

1 Disclosing funding sources for open 2 access publication fees: the Open APC 3 initiative

4 Najko Jahn¹ and Marco Tullney²

5 ¹Bielefeld University Library, Bielefeld University, Bielefeld, Germany

6 ²Technische Informationsbibliothek (TIB) - German National Library of Science and
7 Technology, Hannover, Germany

8 ABSTRACT

9 Publication fees in open access publishing hold a prominent place on the agenda of researchers, policy-
10 makers, and academic publishers. This paper contributes to the evolving empirical basis on open access
11 funding. It describes the Open APC initiative, in which German universities and research organizations
12 share their expenditures for publication fees. As method, the initiative uses existing open data tools to
13 aggregate and disseminate institutional spending on open access publication fees. In total, 29 German
14 research organizations self-reported funding of 6,279 open access journal articles, which amounted to
15 8,039,339 €. The average payment for each article was 1,280 €, and the median payment 1,209 €. Our
16 data-set comprises only 53 articles in hybrid journals. With an indexing coverage of 99 %, the findings
17 reveal that the DOI agency CrossRef provides both comprehensive bibliographic coverage of the funded
18 open access journal literature and disambiguated names of journal titles and publishing houses. We
19 show that authority control of these bibliographic information is particularly relevant for the comparative
20 study of the economical effects of open access publishing.

21 Keywords: Open access, open access journal, scholarly publishing, publication fees, article processing
22 charges, science policy

23 INTRODUCTION

24 General Background

25 The rise of open access journals matches the increasing relevance of publication fees in academic
26 publishing (Davis and Walters, 2011; Laakso and Björk, 2012; Pinfield, 2015). To cover these fees, also
27 referred to as article-processing charges (APC), authors tend to make use of funding that grant agencies or
28 academic institutions provide (Suber, 2012). Yet, how and to what extent these research support activities
29 are effective in terms of the number of supported articles and associated costs remains under debate.

30 One reason why the study of open access journals using publication fees is in most cases difficult
31 is that total spending on publication fees is fragmented across the budgets of grant agencies, research
32 institutions, and libraries, or, if support is limited, are taken from personal budgets. Asking 9,645 authors
33 from various disciplines how they financed publication fees, a comprehensive survey in 2010 revealed
34 that the majority of the respondents had access to research funding or institutional support to cover these
35 charges. By contrast, 12 % paid publication fees individually (Dallmeier-Tiessen et al., 2011). These
36 findings are consistent with that of other studies, adding that sources of funding mostly exists in higher
37 income countries, mainly to support research articles in the bio- and physical sciences (Solomon and
38 Björk, 2011). Personal budgets, on the other hand, are likely used to cover low price publication fees
39 (Björk, 2015; Solomon and Björk, 2011).

40 Another key problem for the study of open access is that funding for open access journals using
41 publication fees lacks transparency because the parties involved - authors, universities, funders, publishers
42 - neither release information on who pays for what nor the costs of publishing (Björk and Solomon, 2014),
43 a situation similar to the lack of transparency regarding journal subscriptions (Lawson and Meghreblian,
44 2015). However, empirical studies examining publication fees gathered from journal websites report
45 similar findings. While the average publication fee reported ranged between 904 \$ (Solomon and Björk,

2012) and 923 \$ (Walters and Linvill, 2011), considerable price variances across journals and publishers were observed. Accordingly, Solomon and Björk (2012) suggested to cluster fully open access journal using publication fees into several groups. In descending order, high-impact journals charged most, followed by biomedicine journals from commercial publishers, large multi-disciplinary journals, and mid-price ranged journals from commercial publishers covering a large spectrum of disciplines. Lower priced journals were published by academic societies and by publishers from low-income countries.

It remains unclear which other factors contribute to this varying pricing. Generally, these might include article processing, impact, rejection rates, management and investment, and profit margins (Noorden, 2013). While fixed prices for individual articles are common, agreements between publishers and institutions often provide discounts, and publishers sometimes waive publication fees for authors from low-income countries (Björk and Solomon, 2012; Lawson, 2015c). Other factors leading to variable pricing schemes include submission or page charges (Björk and Solomon, 2012).

Hybrid journals substantially add to this complexity of open access funding (Kingsley, 2014). These journals, allowing articles to be published immediately as open access after a charge was paid, rely both on subscriptions and publication fees as revenue sources. Although the uptake of open access through hybrid journals was described as lower and more expensive compared to that of fully open access journals (Björk and Solomon, 2014; Solomon and Björk, 2012), this model has gained attention through recent science policies, notably because of open access policies from the UK (Pinfield, 2015).

To address the problems of fragmented spending on publication fees and in-transparency about what was paid, some European research funders and research performing institutions have recently begun to disclose their spending on publication fees as open data. To our knowledge, the first research funders providing such data were the Wellcome Trust (Kiley, 2014) and the Austrian Science Fund FWF (Reckling and Kenzian, 2014). The not-for-profit company Jisc followed by collecting data from higher-education institutions in the UK (Lawson, 2015b). Disclosed as publicly available spreadsheets, these data-sets self-report payments made along with bibliographic information, including title, journal and publisher, and a persistent identifier to the publisher's version. Curatorial efforts focused on the disambiguation of publisher and journal titles as well as on detecting duplicates (Woodward and Henderson, 2014). Parts of Jisc cost data was examined by Pinfield et al. (2015). Although the average spending on publication fees remained stable across the universities, they found large price variances, as well as a varying number of articles UK universities supported between 2007 - 2014.

Central funding for publication fees in Germany

This paper focuses on how much German universities and research organization spent on open access publication fees. In Germany, the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG), the largest German research funder, has strongly influenced how universities manage institutional support for publication fees.¹ Before the DFG started to pay for centrally funded publication fees on a pro rata basis through its "Open-Access Publishing" program in 2011, and similar to the situation described in Canada (Hampson, 2014) or the UK (Pinfield and Middleton, 2012), only few central funds existed (Eppelin et al., 2012). Because the DFG has enforced a set of criteria grantees have to comply with, similar implementations for supporting open access publishing across German universities exists (Fournier and Weihberg, 2013): these criteria exclude sponsoring of articles in hybrid journals, and the funding of articles whose publication fee exceeds 2,000 € (excluding value added tax). Grantees agree not only to reimburse the bills on behalf of the researchers they support, but also to look for ways to improve the handling of those financial transactions. They include central invoicing schemes and related agreements between university libraries and publishers (Fournier and Weihberg, 2013).

Research institutes organized in the Fraunhofer-Gesellschaft, Helmholtz-Gemeinschaft, Leibniz-Gemeinschaft, and Max-Planck-Gesellschaft are not eligible for this funding program, contributing to the diversity of schemes in Germany. But in response, some organizations have adopted similar processes to support authors. The Max-Planck-Gesellschaft operates their long-lasting open access activities, including handling spending and publisher agreements centrally, through the Max Planck Digital Library (Schimmer et al., 2013; Sikora and Geschuhn, 2015), while the Leibniz-Gemeinschaft set up a dedicated open access fund in 2016.

The evolving institutional support structures to cover open access publication fees has led to calls for an unified approach towards supporting open access journal publishing. The Allianz der Wissenschaftsor-

¹Guidelines for the funding program can be found here: http://www.dfg.de/formulare/12_20/

99 ganisationen², a science policy board representing all major research organizations in Germany, marks
100 cost transparency as one way to sustain an “adequate open access publication system” (Bruch et al., 2015).
101 Reflecting Austrian and UK initiatives to share institutional spending on open access publication fees as
102 open data, as well as professional discussions on open access publishing, Bielefeld University Library
103 began to openly share its payments in May 2014. After engaging with the working group “Electronic
104 Publishing” of the Deutsche Initiative für Netzwerkinformation (DINI)³ other German institutions joined
105 under the umbrella of the Open APC initiative soon after.

106 **Research question**

107 The aim of the study was to examine how much German universities and research organisations spent on
108 open access publication fees until 2015. Using self-reported cost data from the Open APC initiative, the
109 analysis focused on the amount of institutional payments for publication fees, and compared these findings
110 with those from related Austrian and UK initiatives. We also asked how thoroughly self-reported articles
111 were indexed in CrossRef, a DOI minting agency for scholarly literature, and analysed how institutional
112 spending per articles was distributed over publishers and journal titles.

113 **METHODS AND MATERIALS**

114 We analysed self-reported cost data released by the Open APC initiative on May 13, 2016, to assess
115 institutional spending on open access publication fees in Germany. In addition to administrative data
116 about the amount paid per article including value added tax, the reporting institution, and the year of
117 invoicing, we used information about whether an article was published in a fully or hybrid open access
118 journal as well as the recorded DOI from the data-set.

119 We fetched bibliographic metadata for each article from CrossRef on May 19, 2016, on the basis of the
120 reported DOIs. Although the Open APC initiative gathered metadata representing publishers and journals
121 from CrossRef as well, this information was retrieved at the time when the participating institutions
122 submitted the cost information. The Open APC initiative tracked the date of data submission and the
123 contributors for every data submission with Git, a version control system, increasingly used for enabling
124 reproducible research (Ram, 2013), and made this information available via GitHub to be transparent over
125 time. However, CrossRef regularly updated metadata to represent ongoing mergers of publishing houses
126 or name changes. A prominent example in this regard was the merger of the two large publishing houses
127 Springer Business + Media and Nature Publishing Group announced on May 6, 2015, that operated as
128 Springer Nature at the time of our study. To reflect these dynamics in academic publishing, we decided to
129 retrieve updated metadata from CrossRef for the whole Open APC data-set instead of re-using publisher
130 and journal information contained in the Open APC data-set.

131 As a client, we used the R package rcrossref (Chamberlain et al., 2016), developed and maintained
132 by the rOpenSci initiative⁴, to access CrossRef’s REST API. We requested the XML-based format
133 application/vnd.crossref.unixsd+xml in which full and abbreviated journal titles as well
134 as the ISSN media types, the International Standard Serial Number used to identify journals, were
135 distinguished. It also contained normalised publisher information, thus avoiding confusion about naming
136 of publishing houses other studies were faced with when working with self-reported data (Woodward and
137 Henderson, 2014). In cases where no bibliographic information could be obtained, we used the Open
138 APC values. Because CrossRef was not the only registration agency for DOIs, but also the agencies
139 DataCite and Medra minted DOIs for scholarly work, we furthermore obtained the DOI agency for each
140 article with the help of the rcrossref client.

141 Data collection also involved obtaining cost data from related open data initiatives. To compare
142 self-reported spending on open access journal articles by Germany universities and research organisations
143 with that of other initiatives, we reviewed the openly available data-sets from the the Austrian Science
144 Fund FWF (Reckling and Rieck, 2015; Rieck et al., 2016), Jisc (Lawson, 2015a, 2016) and the Wellcome
145 Trust (Kiley, 2015, 2016). For analysis, we obtained the overall publication fee spending to support
146 fully and hybrid open access journal articles. In the case of FWF, we gathered the cost information from
147 the accompanying spending reports. We used the spreadsheet data to calculate Wellcome Trust’s and
148 Jisc’s spending, and converted the prices from GBP to Euro in accordance with the average Euro foreign

²http://www.dfg.de/en/dfg_profile/alliance/index.html

³<http://dini.de/english/ag0/e-pub0/>

⁴rOpenSci: <https://ropensci.org/>

exchange reference rates provided by the European Central Bank. Our comparison between the open data initiatives focussed on the last two years 2014 and 2015. Because Wellcome Trust's spending was reported for the periods 2013 - 2014 and 2014 - 2015, we referred to the average exchange rates of the full two-year period as we could not determine the actual invoicing dates from the data. We excluded articles from the analysis for which neither price information nor the journal type could be obtained. In the case of Jisc's 2014 data (Lawson, 2015a), 4.861.772 € being spent on 2,812 publications were not eligible for further analysis because no publication type was given in the data-set.

Data collection methods of the Open APC initiative and those of the others differed in some aspects. For instance, whereas the DOI was a mandatory element in the Open APC data template that the participating institution were required to report, publication identifier in the Wellcome Trust data was also added through automated compliance checks. Our first screening of the data-sets revealed that some articles lacked a DOI. For this reason, and as our main focus is institutional funding for publication fees in Germany, we decided only to compare German spending with that of other initiatives, but not its size and distribution over publisher and journal titles, as well as the indexing coverage in CrossRef.

RESULTS

Cost Data

On May 13, 2016,⁵ the Open APC initiative covered 7,417 articles whose publication fees were centrally paid by 30 German universities and research institutions until 2015. The number of supported open access journal articles grew over the years (see Figure 1). While one institution disclosed 5 payments made in 2005, the majority shared their expenditures from 2013 onwards. With 1,999 articles, the year 2015 was best represented in our data-set. However, 27 institutions contributed their cost data for 2015 at the time of this analysis, suggesting that there exists a time lag between payments made and reporting these spending to the Open APC initiative.




Figure 1. Growth of Open APC Initiative

Among all articles, fees amounted to 9,627,537 € including VAT, the average payment was 1,298 € and the median value 1,231 €. Figure 2 shows the large price variation among the articles. The disclosed publication fees ranged from 40 € to 7,419 €. However, the average price paid varied somewhat during the period 2011 and 2014 (1239 - 1289 €). We also observe that 6,996 (94%) of the publication fees were paid in accordance with the DFG price cap of 2,000 €.

The number of APC payments per institutions varied considerably (see Table 3). With 2,856 reported articles, the Max Planck Society contributed 39 % of the overall submissions. In contrast, the two universities of technology, TU Clausthal and TU Ilmenau, who recently began to set up support structures for fee-based open access journal articles, shared payments made for four articles each.

⁵The data is openly available on GitHub. The following analysis is based on version 2.1.13 of the dataset, available at <https://github.com/OpenAPC/openapc-de/tree/v2.1.13>.




Figure 2. Histogram APC




Figure 3. Payments per year

Table 1. Institutions self-reporting expenditures for open access publications (in €)

Institutions	Articles funded	Total	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
MPG	2,856	3,661,120	1,282	1,168	69	7,419
Goettingen U	650	883,918	1,360	1,354	180	4,695
KIT	426	523,166	1,228	1,243	69	3,731
Regensburg U	399	503,205	1,261	1,207	77	4,403
Muenchen LMU	365	463,491	1,270	1,299	496	2,023
TU Muenchen	308	390,086	1,267	1,386	131	2,122
Bielefeld U	262	322,815	1,232	1,234	142	2,103
Giessen U	243	326,082	1,342	1,247	81	4,498
Konstanz U	221	302,659	1,369	1,380	40	2,072
Heidelberg U	215	308,348	1,434	1,500	60	2,042
Wuerzburg U	207	286,543	1,384	1,447	105	2,514
Leipzig U	173	243,873	1,410	1,471	341	2,055
FZJ - ZB	158	196,869	1,246	1,177	370	3,700
TU Dresden	130	175,723	1,352	1,415	200	2,193
Duisburg-Essen U	114	136,911	1,201	1,214	238	1,982
FU Berlin	106	142,671	1,346	1,292	220	2,000
GFZ-Potsdam	106	126,520	1,194	1,065	223	4,403
Bayreuth U	92	105,725	1,149	1,200	82	2,059
Bochum U	71	93,546	1,318	1,438	100	2,042
Hannover U	69	90,259	1,308	1,241	149	2,159
MDC	69	145,256	2,105	1,800	491	4,700
TU Chemnitz	36	37,826	1,051	1,142	78	2,123
Kassel U	35	35,550	1,016	1,142	150	1,861
Hamburg TUHH	24	32,789	1,366	1,466	300	2,027
Potsdam U	24	32,128	1,339	1,386	916	2,116
Bamberg U	22	23,663	1,076	1,009	90	2,010
TU Ilmenau	13	13,053	1,004	986	178	2,077
Dortmund TU	9	8,238	915	900	155	1,738
TU Clausthal	8	6,999	875	918	181	1,724
INM - Leibniz-Institut für Neue Materialien	6	8,505	1,418	1,492	237	2,454

Comparison of related cost data-sets

Table 2 compares Open APC spending data with that of the Austrian FWF, as well as with Jisc's and Wellcome Trust's expenditures. Prices were converted according to the average Euro exchange rate of the examined periods, and gathered for both fully and hybrid open access journals. The comparison reveals that the Open APC initiative lacked cost information about hybrid journals, whereas the related Austrian and UK open data initiatives could report a large share of spending for these journals between 2014 and 2015. This situation likely reflected the DFG-inspired funding policy of most participating institutions that excluded support for publications in hybrid journals. Over the years 2005 – 2015, 3 out of 30 German universities and research institutions reported 60 hybrid journal articles to the Open APC initiative, accounting for 0.81 % of the overall payments. In terms of the number of supported articles and the amount being spent on publication fees, by contrast, the Open APC data-set provided the most comprehensive price information for fully open access journals compared to what the Austrian and UK initiatives had reported.

Table 2. Comparison of cost data per period and journal type (in €)

Cost data-set	Journal Type	Articles funded	Total costs in Euro	Mean
FWF		NA	NA	NA
2014	Fully OA	247	316,765	1,282
	Hybrid OA	780	1,794,604	2,301
2015	Fully OA	288	418,408	1,453
	Hybrid OA	912	2,376,356	2,606
Jisc		NA	NA	NA
2014	Fully OA	1,161	1,897,862	1,635
	Hybrid OA	2,938	5,409,623	1,841
2015	Fully OA	1,168	2,211,958	1,894
	Hybrid OA	2,944	6,977,753	2,370
Open APC		NA	NA	NA
2014	Fully OA	1,832	2,353,665	1,285
	Hybrid OA	15	26,546	1,770
2015	Fully OA	1,991	2,820,445	1,417
	Hybrid OA	8	23,412	2,927
Wellcome Trust		NA	NA	NA
2013-2014	Fully OA	607	911,302	1,501
	Hybrid OA	1,894	4,648,878	2,455
2014-2015	Fully OA	775	1,418,097	2,756
	Hybrid OA	2,065	5,690,178	1,830

Comparison of average prices suggests that publishing in hybrid journal was more expensive than in fully open access journals. Price differentials between these two categories were also reported earlier, concluding that prices for fully open access journals were generally lower (Pinfield et al., 2015; Solomon and Björk, 2012). In 2014 and 2015, the mean price for fully open access journals calculated from all data-sets was below the DFG price cap of 2,000 €.

CrossRef indexing

Along with the price information, participating institutions were required to identify funded articles by their DOI. They were reported for 7,373 out of 7,417 articles. Of those, `my_apc %>% filter(indexed.in.crossref == TRUE) %>% nrow()` were indexed in CrossRef, representing `my_apc %>% filter(indexed.in.crossref == TRUE) %>% nrow() / my_apc %>% nrow() * 100 %` of all funded publications. The reasons why articles identified by a DOI were not registered with CrossRef differed. Some journals were not indexed by CrossRef at the time of our study but by the DOI agencies DataCite (Journal of new frontiers in spatial concepts published by KIT Scientific Publishing) and Medra (DIE ERDE: Journal of the Geographical Society of Berlin). In other cases, either the DOI did not refer to the full text despite the fact that the journal was indexed on a regular basis (compare <http://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2105-13-S19-S7> with <http://bmcbioinformatics.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/1471-2105-13-S19-S7>) or the resource type could not be retrieved, although the DOI resolves (<http://doi.org/10.1186/s12885-015-1795-7>).

Cost data by publisher and journal

We used the DOI to automatically fetch publisher and journal names for each article from the CrossRef REST API. Table 4 shows the top ten publishers in terms of payments made that represent 92 % of the spending for publication fees. In total, payments were made to 139 publishing houses. In comparison with data from the UK, full open access publishers have a greater share on total spending. Pinfield et al. (2015), for instance, reported remarkably lower numbers for the open access publishers MPDI AG, Copernicus GmbH, and Hindawi Publishing.

Table 3. Publication fees paid per publisher (in €)

Journal	Articles funded	Total	Mean	SD	Median	Range
Springer Nature	2,167	2,948,697	1,361	387	1,385	80.92 – 4403
Public Library of Science (PLOS)	1,680	2,243,128	1,335	321	1,207	555.66 – 2790.27
Frontiers Media SA	906	1,186,283	1,309	424	1,142	77.35 – 4179
Copernicus GmbH	841	1,160,450	1,380	658	1,277	69.12 – 7418.88
IOP Publishing	677	699,137	1,033	228	953	374.77 – 1950
MDPI AG	208	236,729	1,138	453	1,177	154.43 – 2054.68
Hindawi Publishing Corporation	120	125,495	1,046	538	947	174.99 – 2225.22
The Optical Society	111	176,665	1,592	392	1,626	498.62 – 3731.09
Wiley-Blackwell	78	126,148	1,617	467	1,601	490.58 – 3065
Oxford University Press (OUP)	64	118,225	1,847	793	1,741	297.5 – 4498.2
Other	565	606,578	1,074	840	922	40 – 4699.61

Most of the funding of publication fees in Germany went to the publisher Springer Science + Business Media, especially profiting from the merge with the former full open access publisher BioMed Central. In contrast, other established publishing houses such as Elsevier and Wiley-Blackwell rank lower, presumably because they mostly publish hybrid journals, which were not well represented in our data-set at the time of the study. Table 4 also illustrates the variation across and within publishers, which confirms earlier findings (Pinfield et al., 2015).

Table 4. Publication fees paid per journal (in €)

Journal	Articles funded	Total	Mean	SD	Median	Range
PLOS ONE	1,433	1,745,513	1,218	130	1,198	748.71 – 1808.8
New Journal of Physics	673	693,322	1,030	225	953	374.77 – 1856.4
Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics Discussions	281	437,903	1,558	776	1,403	233.86 – 7418.88
Frontiers in Psychology	271	363,794	1,342	429	1,142	77.35 – 2122.81
BMC Genomics	135	179,592	1,330	205	1,276	920 – 1926
Biogeosciences Discussions	127	187,716	1,478	548	1,313	663.55 – 3641.47
BMC Bioinformatics	113	142,680	1,263	217	1,244	655 – 1661.24

Journal	Articles funded	Total	Mean	SD	Median	Range
Frontiers in Plant Science	107	126,763	1,185	408	1,106	551.04 – 2380
Atmospheric Measurement Techniques Discussions	107	143,782	1,344	585	1,203	428.4 – 3709.44
Frontiers in Human Neuroscience	106	140,065	1,321	415	1,106	575 – 2000
Other	4,064	5,466,407	1,345	557	1,350	40 – 4699.61

Prices also varied within single journals. Based on the number of articles paid for, Table 5 illustrates the top ten out of 732 journals. Payments to these ten journals represent 45 % of all payments. In the case of Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics Discussions, the price range can be explained by the fact that this journal charges per page and also takes the submission's file format into consideration.

DISCUSSION

In Germany, institutional spending on open access publication fees has increased over the years, confirming the general trend of publication fees in academic publishing (Davis and Walters, 2011; Laakso and Björk, 2012; Pinfield, 2015). With a share of 99%, the majority of open access articles German institutions reported to the Open APC initiative were published in fully open access journals. This presumably reflects the DFG funding policy which excludes the support of articles published in hybrid open access journals. The DFG has been financially supporting the implementation of central publication funds at more than 30 German universities since 2009. However, in reviewing self-reported cost data from funders or countries that also support hybrid open access journals or open access books, we revealed smaller proportions of payments in favour of articles in fully open access journals. Because open access publication fee spending is fragmented, we cannot answer whether German researchers avoided opting for open access when publishing in hybrid journals or used other budgets to pay publication fees required to make their work open access through these kind of journals.

In our study, CrossRef thoroughly indexed open access journal articles in the Open APC data-set. We could gather metadata representing publisher and journal titles for 99 % articles, and successfully merged these information with the Open APC cost data. Using metadata from CrossRef, therefore, reduces the extensive validation work of bibliographic information provided that the reporting of the DOI along with the expenses is made mandatory. Drawing on CrossRef would also increase the comparability of cost data for future negotiations with publishers on open access agreements, and the open access spending between open data initiatives that apply the same reporting standards, as its metadata represent the dynamic landscape of academic publishing in terms of ongoing mergers of publishing houses or name changes.

Another advantage of self-reported data-sets on the article-level to disclose spending on open access publication fees is that they enable researchers and practitioners alike to study in which open access journals researchers from one institution actually publish, and to compare these findings with that of other universities or research organizations. For instance, our study revealed that the size of publication fee spending differed among the institutions with the Max Planck Society accounting for almost 39 % of the overall articles. Many universities and research organization reported remarkably lower number of supported open access articles to the Open APC initiative. Using self-reported data, therefore, contributes to the understanding about how much and to what extent spending on open access publishing varies on the institutional level. This is particularly relevant given the increasingly important role open access publishing plays in recent negotiations between German universities and research organizations forming consortia on the one side and publishers on the other about financing scholarly publishing in future (Bruch et al., 2015).

This study is limited in some respects. One is that we cannot assess whether publishers and journals granted publication fee discounts seeing that the Open APC initiative does not track this kind of informa-

tion. However, the large price ranges of particular journals suggests that varying pricing schemes were in place. Adding to this complexity, it is likely that some institutions only paid parts of the publication fee. Take for instance the journal *Nature Communication*. Charges reported in our sample ranged between 2000 €, the DFG price cap, and 4.403 €. Such co-payments that involve several budgets were a proposed strategy to sustain publication funds at German universities (Fournier and Weihberg, 2013). In another case, one university included its charges for participating in the German SCOAP consortia and presumably divided the sum by the articles published in SCOAP journals. In this national consortia, managed by the German National Library of Science and Technology, payments were not directly made per article. Instead, subscription costs between a participating library and a publisher were reconciled, and the reduction transferred to the consortia to finance publications in SCOAP journals.

It must also be noted that reporting to the Open APC initiative is voluntary. Therefore, not all institutions in Germany that provide central funding of publication fees contribute cost data to this initiative. In a qualitative survey, asking why German institutions are reluctant to share their cost data through the Open APC initiative, one institution feared that increase in transparency would allow publishers to adjust prices in their favour. Others pointed out that the workload to produce such a data-set could be too extensive (Deppe, 2015). As no registry of institutional open access funds or similar support structures exists, we cannot assess the number of non-participants in Germany.

Our analysis on how institutional spending per articles was distributed over publishers and journal titles shows that open access publishing is diverse and concentrated at the same time. While we were able to identify 139 individual publishing houses that were supported by the German universities and research organizations, the distribution is highly skewed. 92 % of open access publication fee spending went to ten publishers, confirming a general high concentration of few publishers in current academic publishing. However, our study could not confirm that publications in open access journals owned by traditional publishing houses account for most of the spending on publication fees. Rather, open access publishers such as Public Library of Science (PloS), Copernicus GmbH or MPDI AG rank higher in our study than in the analyses of cost data in the UK.

This study finally confirms the leading role of “mega-journals” in open access publishing, including the multidisciplinary PLOS ONE and the journals *New Journal of Physics*, *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics Discussions* and *Frontiers in Psychology*, all of which publish contributions from all branches of their respective discipline. In general, an estimated 14 out of more than 10,000 journals registered in DOAJ in 2015 accounted for up to 15–20 % of all articles published in full open access journals (Björk, 2015).

CONCLUSION

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

We thank Andrea Hacker and Ada-Charlotte Regelman for valuable comments on the first draft of this paper. We also thank Christoph Broschinski, Vitali Peil, and Dirk Pieper, the members of the DINI working group “Electronic publishing”, and all data contributors⁶ of the Open APC initiative.

REFERENCES

- Björk, B.-C. (2015). Have the ‘mega-journals’ reached the limits to growth? *PeerJ* 3, e981. <http://doi.org/10.7717/peerj.981>.
- Björk, B.-C., and Solomon, D. (2012). Pricing principles used by scholarly open access publishers. *Learned Publishing* 25, 132–137. <http://doi.org/10.1087/20120207>.
- Björk, B.-C., and Solomon, D. (2014). How research funders can finance APCs in full OA and hybrid journals. *Learned Publishing* 27, 93–103. <http://doi.org/10.1087/20140203>.
- Bruch, C., Deinzer, G., Geschuhn, K., Haetscher, P., Hillenkoetter, K., Kress, U., et al. (2015). Positions on creating an Open Access publication market which is scholarly adequate : Positions of the Ad Hoc Working Group Open Access Gold in the priority initiative “Digital Information” of the Alliance of Science Organisations in Germany. Ad-hoc-Arbeitsgruppe Open-Access-Gold der Schwerpunktinitiative “Digitale Information” der Allianz der deutschen Wissenschaftsorganisationen. <http://doi.org/10.2312/allianzoa.009>.

⁶<https://github.com/OpenAPC/openapc-de#contributors>

314 Chamberlain, S., Boettiger, C., Hart, T., and Ram, K. (2016). *rcrossref: Client for Various 'CrossRef'*
 315 *'APIs'*. Available at: <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=rcrossref>.

316 Dallmeier-Tiessen, S., Darby, R., Goerner, B., Hypoelae, J., Igo-Kemenes, P., Kahn, D., et al. (2011).
 317 Highlights from the SOAP project survey. What Scientists Think about Open Access Publishing. Available
 318 at: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1101.5260>.

319 Davis, P. M., and Walters, W. H. (2011). The impact of free access to the scientific literature: a review
 320 of recent research. *Journal of the Medical Library Association* 99, 208–217. <http://doi.org/10.3163/1536-5050.99.3.008>.

322 Deppe, A. (2015). *Ansätze zur Verstetigung von Open-Access-Publikationsfonds.*, ed. K. Umlauf
 323 Institut für Bibliotheks- und Informationswissenschaft. Available at: <http://nbn-resolving.de/urn:nbn:de:kobv:11-100234262>.

325 Eppelin, A., Pampel, H., Bandilla, W., and Kaczmirek, L. (2012). Umgang mit Open-Access-
 326 Publikationsgebühren – die Situation in Deutschland in 2010. *GMS Medizin — Bibliothek — Information*.
 327 12. <http://doi.org/10.3205/mbi000240>.

328 Fournier, J., and Weihberg, R. (2013). Das Förderprogramm “Open Access Publizieren” der Deutschen
 329 Forschungsgemeinschaft. Zum Aufbau von Publikationsfonds an wissenschaftlichen Hochschulen in
 330 Deutschland. *Zeitschrift für Bibliothekswesen und Bibliographie* 60, 236–243. <http://doi.org/10.3196/186429501360528>.

332 Hampson, C. (2014). The Adoption of Open Access Funds Among Canadian Academic Research
 333 Libraries, 2008-2012. *Partnership: The Canadian Journal of Library and Information Practice and*
 334 *Research* 9. <http://doi.org/10.21083/partnership.v9i2.3115>.

335 Kiley, R. (2014). Wellcome Trust APC spend 2012-13: data file. <http://doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.963054.v1>.

337 Kiley, R. (2015). Wellcome Trust open access (OA) spend and compliance monitoring: 2013-14.
 338 <http://doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.1321361.v5>.

339 Kiley, R. (2016). Wellcome Tust/COAF spend on open access publishing (article processing charges)
 340 - 2014-15. <http://doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.3118936.v1>.

341 Kingsley, D. A. (2014). Paying for Publication: Issues and Challenges for Research Support Services.
 342 *Australian Academic & Research Libraries* 45, 262–281. <http://doi.org/10.1080/00048623.2014.945135>.

344 Laakso, M., and Björk, B.-C. (2012). Anatomy of open access publishing: a study of longitudinal
 345 development and internal structure. *BMC Medicine* 10, 124. <http://doi.org/10.1186/1741-7015-10-124>.

347 Lawson, S. (2015a). APC data for 25 UK higher education institutions - 2014. <http://doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.1305596.v5>.

349 Lawson, S. (2015b). Article Processing Charges Paid by 25 UK Universities in 2014. *Journal of Open*
 350 *Humanities Data* 1. <http://doi.org/10.5334/johd.2>.

351 Lawson, S. (2015c). Fee Waivers for Open Access Journals. *Publications* 3, 155–167. <http://doi.org/10.3390/publications3030155>.

353 Lawson, S. (2016). APC data for 27 UK higher education institutions in 2015. <http://doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.1507481.v4>.

355 Lawson, S., and Meghreblian, B. (2015). Journal subscription expenditure of UK higher education
 356 institutions. *F1000Research*. <http://doi.org/10.12688/f1000research.5706.3>.

357 Noorden, R. V. (2013). Open access: The true cost of science publishing. *Nature* 495, 426–429.
 358 <http://doi.org/10.1038/495426a>.

359 Pinfield, S. (2015). Making Open Access work. *Online Information Review* 39, 604–636. <http://doi.org/10.1108/oir-05-2015-0167>.

361 Pinfield, S., and Middleton, C. (2012). Open access central funds in UK universities. *Learned*
 362 *Publishing* 25, 107–117. <http://doi.org/10.1087/20120205>.

363 Pinfield, S., Salter, J., and Bath, P. A. (2015). The “total cost of publication” in a hybrid open-access
 364 environment: Institutional approaches to funding journal article-processing charges in combination with
 365 subscriptions. *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology*. <http://doi.org/10.1002/asi.23446>.

367 Ram, K. (2013). Git can facilitate greater reproducibility and increased transparency in science.
 368 *Source Code for Biology and Medicine* 8, 7. <http://doi.org/10.1186/1751-0473-8-7>.

369 Reckling, F., and Kenzian, M. (2014). Austrian Science Fund (FWF) Publication Cost Data 2013.
 370 <http://doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.988754.v4>.

371 Reckling, F., and Rieck, K. (2015). Austrian Science Fund (FWF) Publication Cost Data 2014.
 372 <http://doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.1378610.v14>.

373 Rieck, K., Haslinger, D., Meischke-Ilic, S., Kirindi-Hentschel, Ü., and Reckling, F. (2016). Austrian
 374 Science Fund (FWF) Publication Cost Data 2015. [http://doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.](http://doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.3180166.v1)
 375 [3180166.v1](http://doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.3180166.v1).

376 Schimmer, R., Geschuhn, K., and Palzenberger, M. (2013). Open Access in Zahlen: Der Umbruch in
 377 der Wissenschaftskommunikation als Herausforderung für Bibliotheken. *Zeitschrift für Bibliothekswesen*
 378 *und Bibliographie* 60, 244–250. <http://doi.org/10.3196/186429501360532>.

379 Sikora, A., and Geschuhn, K. K. (2015). Management of article processing charges – challenges for
 380 libraries. *Insights: the UKSG journal* 28, 87–92. <http://doi.org/10.1629/uksg.229>.

381 Solomon, D. J., and Björk, B.-C. (2011). Publication fees in open access publishing: Sources of
 382 funding and factors influencing choice of journal. *Journal of the Association for Information Science and*
 383 *Technology* 63, 98–107. <http://doi.org/10.1002/asi.21660>.

384 Solomon, D. J., and Björk, B.-C. (2012). A study of open access journals using article processing
 385 charges. *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology* 63, 1485–1495. <http://doi.org/10.1002/asi.22673>.

386 Suber, P. (2012). *Open Access*. MIT Press. Available at: [https://mitpress.mit.edu/](https://mitpress.mit.edu/books/open-access)
 387 [books/open-access](https://mitpress.mit.edu/books/open-access).

388 Walters, W. H., and Linvill, A. C. (2011). Bibliographic index coverage of open-access journals in
 389 six subject areas. *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology* 62, 1614–1628.
 390 <http://doi.org/10.1002/asi.21569>.

391 Woodward, H. M., and Henderson, H. L. (2014). Report for Jisc Collections on total cost of owner-
 392 ship project: Data capture and process. Information Power Ltd. Available at: [https://www.jisc-](https://www.jisc-collections.ac.uk/Global/News%20files%20and%20docs/IPL-Jisc-Total-Cost-of-Ownership-Data-Capture-Report.pdf)
 393 [collections.ac.uk/Global/News%20files%20and%20docs/IPL-Jisc-Total-Cost-](https://www.jisc-collections.ac.uk/Global/News%20files%20and%20docs/IPL-Jisc-Total-Cost-of-Ownership-Data-Capture-Report.pdf)
 394 [of-Ownership-Data-Capture-Report.pdf](https://www.jisc-collections.ac.uk/Global/News%20files%20and%20docs/IPL-Jisc-Total-Cost-of-Ownership-Data-Capture-Report.pdf).