Question and Answer Session

Question: Who is responsible for evaluating the Open Science Elements provided by publishers?

> **Answer:** The SCOAP3 first completes the evaluation. This is then shared with the publishers, who can verify the details of their assessment and provide clarification. Following this process, the final annual score for each publisher is determined.

Question: What definition of 'dataset linking' is used in the definition of SCOAP3 Open Science elements?

> **Answer:** SCOAP3 has a scoring category for dataset and software linking, granting up to 10 points (5 for data and 5 for software). For data: Two points are assigned if the journal has a data policy that requires authors to make their data available or to provide a data availability statement. A further point is granted for each additional 10% increase in the journal's dataset share (measured by clearly identified links in the articles' references or metadata), up to a maximum of three points. A similar grading method is used for software linking.

Question: Is it possible to find the list of mandatory and additional fields somewhere on the site?

> **Answer:** You'll find the details on this page:
> https://scoap3.org/journals-2025-2027/open-science-elements/

Question: When will discussions on SCOAP3 post-Phase 4 start?

> **Answer:** No discussion on this topic is planned for this SCOAP3 forum, as the future is uncertain. The SCOAP3 partnership will start this discussion soon. It will be the focus of the Governing Council meeting in October 2025.

Question: Can we infer from the OS Element results that only one out of two articles has the author's ORCID in the metadata (2.63 out of 5 available points)?

> **Answer:** No, we cannot infer this from the score. This is because the ORCID element calculation is based on three components. Firstly, we calculate the proportion of articles in the evaluated set that have at least two ORCIDs (where there are at least two authors). Secondly, we evaluate the presence of ORCID validation through an API (for this, publishers must provide documentation). Finally, we calculate the proportion of authors with an ORCID compared to the

total number of authors in the set of evaluated articles. This grants publishers additional points.

It is worth noting that articles with a high number of authors are not uncommon in our field, e.g. for collaborative papers. However, collaborations have different ways of collecting and providing ORCIDs, so not all ORCIDs are collected and shared by some collaborations. This can impact the final results for this element.

Question: Even though the total number of obtainable points is 25 in 2025 (rather than 31), do publishers still have to reach 16 points to get the 5% bonus?

Answer: Yes, the 16-point threshold was also valid for 2025.

Question: Is it possible to share the results at journal level? For instance it would be interesting to see how individual journals scored on metadata.

Answer: We will not share detailed scores for individual publishers or journals, only the average. Rather than focusing on individual elements, we want to encourage publishers to improve their overall compliance with these elements. However, as you can see from the average metadata score of 2.17 out of 5, there is room for improvement, and we hope to see improvements in 2026.

Question: On slide 6 of the JISC presentation, how are the points in the HEII (How Equitable Is It?) model chosen? This seems to affect the final outcome.

Answer: Further information on the scoring criteria can be found here: https://www.coalition-s.org/wp-content/uploads/2024/09/HowEquitableIsIt_Framework_criteria_definitions.pdf.

We have also worked with the CERN team to verify our rationale.

The Working Group welcomes anyone to test the tool to make it as useful as possible. https://www.coalition-s.org/moving-away-from-apcs/

Question: Why hasn't SCOAP3 scored higher in the preprints category of the JISC model when submitting a preprint is a requirement for SCOAP3 eligibility? Is it because it isn't required at the point of submission?

Answer: SCOAP3 does not require the existence of a preprint per se. In some journals, de facto, you can only be funded through SCOAP3 as the eligibility is verified through the arXiv category. However, in other journals, all articles are funded independently of any arXiv preprint.

Within HEII, the two criteria regarding preprints are: (1) encouraging and facilitating preprints, and (2) whether reviews of preprints selected for peer review

are publicly posted, irrespective of whether an article is selected for formal publication in a journal.

Question: Has SCOAP3 considered the idea that a metric stops being useful once it becomes a goal? How will the scoring system evolve?

> **Answer:** SCOAP3 acknowledges this possibility; however, the evaluation of open science elements is not a metric as such, but rather a set of elements chosen by the community to improve and promote the implementation of open science practices. The goal is to improve these practices beyond high-energy physics for the entire scientific community.
>
> It is also worth mentioning that the scoring system is only in place for Phase 4 of SCOAP3 and can therefore be subject to change if new goals or necessities are defined.

Question: Could you elaborate on the reported 7% increase over the past year? The transparency data on cost increases on the SCOAP³ website appears to show a higher figure: https://scoap3.org/phase3-journals/. Does this suggest that CERN may have been capping costs for its members?

> **Answer:** No, CERN does not cap costs for SCOAP³ members who contribute according to their fair share of publications in the journals. In addition, they pay an amount for countries that are not participating.
>
> The numbers displayed on the website represent the overall costs of SCOAP³. The 7% increase shown on the slide is the average increase in SCOAP3 contributions by individual partners. Part of the overall cost increase is due to the inclusion of APS journals in the SCOAP3 journals, which occurred in 2018.

Question: What is the geographical breakdown of financial contributions versus publications for SCOAP3?

> **Answer:** Contributions are based on a country's fair share of articles, not its geographical location. For countries that cannot meet their fair share of contributions or are not members of the consortium for financial reasons, SCOAP3 introduced the 'solidarity contribution' – an additional 10% to cover costs for authors in countries not part of SCOAP3.