various types of reviewer recognition and rewards, i.e. by publishing annually and/or making publicly available a list of reviewers (updated at least once a year). Additionally, a journal peer review system can be configured to solicit permission to share review data and export it in the reviewer recognition services, e.g. Publons.
- f) Dates of submission and acceptance should be displayed on publications - at least basic statistics should be published annually on the website, covering in particular the number of submissions, the number of reviews requested, the number of reviews received, the approval rate, and the average time between submission and publication.
- g) The IPSP and/or the editorial team should maintain the registry of submitted manuscripts, the archive of author statements, reviewer guidelines, list of reviewers and the registry of peer-review reports. It is recommended to employ open/transparent peer review and publish review reports in open access whenever possible. Reviewers should be allowed to self-archive the reports in the open access repository or reviewers' recognition service.
- h) The IPSP and/ or the editorial team should have a policy in place to address complaints and appeals regarding rejected manuscripts and withdrawn and retracted publications - and help resolve these issues.
- i) The IPSP should provide training for editors and reviewers and share training materials (i.e., by making them publicly available). Participation in different workshops, webinars and conferences should be encouraged.



Research integrity:

- a) The IPSP should describe the standards or codes of ethics it uses, which may be international, institutional or its own.
- b) Ethical oversight should include, but should not be limited to, policies on consent to publication, publication on vulnerable populations, ethical conduct of research using animals, ethical conduct of research using human subjects, preregistration of the study, handling confidential data and ethical business/marketing practices.
- c) Research integrity control procedures ("similarity checks", checks for falsification and fabrication of data, image manipulation, etc.) should be in place, and responsible reporting guidelines should be provided to authors to enable reproducibility, replicability and repeatability of the published research results. Editors and IPSPs are responsible for ensuring the integrity of the scholarly literature in their publications and should ensure they outline their policies and procedures for handling such issues when they arise. These issues include plagiarism, citation manipulation, and data falsification/fabrication, among others.
- d) Institutional Research Integrity plans should also include journal publishing, and adequately trained research ethics committees could provide support to journal editors and IPSPs.
- e) Authors, reviewers and editorial staff are required to provide transparent declarations of conflict of interests, and editorial staff should ensure that conflicts of interests are handled adequately, following journal policies and guidelines and standardised procedures, such as correction or retraction of papers, sanctioning of researchers who engage in misconduct, and appropriate steps towards prevention in the future.
- f) Citation manipulation: stakeholders in the peer-review and editorial process should be alerted to citation manipulation and bring concerns to the attention of the editor, IPSP, or other accountable parties.
- g) Editors have a responsibility to maintain the integrity of the literature by publishing errata or corrections identifying anything of significance, retractions, and expressions of concern as quickly as possible; and consider publication versioning, with a clear description of what has been changed.
- h) The IPSP should have guidelines to help authors, editors, and reviewers recognise the use of language and images that are inclusive and culturally sensitive (e.g. following the [Guidelines on Inclusive Language and Images in Scholarly Communication](#))

Readers feedback and post publication discussions

- a) IPSPs should allow for debate to take place post publication, either on their site, through letters to the editor, or on an external moderated site, such as PubPeer.



They should have mechanisms for correcting, revising or retracting published outputs after publication. Publishing new versions of the publications should be encouraged. Editors are responsible for screening discourteous, inaccurate, or libellous comments.

- b) The Red Flag system, implemented by Octopus ('Frequently Asked Questions' n.d.), is one example of a reader feedback system for raising concerns if they suspect plagiarism, copyright issues, ethical or scientific misconduct (with explanatory comments to explain their concerns to the authors and other readers). Each red flag generates an automated email to all the publication's authors, who will be able to respond to the issues raised through the platform. The reader who raised the red flag can also remove it, once they feel the issue has been resolved.

4.5 Technical service efficiency

The best practice recommendations regarding technical service efficiency found in the analysed documents address two aspects: i) use by humans ii) semantic and technical interoperability; and three levels: the infrastructure level (publishing platform), the journal or book level, and the article (or book chapter) level.

The publishing infrastructure should:

- a) support online publishing workflows;
- b) be continuously developed and regularly updated to conform to current interoperability standards and open science principles;
- c) support widely adopted metadata formats for harvesting (e.g. Dublin Core, OpenAIRE, etc.) and provide metadata;
- d) be preferably based on free and open-source software, with publicly available code; the IPSP should also strive to use free and open-source software as much as possible in its editorial and publishing workflows;
- e) support metadata exchange protocols (OAI-PMH, APIs) and indicate which interoperability protocol is used and how to access it;
- f) ensure compliance with international interoperability standards (OpenAIRE Guidelines, KBART, COUNTER) to allow for greater discoverability;
- g) support massive metadata export (as CSV files, ONIX XML feeds or in any other established format);
- h) support HTML meta tags for published items;
- i) support text and data mining (automatic downloading, extraction and indexing of the full texts and the associated metadata) and state this in the relevant policy;
- j) provide MARC records to libraries;
- k) enable easy content migration;



- l) have basic functionalities (searching, browsing, navigation, offer formatted citations in multiple citation formats [styles], etc.) and a user friendly interface, in line with the needs of researchers, as the main audience;
- m) be aligned with the W3C Web Content Accessibility Guidelines (WCAG);
- n) support usage statistics (visits and downloads), as well as integration with altmetric services (Altmetric, PlumX, etc.).

The owners of the infrastructure should ensure technical support and maintenance, protection from viruses and malware. IPSPs should provide training for the editorial and publishing staff. Creating an interface adjusted to a low bandwidth and using https instead of http is also recommended.

The online edition of a journal or a book should:

- a) have a dedicated URL and a publicly accessible homepage;
- b) have a unique URL (landing page) and persistent identifier (preferably DOI) per article (or chapter);
- c) assign and indicate appropriate standard identifiers (ISSN, eISSN, ISBN, DOI, etc.);
- d) have dedicated “about” (non-article) pages displaying information about aims and scope, target audience, ownership and governance, contact information, all relevant policies and reviewer guidelines, descriptions of editorial procedures, licensing and copyright terms; the date is indicated when these pages were last updated;
- e) support content publishing and archiving in at least one digital file format suitable for preservation;
- f) be regularly backed up;
- g) have complete metadata about publications regularly deposited in a registration agency (e.g. CrossRef);
- h) have content deposited in a digital preservation service (LOCKSS, CLOCKSS, Portico, etc.);
- i) provide a table of contents or a structure that allows direct access to articles/chapters in as few clicks as possible.

An article/ chapter should:

- a) have a landing page containing all relevant metadata (title, full names and institutional affiliations – including country/region – of all contributing authors, abstracts and keywords, funding information provided 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.);



- b) have a bibliographic letterhead in the full text of each article, on the title page, including the name of the journal/book, ISSN, eISSN (or ISBN) volume and issue, period covered by the issue indicating months and years;
- c) have titles, abstracts and keywords (preferably use controlled subject specific vocabularies) available in the original language of the paper and in a second language (most commonly, if the original language is not English, this information should also be available in English) in human and machine readable formats;
- d) indicate persistent identifiers for authors and contributors (ORCID), author affiliations (ROR), and funding organisations (Funder DOIs when available) and other relevant persistent identifiers;
- e) use CRediT tags to indicate contributions of the authors and make this information machine-readable ([coded in JATS xml v1.2.](#));
- f) the conflict-of-interest statements within articles should be [captured in the metadata using JATS XML v1.2.](#)
- g) provide complete and reliable machine-readable information on funding (including as a minimum the name of the funder and the grant number/identifier);
- h) provide machine readable information about the open access status, copyright holder and licensing embedded in the article in a standard non-proprietary format;
- i) have bibliographic references deposited in a registration agency (e.g. CrossRef);
- j) contain high resolution figures and well-constructed tables, annotated and easy to read and interpret;
- k) provide links to data, code, and other research outputs, including preprints, that underlie the publication and are available in external repositories;
- l) provide full-text content in multiple file formats (PDF, HTML, XML, ePub, etc.) and have the full text tagged in the XML JATS format;
- m) ensure that the W3C Web Content Accessibility Guidelines are implemented in all full-text formats.

4.6 Visibility, indexation, communication, marketing and impact

The issues related to visibility, communication, marketing and impact are addressed in diverse ways and are given different weights in documents of different types.

There is an agreement that unhindered and reliable communication and dissemination of content to academia and society at large is crucial to visibility. Content dissemination is closely related to the technical aspects of interoperability (metadata standards, exchange protocols, etc.) and Open Science practices (open metadata, licences), discussed above.



All the information provided by the IPSP, already listed in the previous sections, should be truthful to avoid misinterpretation and misinformation. Any marketing activities should be carried out responsibly.

Where relevant, it is recommended to implement impact statements and/or simple-language abstracts alongside published content that can be understood by a general audience and allow authors to emphasise the intention and importance of their work. It is also recommended to provide translations of publications potentially interesting for non-academic audiences to the local language or, at least, to summarise their results in blog posts, social media posts and the like.

Assessment guidelines put forward the following general recommendations:

- a) Being included in abstracting and indexing services relevant for the target audiences; inclusion in the Directory of Open Access Journals (DOAJ) is particularly highlighted;
- b) Using a comprehensive array of usage and impact indicators, while avoiding misinterpretation and taking into account the various discipline-specific dynamics to generate and circulate knowledge, especially as regards Social Sciences and Humanities;
- c) Internationalisation of publications and IPSPs (by increasing the diversity of authors and editors) is promoted as a way to reach out to a wider and more diverse audience, consequently increasing the visibility and impact of published outputs;
- d) IPSPs should provide access to all content, including the backfile content.
- e) Having an operational plan for marketing and dissemination. IPSPs are expected to disseminate new research on the most relevant social networks.
- f) IPSPs should encourage and support dissemination of scientific information through scientific journalism and media, popularisation of science, open lectures and various social media communications. To avoid misinterpretation and dissemination of misinformation, the quality and appropriate citation of original sources of information should be ensured.
- g) IPSPs should help the media prepare accurate reports by providing news releases, answering questions, supplying advance copies of the article, or referring reporters to appropriate experts.

Metrics should be used responsibly. Platforms should not exclude publications, or categorise them into tiers based on their tracked usage, outreach and impact. Inclusion in other indexes should not be a requirement for inclusion in a platform.



4.7 Equity, Diversity and Inclusion (EDI): multilingualism, gender equity

In the literature that has been surveyed, Diversity, Equality and Inclusion best practice is seen to cut across the themes of stakeholders, governance, the IPSP and journal website and its content/metadata, decision-making around content, and the promotion of diversity in open science practices.

Stakeholders

The literature promotes the necessity of a diversity of stakeholders, in terms of authors, members of editorial boards (and any supporting committees), peer reviewers, and journal staff. This diversity should be seen in terms of the pluralism of the stakeholders' linguistic, cultural, academic, geographical, institutional, economic backgrounds. There is also a specific and explicit emphasis on mainstreaming gender equality. The IPSP should define gender policies regarding the composition of editorial staff and boards and policies that strive for gender balance among peer reviewers. The IPSP should promote systematic reporting of sex and gender in research in line with the SAGER guidelines (Epps et al. 2022) and provide instructions for authors that require or encourage disaggregation of data by sex or gender when feasible, as well as guidelines requiring reviewers to assess manuscripts for inclusion of sex-disaggregated data and gender analysis.

Governance - Good practices and documentation/visibility

In the literature, it is evident that EDI should be actively promoted and visibly displayed so that practices are transparent.

There is specific guidance from the **CSE** ('Editorial Policies' n.d.) on:

- a) Developing EDI guidelines
- b) Publishing intentional statements
- c) Collecting demographic data
- d) Acknowledging progress, and missteps

The type of data that should be collected and made available includes (amongst other potential statistics) the following:

- a) share of references to journal articles
- b) share of references to publications in international languages
- c) share of international authors



- d) share of international reviewers
- e) share of contributions authored by members of editorial bodies
- f) share of articles in international languages

Another key reference source for specific EDI practice is the EDI Toolkit for Journal Editors ('Equity, Diversity and Inclusion Toolkit for Journal Editors' 2021).

Inclusive/Accessible website, content and metadata

There are many references in the literature to language being an important component of EDI practices. In particular, there is a requirement for a minimum of 2 languages to be included, but with a preference for a multilingual website and content. Metadata should at least also be available in English when the language of the text is not English. The information given on the site should be the same in all languages. Regarding the content of the publications etc, the language used should also be inclusive and cover a pluralism of topics, with international coverage. Attention should be paid to the accessibility of the content, with all images and tables in articles and on the website having a description for the visually impaired.

Decision-making on content

Good practice in decision-making concerning content is that it should be made without regard to the race, gender, age, sexual orientation, religious belief, ethnic origin, citizenship, or the political philosophy of the authors, reviewers and editors.

Open Science practices

The literature recommends enabling collaboration and diversity across the entire spectrum of the research community – as open science should embrace diversity. Open access to the record of science for authors and readers means ensuring that there are no barriers to participation. Practices that promote bibliodiversity are also emphasised.

5. Checklist

5.1 Funding

- a) Do you have a clearly described open access policy indicating the fulfilment of funders requirements (where relevant)?
- b) Do you have a clearly described open access business model?



- c) Do you indicate on the homepage your funding sources, in case you receive funds from outside the publishing institution?
- d) Do authors disclose financial conflicts of interest (i.e., in the Conflict of Interest statement in the manuscript)?
- e) Do authors disclose all sources of funding (i.e., in the Funding acknowledgements/statements)?
- f) Do you have formal, explicit, written policies for advertising in both print and electronic versions?
- g) Do you have information on the website that you don't charge Article Processing Charges (APCs) and/or Book Processing Charges (BPCs)? In case you are charging Voluntary Author Contributions (VAC), is this information publicly available on your website? Are the amounts and the structure of costs transparently stated?
- h) Do you have a clear breakdown of the structure of your resources and costs, including the role of volunteer work?
- i) Do you have a sustainability plan?

5.2 Ownership and governance

- a) Is information about your ownership structure publicly available?
- b) Is there a legal document that describes the activities?
- c) Is there a document that stipulates the governance structure?
- d) Does your strategic governance allow community input on the direction of the publishing service and operational governance with community representation and decision making power?
- e) Is information about the ownership and management clearly indicated on the website?
- f) How easy is it to identify and contact the IPSP? Is the IPSP name clearly displayed on the website? Can one contact the IPSP by telephone, email, and post?
- g) Are the composition and constitution of the editorial bodies defined and publicly displayed (i.e. with the editorial team names, functions and roles; Editorial Board affiliations)?
- h) Are procedures for the selection of members of the governance and editorial bodies open and publicly available?
- i) Is there a regular renewal of editorial bodies?
- j) Do editors-in-chief have full authority over the entire editorial content of their journal and the timing of publication of that content?
- k) Do you display information about the mission (i.e. in a journal mission statement), aims and scope on the website?
- l) Do reviewers retain copyright of their reviews?



- m) Is ownership of all correspondence and mailing lists in the hands of a scholarly organisation?
- n) Do you regulate relations between authors and the publishing entity for the content (i.e. in the form of a contract and the licensing policy)?
- o) Are authors allowed to retain copyright without restriction?
- p) Do you publicly display the General Terms and Conditions of the use of the infrastructure or platform?
- q) Do you have a written environmental policy?

5.3 Open science practices

- a) Do you have a clear open access policy?
- b) Who owns copyright on contributions? Is there any transfer or granting of rights?
- c) Are authors and readers well informed about IPR?
- d) Are authors allowed to retain copyright?
- e) Do you use the Creative Common licences (e.g. CC-BY and/or CC-BY-SA)?
- f) Do you have policies on data availability and encourage the use of reporting guidelines?
- g) Do you promote and experiment with open peer review (including the potential disclosure of the identity of reviewers, publicly available reviews, and the ability for a broader community to participate in the review process)?
- h) Do you allow posting manuscripts in preprint repositories?
- i) Do you accept manuscripts presenting and discussing negative scientific results (and those that do not meet the expected results)?
- j) Do you publish/make available the research protocols and methods?
- k) Do you encourage sharing of research software?
- l) Are your bibliographic references openly available, structured, separable, freely accessible and reusable? Are you aligned with the Initiative for Open Citations (I4OC) and the Initiative for Open Abstracts (I4OA)?
- m) Do you adhere to the TOP Guidelines of Promotion of Transparency and Openness? If you do, to which standard/s: Citation standards, Data transparency, Analytic methods (code) transparency, Research materials transparency, Design and analysis transparency, Study preregistration, Analysis plan pre-registration, and Replication? And to which level of increasing stringency - Disclosure, Requirement, or Verification?
- n) Do you participate in or support research assessment reform?

5.4 Editorial quality, editorial management and research integrity

- a) Do editors monitor the turnaround time for every publishing stage from manuscript receipt to publication or rejection to ensure a reasonable response time to authors and reasonable publication time?
- b) Are editor roles and responsibilities (towards authors, reviewers, readers and the scientific community, journal owners/IPSPs, public) clearly described?
- c) Do you have written editorial policies, including a written job description, specifically detailing components of editorial freedom, including the degree of control regarding editorial content, acceptance and publication, and advertising content; a mechanism to prevent inappropriate influence on the editor by others and to handle conflicts in an objective and transparent manner with the goal of conflict resolution and maintenance of trust?
- d) Do you have a policy on publication ethics (for example, [COPE's Core Practice guidance](#)), addressing [authorship and contributorship](#), handling [complaints and appeals](#), handling [allegations of research misconduct](#), [conflicts of interest](#), [data sharing and reproducibility](#), [ethical oversight](#), [intellectual property](#), [post-publication discussions](#), [corrections and retractions](#)? Do these policies address plagiarism, citation manipulation, and data falsification/fabrication, among others?
- e) Do you provide publicly available clear and detailed author guidelines?
- f) Do you have clear policies on authorship and contributorship, which also address chatbots and other writing assistance tools? Do you apply the CRediT taxonomy? Do you display the full names and affiliations of each author/contributor? Do you have complete and unambiguous author information supported by the author's persistent identifiers (ORCID)?
- g) Do you have defined criteria for acceptance of manuscripts, preprints and other contributions?
- h) Do you allow the deposit of the "Version of Record" or the "Publisher Version" in repositories?
- i) Do you use the preferred open licence for journal articles (CC-BY), and other types of CC licences for book publications?
- j) Do you have a data publication policy stipulating "data papers", data sharing guidelines or joint deposition of publications and data in a repository?
- k) Do you have an archival, digital preservation policy and do you implement it?
- l) Do you indicate compliance with the GDPR in the journal website?
- m) Do you regularly review and update your policies and guidelines?
- n) Do you describe your quality assurance measures on the website?



- o) Do you have established procedures to ensure responsible scientific practice before, during and after publication? Have you appointed appropriate contact persons on this topic?
- p) Do you comply with generally accepted reporting guidelines and adhere to bibliographic standards adopted for citations and bibliographic references to other texts, research data, methods and computer software?
- q) Do you have a mechanism for regular and objective evaluation of editor performance by the IPSP based on predetermined and agreed-upon measures of success?
- r) Do you have clearly defined reviewer roles and responsibilities? Do you provide a review framework to reviewers and do you publish it on the journal website with the process outline and evaluation criteria?
- s) Do you practise one of the forms of anonymised peer review or open peer review by at least two reviewers? Do you publish review reports? Do you have any other form of evaluation of submissions by more than one person, and is this transparently specified on your website?
- t) Do you take care of reviewers' recognition and awards? Do you publish the names of reviewers annually and/or do you have a publicly available list of reviewers (updated at least once a year)?
- u) Do you display dates of submission and acceptance on published articles? Do you publish at least basic statistics annually on the journal/platform website, covering in particular the number of submissions, the number of reviews requested, the number of reviews received, the approval rate, and the average time between submission and publication?
- v) Does the editorial team maintain the registry of submitted papers, the archive of author statements, reviewer guidelines, list of reviewers and the registry of peer-review reports?
- w) Do you have a policy in place to address complaints and appeals for rejected or withdrawn manuscripts?
- x) Do you provide training for editors and reviewers? Do you share your training materials?
- y) Do you describe the standards or codes of ethics you use?
- z) Do you have research integrity control procedures (e.g. similarity check)? Do you provide responsible reporting guidelines to authors to enable reproducibility of published works?
- aa) Do your institutional Research Integrity plans include journal publishing? Are there adequately trained research ethics committees who could provide support to journal editors and IPSPs?

- bb) Are authors, reviewers and editorial staff required to provide transparent declarations of conflict of interests?
- cc) Do editors maintain the integrity of the literature by publishing errata or corrections identifying anything of significance, retractions, expressions of concern and new versions of the publication as quickly as possible?
- dd) Do you have sponsor roles and responsibilities described, as well as relations between editors and IPSPs, sponsoring societies, or journal owners?
- ee) Do you allow debate post publication either on the journal site, through letters to the editor, or on an external moderated site, such as PubPeer?
- ff) Do you have mechanisms for correcting, revising or retracting articles after publication?

5.5 Technical Service Efficiency

- a) Does the publishing infrastructure you are using/providing support online publishing workflows?
- b) Is the publishing infrastructure you are using/providing regularly updated to conform to the current interoperability standards and open science principles?
- c) Is the publishing infrastructure you are using/providing based on open-source software?
- d) Is the publishing infrastructure you are using/providing interoperable (using widely adopted metadata standards and protocols for harvesting; supporting HTML meta tags and massive metadata export for published outputs, providing MARC records to libraries, if relevant)?
- e) Is content migration enabled on the publishing infrastructure you are using/providing?
- f) Is the publishing infrastructure you are using/providing supplied with basic functionalities (searching, browsing, navigation, formatted citations in multiple citation formats [styles], etc.) and a user friendly interface, in line with the needs of researchers, as the main audience? Is the user interface adjusted to low bandwidths?
- g) Is the publishing infrastructure you are using/providing aligned with the W3C Web Content Accessibility Guidelines (WCAG)? Are the full-text formats aligned with these Guidelines?
- h) Are text and data mining (automatic downloading, extraction and indexing of the full texts and the associated metadata) supported on the publishing infrastructure you are using/providing and is this clearly stated in the relevant policy?



- i) Does the publishing infrastructure you are using/providing provide usage statistics (visits and downloads) and is it integrated with altmetric services (e.g. Altmetric, PlumX)?
- j) Are technical support and maintenance, protection from viruses and malware, backing up, etc. ensured for the publishing infrastructure you are using/providing?
- k) Do you provide training on using the publishing platform to relevant stakeholders?
- l) Does each journal/book and article/chapter have a unique landing page (URL) and relevant persistent identifier (ISSN, ISBN, DOI) and are persistent identifiers clearly indicated?
- m) Are dedicated “about” (non-article) pages displaying information about aims and scope, target audience, ownership and governance, contact information, all relevant policies and reviewer guidelines, descriptions of editorial procedures, licensing and copyright terms provided for each journal/book? Is the date when these pages were last updated provided?
- n) Is publishing and archiving in at least one digital file format suitable for long term preservation supported?
- o) Is the published content regularly backed up?
- p) Is the published content deposited in a digital preservation service (e.g. LOCKSS, CLOCKSS, Portico)?
- q) Is a table of contents or a structure that allows direct access to articles/chapters provided?
- r) Are the landing pages of the published items supplied with all relevant metadata (title, full names and institutional affiliations – including country/region – of all contributing authors, abstracts and keywords, funding information), provided in the original language and English / second language, and in human and machine readable formats (e.g. HTML meta tags, XML exposed via OAI-PMH, JSON)?
- s) Do you provide a bibliographic letterhead in the full text of each article, on the title page, including the name of the journal/book, ISSN, eISSN (or ISBN) volume and issue, period covered by the issue indicating months and years?
- t) Are persistent identifiers for authors and contributors (ORCID), organisations (ROR), etc. clearly indicated?
- u) Do you use CRediT tags to indicate contributions of the authors and is this information machine-readable ([coded in JATS xml v1.2.](#))?
- v) Do you provide complete and reliable machine-readable information on funding (including as a minimum the name of the funder and the grant number/identifier)?
- w) Do you provide machine readable information about the open access status and licensing embedded in the article in a standard non-proprietary format?
- x) Do you regularly deposit complete metadata about publications in a registration agency (e.g. CrossRef)?



- y) Do you deposit bibliographic references in a registration agency (e.g. CrossRef)?
- z) Are abstracts deposited in a registration agency (e.g. CrossRef) in line with the Initiative for Open Abstracts (I4OA)?
- aa) Do you have quality assurance mechanisms to ensure a high quality of figures and tables (high resolution, annotations, clarity)?
- bb) Are the links to data, code, and other research outputs that underlie the publication and are available in external repositories, provided?
- cc) Is the full-text content provided in multiple file formats (PDF, HTML, XML, ePub, etc.) tagged in the XML JATS format?

5.6 Visibility, indexation, communication, marketing and impact

- a) Do you control if your published content is present in:
 - general search engines
 - scholarly search engines
 - abstracting and indexing databases (multidisciplinary and disciplinary)
 - citation indexes
 - discovery services
 - aggregator databases/hosting platforms?
- b) Do you make specific efforts to enhance your visibility in general and scholarly search engines (e.g. through search engine optimisation, structured metadata, sitemaps)?
- c) Do you apply for inclusion of your publications in:
 - abstracting and indexing databases
 - citation indexes
 - discovery services
 - aggregator databases/hosting platforms?
- d) Do you regularly control the accuracy and reliability of the information about inclusion in indexes and registries stated on your website(s)?
- e) Is all your metadata available freely in the public domain (including the abstracts and references in line with the Initiative for Open Citations I4OC)?
- f) Do you encourage authors to share their manuscripts by depositing them and making them immediately available in open repositories, at all stages of the publication process?
- g) Do you make an effort to regularly control the accuracy and reliability of all information on your website, and avoid possible misleading information?
- h) Do you keep the community of users informed of developments, policy changes, updates, new features and functionality (e.g. through newsletters, blogs, social



media, direct emails, mailing lists, content alerts, notifications, RSS/Atom feed or other mechanism)?

- i) Do you have a clear insight into the composition of the community of authors, reviewers, editors and readers (according to their institutional affiliation, nationality and disciplinary orientation)? Do you strive for greater diversity?
- j) Have you implemented impact statements alongside published content that can be understood by a general audience and allow authors to emphasise the intention and importance of their work?
- k) Do you have social media or social networking profiles that are active and regularly updated?
- l) Do you actively work with the media on the popularisation of science (preparing press releases and information for journalists)?
- m) Do you work with services for crediting reviewers (such as Reviewer Credits)?
- n) Do you have a data protection policy and a privacy policy in line with the GDPR?
- o) Do you take care that all marketing activities (including solicitation of manuscripts for your publications) are appropriate, well-targeted, and unobtrusive?
- p) Do you encourage authors to share content via academic sharing services?
- q) Do you inform libraries about new publications?
- r) Do you actively work to support authors in promoting published content (e.g. by inviting post-publication reviews articles, inviting and moderating post-publication online comments, organising events like book promotions, sending out copies, writing press releases, working with the media)?
- s) Do you publicly display a wide array of metric indicators for your publications, in a responsible way, including the following :
 - submission, acceptance, publication dates
 - article-level usage metrics, such as visits, views, downloads
 - publication-level usage metrics, such as visits, views, downloads
 - article-level impact metrics, such as citation counts
 - publication-level impact metrics
 - altmetrics indicators
 - widget showing the geographical spread of visitors?
- t) Do you provide clear information about the analytics software used to generate usage metrics and methods used to collect them?

5.7 Equity, Diversity and Inclusion (EDI) : multilingualism, gender equity

- a) Do you have gender policies regarding the composition of editorial staff and boards and policies that strive for gender balance among peer reviewers?
- b) Do you promote systematic reporting of sex and gender in research in line with the SAGER guidelines?
- c) Do you have a defined policy for maintaining Diversity, Equity and Inclusion across all activities?
- d) Is the policy publicly available?
- e) Do you provide information/contact person(s) if a reader/user likes to communicate e.g. accessibility problems?
- f) Do you collect data/statistics to monitor the success and failure of the policy?
- g) Do you take action as a result of these statistics, in terms of acknowledging progress?
- h) Do you take action as a result of these statistics, in terms of acknowledging missteps and creating a plan to recover from missteps and implementing it?
- i) Does the EDI policy include a section for ensuring the diversity of all the relevant stakeholders?
- j) Does the EDI policy have a clear route for accountability?
- k) Does the EDI policy cover the site's content and metadata?
- l) Do you have a policy for multiple languages (including the use of English)?
- m) Does the EDI policy cover the accessibility of the website for the visually impaired?
- n) Does the EDI policy cover decision-making on content?
- o) Does the EDI policy promote diversity in open science practices?
- p) Does the EDI policy refer explicitly to gender equity?



6. References

- 'AmeliCA Principles and Values'. n.d. AmeliCA.
<http://amelica.org/index.php/en/principles-and-values/>.
- Ancion, Zoé, Lidia Borrell-Damián, Pierre Mounier, Johan Rooryck, and Bregt Saenen. 2022. 'Action Plan for Diamond Open Access'.
<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.6282403>.
- Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE), Directory of Open Access Journals (DOAJ), Open Access Scholarly Publishing Association (OASPA), and World Association of Medical Editors (WAME). 2022. 'Principles of Transparency and Best Practice in Scholarly Publishing'.
<https://oaspa.org/principles-of-transparency-and-best-practice-in-scholarly-publishing-4/>.
- 'Editorial Policies'. n.d. Council of Science Editors. Accessed 15 January 2023.
<https://www.councilscienceeditors.org/resource-library/editorial-policies/>.
- Epps, Heather Van, Olaya Astudillo, Yaiza Del Pozo Martin, and Joan Marsh. 2022. 'The Sex and Gender Equity in Research (SAGER) Guidelines: Implementation and Checklist Development'. *European Science Editing* 48 (May): e86910.
<https://doi.org/10.3897/ese.2022.e86910>.
- 'Equity, Diversity and Inclusion Toolkit for Journal Editors'. 2021. American Psychological Association. <https://doi.org/10.31219/osf.io/wst4q>.
- 'Exemplarity Criteria for Funding from the National Open Science Fund through Platforms, Infrastructures and Editorial Content'. 2019. National Open Science Fund, France.
<https://www.ouvri.lascience.fr/exemplarity-criteria-for-funding-from-the-national-open-science-fund/>.
- 'Frequently Asked Questions'. n.d. Octopus. Accessed 15 January 2023. <https://octopus.ac>.
- 'Initiative for Open Citations'. 2017. I4OC. 2017. <https://i4oc.org/>.
- 'Latindex - Sistema regional de información en línea para Revistas científicas de América Latina, el Caribe, España y Portugal: Metodología del Catálogo 2.0'. 2022. Latindex.
<https://latindex.org/latindex/postulacion/postulacionCatalogo>.
- Mertens, Stephan, and Alastair Brown. 2021. 'Environmental Sustainability and Scientific Publishing: EASE Manifiesto'. *European Science Editing* 47 (October): e75625.
<https://doi.org/10.3897/ese.2021.e75625>.
- Ross-Hellauer, Tony. 2017. 'What Is Open Peer Review? A Systematic Review'. F1000Research. <https://doi.org/10.12688/f1000research.11369.2>.
- 'The Agreement on Reforming Research Assessment'. 2022. COARA.
<https://coara.eu/agreement/the-agreement-full-text/>.
- 'UNESCO Recommendation on Open Science'. 2021. UNESCO.
<https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000379949.locale=en>.



'Web of Science Journal Evaluation Process and Selection Criteria'. 2022. Clarivate.
<https://clarivate.com/products/scientific-and-academic-research/research-discovery-and-workflow-solutions/web-of-science/core-collection/editorial-selection-process/editorial-selection-process>.

Zielinski, Chris, Margaret Winker, Rakesh Aggarwal, Lorraine Ferris, Markus Heinemann, Jose Florencio Jr. Lapeña, Sanjay Pai, Edsel Ing, and Leslie Citrome. 2023. "Chatbots, ChatGPT, and Scholarly Manuscripts: WAME Recommendations on ChatGPT and Chatbots in Relation to Scholarly Publications." WAME. January 20, 2023. <https://wame.org/page3.php?id=106>.



Appendix 1: List of analysed documents

'About Publicera'. 2022. Publicera.Kb.Se. 2022.

<https://publicera.kb.se/index.php/index/ompublicera>.

'AmeliCA Evaluation Criteria'. n.d. AmeliCA.

<http://portal.amelica.org/microPortal.oa?opcion=postula>.

'AmeliCA Principles and Values'. n.d. AmeliCA.

<http://amelica.org/index.php/en/principles-and-values/>.

'Best Practices for Peer Reviewer Selection and Contact to Prevent Peer Review Manipulation by Authors'. 2015. WAME.

<https://wame.org/best-practices-for-peer-reviewer-selection-and-contact-to-prevent-peer-review-manipulation-by-authors>.

Bilder, Geoffrey, Jennifer Lin, and Cameron Neylon. 2020. 'The Principles of Open Scholarly Infrastructure'. The Principles of Open Scholarly Infrastructure.

<https://doi.org/10.24343/C34W2H>.

'Campagne 2023-2024 d'attribution de Subventions de l'INSHS Du CNRS Aux Revues Scientifiques : Critères de Bonnes Pratiques Éditoriales et de Science Ouverte'. 2022. Institut des sciences humaines et sociales du CNRS.

https://www.inshs.cnrs.fr/sites/institut_inshs/files/download-file/INSHS_soutien_revues_2023_2024.pdf.

'COAlition S Technical Guidance and Requirements'. n.d. cOAlition S.

https://www.coalition-s.org/technical-guidance_and_requirements/.

Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE), Directory of Open Access Journals (DOAJ), Open Access Scholarly Publishing Association (OASPA), and World Association of Medical Editors (WAME). 2022. 'Principles of Transparency and Best Practice in Scholarly Publishing'.

<https://oaspa.org/principles-of-transparency-and-best-practice-in-scholarly-publishing-4/>.

'Competiția pentru subvenționarea literaturii tehnico-științifice în anul 2022'. 2022. Ministerul Cercetării, Inovării și Digitalizării – România.

<https://www.research.gov.ro/uploads/subventionare-literatura-ts/2022/anexa-20783.pdf>.



- 'Core Practices'. 2017. COPE: Committee on Publication Ethics. 2017.
<https://publicationethics.org/core-practices>.
- 'CRediT'. n.d. CRediT. Accessed 15 January 2023. <https://credit.niso.org/>.
- 'Criteria for Inclusion and Recommendations for Journals in HRČAK Portal'. 2020. Portal of Croatian scientific and professional journals -HRČAK.
<https://hrcak.srce.hr/en/kriteriji>.
- 'Criteria, Policies and Procedures for the Admission and Permanence of Scientific Journals in the SciELO Collection'. 2018. SciELO.
<https://wp.scielo.org/wp-content/uploads/Criterios-Rede-SciELO-en.pdf>.
- 'DOAB Publisher Application Form'. n.d. DOAB - Directory of Open Access Books. Accessed 15 January 2023.
https://docs.google.com/forms/d/e/1FAIpQLScXyEpDHF2XmTsZesAYQ_BYEZq9Xn7pNlv_dTJd6pa053Av0w/viewform?usp=embed_facebook.
- 'DOAJ Basic Criteria for Inclusion'. 2022. DOAJ. <https://doaj.org/apply/guide/>.
- 'Editorial Policies'. n.d. Council of Science Editors. Accessed 15 January 2023.
<https://www.councilscienceeditors.org/resource-library/editorial-policies/>.
- 'Equity, Diversity and Inclusion Toolkit for Journal Editors'. 2021. American Psychological Association. <https://doi.org/10.31219/osf.io/wst4q>.
- 'ERA 2023 Submission Guidelines'. 2022. Australian Government. Australian Research Council.
- 'ERIH PLUS Evaluation Criteria'. 2021. Norwegian Directorate for Higher Education and Skills.
https://kanalregister.hkdir.no/publiseringskanaler/erihplus/about/criteria_for_inclusion.
- 'Exemplarity Criteria for Funding from the National Open Science Fund through Platforms, Infrastructures and Editorial Content'. 2019. National Open Science Fund, France.
<https://www.ouvrirlascience.fr/exemplarity-criteria-for-funding-from-the-national-open-science-fund/>.
- 'Frequently Asked Questions'. n.d. Octopus. Accessed 15 January 2023. <https://octopus.ac>.
- 'Good Practice Principles for Scholarly Communication Services'. n.d. SPARC. Accessed 15 January 2023.
<https://sparcopen.org/our-work/good-practice-principles-for-scholarly-communication-services/>.



- Gouzi, Françoise Catherine, Jean-Luc de Ochandiano, and Armelle Thomas. 2020. 'Critères QUERO - Préconisations pour la qualité des revues scientifiques'. Humanities and Social Sciences / Library and information sciences. HAL.
<https://hal-univ-tlse2.archives-ouvertes.fr/hal-03060601>.
- 'Guía de evaluación de la séptima convocatoria de evaluación de la calidad editorial y científica de las revistas científicas españolas'. 2020. FECYT.
https://calidadrevistas.fecyt.es/sites/default/files/noticias/report_2020_12_10guiaeval7conv_def_2.pdf.
- 'How to Apply for OpenEdition Journals'. 2022. OpenEdition. 2022.
<https://www.openedition.org/10824>.
- 'Identify Trusted Publishers for Your Research'. n.d. Think. Check. Submit. Accessed 15 January 2023. <https://thinkchecksubmit.org/>.
- INASP, and AJOL. 2017. 'JPPS - Journal Publishing Practices and Standards Framework'. *Journal Publishing Practices and Standards (JPPS Framework)*(blog). 2017.
<https://www.journalquality.info/en/>.
- 'Índice de Revistas Certificadas Redalyc: Criterios 2022'. 2020. Sistema de Información Científica Redalyc.
https://www.redalyc.org/redalyc/documentos/Criterios_Categorias_diciembre_2020.pdf.
- 'Initiative for Open Citations'. n.d. I4OC. Accessed 15 January 2023. <https://i4oc.org/>.
- 'International Ethical Principles for Scholarly Publication'. n.d. STM Publishers. Accessed 15 January 2023.
https://www.stm-assoc.org/2013_05_21_STM_Ethical_Principles_for_Scholarly_Publication.pdf.
- 'Journal Selection for PMC'. 2022. National Library of Medicine. 2022.
<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/pub/journselect/>.
- 'Konkurs za sufinansiranje NID - podrška uređivanju naučnih časopisa u 2022. godini'. 2022. Vlada Crne Gore. 2022.
<https://www.gov.me/clanak/konkurs-za-sufinansiranje-nid-podrška-uređivanju-naučnih-casopisa-u-2022-godini>.
- 'Κριτήρια Και Προδιαγραφές Για Την Έκδοση EJournal, EProceedings, EBooks | Πλατφόρμα Ηλεκτρονικών Εκδόσεων'. n.d. EPublishing (EKT). Accessed 15 January 2023. <https://epublishing.ekt.gr/el/5696>.



- 'Kriteriji za financijsku potporu znanstvenim časopisima i časopisima za popularizaciju znanosti'. 2020. Ministarstvo znanosti i obrazovanja Republike Hrvatske.
<https://mzo.gov.hr/UserDocImages//dokumenti/Znanost/ZnanstvenaInfrastruktura/Znanstveno-izdavackaDjelatnost/Kriteriji-ZiD-146//Kriteriji%20za%20financijsku%20potporu%20znanstvenim%20casopisima%20i%20casopisima%20za%20popularizaciju%20znanosti.pdf>
- 'Latindex - Sistema regional de información en línea para Revistas científicas de América Latina, el Caribe, España y Portugal: Metodología del Catálogo 2.0'. 2022. Latindex.
<https://latindex.org/latindex/postulacion/postulacionCatalogo>.
- 'Membership Terms'. 2022. Website. Crossref. 2022.
<https://www.crossref.org/membership/terms/>.
- Mertens, Stephan, and Alastair Brown. 2021. 'Environmental Sustainability and Scientific Publishing: EASE Manifesto'. *European Science Editing* 47 (October): e75625.
<https://doi.org/10.3897/ese.2021.e75625>.
- 'Norwegian Register for Scientific Journals, Series and Publishers'. n.d. Norwegian Directorate for Higher Education and Skills.
https://kanalregister.hkdir.no/publiseringskanaler/OmKriterier.action?request_locale=en.
- 'OASPA Membership Criteria'. n.d. OASPA.
<https://oaspa.org/membership/membership-criteria/>.
- 'Optagelse'. n.d. Tidsskrift.dk. Accessed 15 January 2023.
<https://tidsskrift.dk/index/kriterier>.
- 'Pravilnik o kategorizaciji i rangiranju naučnih časopisa (Službeni glasnik RS, 159/2020-115'. 2020. Ministarstvo prosvete, nauke i tehnološkog razvoja Republike Srbije.
<http://www.pravno-informacioni-sistem.rs/SlGlasnikPortal/eli/rep/sgrs/ministarstva/pravilnik/2020/159/19/reg>.
- 'Pravilnik o postopkih (so)financiranja in ocenjevanja ter spremljanju izvajanja raziskovalne dejavnosti'. 2016. Javna agencija za raziskovalno dejavnost Republike Slovenije.
<http://www.pisrs.si/Pis.web/pregledPredpisa?id=PRAV12770>.
- 'Principles'. 2021. International Science Council. 2021.
<https://council.science/actionplan/why-scientific-publishing-matters/publishingprinciples/>.



- 'PRISM: Peer Review Information Service for Monographs'. n.d. DOAB - Directory of Open Access Books. Accessed 15 January 2023.
<https://www.doabooks.org/en/article/prism>.
- 'ProQuest Editorial and Title Selection Policy - Scholarly Journals'. n.d. ProQuest.
- 'Publication Forum Classification Criteria'. 2021. Publication Forum, Federation of Finnish Learned Societies. <https://julkaisufoorumi.fi/en/evaluations/classification-criteria>.
- Puebla, Iratxe, Daniella Lowenberg, and FORCE11 Research Data Publishing Ethics WG. 2021. 'Joint FORCE11 & COPE Research Data Publishing Ethics Working Group Recommendations'. Zenodo. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.5391293>.
- 'Recommendations for Promoting Integrity in Scientific Journal Publications'. n.d. Council of Science Editors. Accessed 15 January 2023.
<https://www.councilscienceeditors.org/resource-library/editorial-policies/publication-ethics/>.
- 'Recommendations for the Conduct, Reporting, Editing, and Publication of Scholarly Work in Medical Journals'. 2022. International Committee of Medical Journal Editors (ICMJE). <https://www.icmje.org/recommendations/>.
- 'Regolamento per la classificazione delle riviste nelle aree non bibliometriche: Criteri di classificazione delle riviste ai fini dell'Abilitazione Scientifica Nazionale'. 2019. National Agency for the Evaluation of Universities and Research Institutes (ANVUR). https://www.anvur.it/wp-content/uploads/2019/02/REGOLAMENTO-PER-LA-CLASSIFICAZIONE-DELLE-RIVISTE_20022019.pdf.
- 'Scopus Content Policy and Selection'. n.d. Scopus.
<https://www.elsevier.com/solutions/scopus/how-scopus-works/content/content-policy-and-selection>.
- Štebe, Janez, Sonja Bežjak, and Maja Dolinar. 2020. 'Guidelines for the Implementation of Scientific Publishing Policies of Research Data Citation in Scientific Publications and Assuring Access to Primary Data, Used in Publications'. Zenodo.
<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.4040672>.
- 'The Fair Open Access Principles'. n.d. FOAA - Fair Open Access Alliance. Accessed 15 January 2023. <https://www.faiopenaccess.org/the-fair-open-access-principles/>.
- 'Toolbox for Research Integrity v.5.0'. n.d. SOPs4RI - Promoting Excellent Research. Accessed 15 January 2023. <https://sops4ri.eu/toolbox/>.



'TOP Guidelines'. 2015. Center for Open Science. 2015.

<https://www.cos.io/initiatives/top-guidelines>.

'UNESCO Recommendation on Open Science'. 2021. UNESCO.

<https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000379949.locale=en>.

Arbeitsgemeinschaft der Universitätsverlage. 2022. 'Qualitätsstandards für

Open-Access-Bücher'. Zenodo. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.7075761>.

'Web of Science Journal Evaluation Process and Selection Criteria'. 2022. Clarivate.

<https://clarivate.com/products/scientific-and-academic-research/research-discovery-and-workflow-solutions/web-of-science/core-collection/editorial-selection-process/editorial-selection-process/>.



Appendix 2: Analysis sheet of good practices for IPSPs

- Title:
- URL:
- Scope:
 - a. Non journals & platforms specific
 - b. Journals & platforms specific
- Type of document:
 - a. Recommendations and principles (of transparency, etc.)
 - b. Specific assessment guidelines including self-assessment
- Original language:
- Other languages (including English and translations made by DIAMAS project)
- Entity issuing the document
- Entity responsible for the assessment (not applicable in the UNESCO Recommendation case)
- Scope of the assessment/document:
 - a. International
 - b. Regional
 - c. National
 - d. Institutional
- Disciplines' coverage of the assessment: (All for multidisciplinary, [The Frascati Manual defines 6 main research areas \(Natural Sciences, Engineering/Technology, Medical/Health Sciences, Agricultural Sciences, Social Sciences, and Humanities\)](#))
- Periodicity of the assessment (how often is the call open?)
- Reassessment frequency (Assessment revision? (Y/N) - IF YES: Revision periodicity? Revision impact?)
- Benefits linked to the assessment:
 - a. Funding
 - b. Publishing and technical services
 - c. Indexation
 - d. Promoting best practice
 - e. Other
- Classification of the items in the EQSIP's core components framework:
 - (1) **Funding** (description of the funding model, open access business model, transparency in listing all funding sources, etc.)
 - (2) **Ownership and governance** (legal ownership, mission, and governance)
 - (3) **Open science practices** (open access policy, copyright and licensing, open peer review, data sharing, new approaches to research assessment, etc.).



- (4) **Editorial quality, editorial management and research integrity**
- (5) **Technical service efficiency** (technical strength, interoperability - metadata, ISSN, PIDs, machine readability, a journal website)
- (6) **Visibility** (including indexation), **communication, marketing and impact**
- (7) **Equity, Diversity and Inclusion (EDI)** : multilingualism, gender equity
- (8) Other



Consortium overview

AMU	AIX MARSEILLE UNIVERSITÉ	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

