

47

48 **ORCID number:** 0000-0002-2816-6905

49 **Twitter:** @JoshuaDWallach

50

51

52 **Key words:** Publishing; Article processing costs; Open access

53 **Word count:** 5125

54 **Figures/Tables:** 3/4 (3 Figures, 4 Tables)

55 **References:** 56

56 **Appendix:** none

57 **ABSTRACT**

58 **Objective:** To estimate the financial costs paid by individual medical researchers from meeting
59 the article processing charges (APCs) levied by open access journals in 2019. To investigate the
60 emotional burden to researchers using a novel metric (the APC Twitter Whinge Score).

61 **Design:** Cross-sectional analysis.

62 **Data sources:** Scopus was used to generate two random samples of researchers, the first with a
63 senior author article indexed in the ‘Medicine’ subject area (i.e., general researchers) and the
64 second with an article published in the ten highest impact factor general clinical medicine
65 journals (i.e., high-impact researchers) in 2019. For each researcher, Scopus was used to identify
66 all first and senior author original research and review articles published in 2019. Researcher and
67 journal information was obtained from Scopus, institutional profiles, Journal Citation Reports,
68 publisher databases on APCs, the Directory of Open Access Journals, and individual journal
69 websites. Twitter searches were conducted to identify and classify APC-related tweets using a
70 novel APC Twitter Whinge Score.

71 **Main outcome measures:** Median APCs paid by general and high-impact researchers for all
72 first and senior author research and review articles published in 2019; additionally, we examined
73 median APCs paid by researcher gender, affiliation, training, and geographic region. APC
74 Twitter Whinge Score.

75 **Results:** There were 241 general and 246 high-impact researchers identified as eligible for our
76 study. In 2019, the general and high-impact researchers published a total of 914 (median 2,
77 interquartile range 1-5) and 1471 (4, 2-8) first or senior author research or review articles,
78 respectively. 42% (384/914) of the articles from the general researchers and 29% (428/1471) of
79 the articles from the high-impact medical researchers were published in fully open access

80 journals. The median total APCs paid by general researchers in 2019 was \$191 [£150]
81 (interquartile range \$0-\$2500 [£0-£1960]) and the median total paid by high-impact researchers
82 was \$2900 [£2274] (interquartile range \$0-\$5465 [£0-£4285]); the maximum paid by a single
83 researcher in total APCs was \$30115 [£23610] and \$34676 [£27186], respectively. There were
84 no differences in total APCs paid by gender, affiliation, or training. However, high-impact
85 researchers from the Region of the Americas had a lower median total APCs paid than those
86 from other regions (\$1695, interquartile range \$0 - \$3935) [£1329, £0-£3085] vs. \$4800, \$1888-
87 \$8290) [£3763, £1480-£6500]; $P < 0.001$). Among a sample of 195 APC-related tweets in 2019,
88 121 (62.1%) were publicly resentful (with or without swears) of APCs, scoring in the
89 highest two categories of the APC-related Twitter Whinge Score.

90 **Conclusions:** Medical researchers in 2019 were found to have paid between 0 [£0] and \$34676
91 [£27186] in total APCs. As journals with APCs become more common, it is important to
92 understand the cost to researchers, especially those who may not have the funding or institutional
93 resources to cover these costs, or we risk creating a pay-to-publish system that favors well-
94 resourced authors from well-resourced institutions and areas of the world. We also present
95 evidence that these APCs may cause emotional damage to researchers, causing them to divert
96 effort to moaning on Twitter. We postulate that behind this behavior may lie hidden harmful
97 cycles of personal penury, domestic argument, insomnia, poor work relationships, inadequately
98 prepared coffee, and even the possible use of alcohol before tweeting.

99 **What is already known on this topic:**

- 100 - Over the past 20 years, a new model of scientific publishing has emerged that relies on
101 digital publication rather than print distribution – open access publishing.
- 102 - Open access publishing has shifted part of the financial costs of publishing from
103 academic institutions to individual researchers and their funders, who are responsible for
104 article processing charges that can average \$2000 (£1568) to \$3000 (£2352) per article.
- 105 - In addition to the potential financial costs of publishing, anecdotal evidence suggests
106 that article processing charges may lead to emotional damage to researchers, causing
107 them to divert effort to moaning on Twitter.

108 **What this study adds:**

- 109 - Medical researchers could be paying as much as \$34676 [£27186] in total article
110 processing charges for their first and senior research and review articles each year.
- 111 - The majority of article processing charge related tweets are publicly resentful (with or
112 without swear language) of these journal fees, scoring in the highest two categories of
113 the Twitter Whinge Score.
- 114 - As journals with article processing charges become more common, it is important to
115 understand the burden – financial and emotional - on researchers, especially those who
116 may not have the funding or institutional resources to cover these costs.

117 **INTRODUCTION**

118

119 Publications in peer-reviewed journals are currency in the academic world, and are often

120 viewed as a proxy for productivity, competency, and prestige. With over 15 million publishing

121 scientists across the world,^{1,2} the pressure to publish has only risen, as has the importance of

122 publications for employment, promotion, and tenure.³ Over the past decade, there has been a

123 striking growth in the number of scientific articles published per year, with nearly 2.5 million

124 scientific articles published in 2018 alone.⁴ The sheer quantity of scientific research being

125 published, the shift to predominantly electronic publishing, and a broad movement to make

126 scientific research more transparent has wrought a dramatic change in the landscape of scientific

127 publishing.^{5,6}

128 Currently, the primary mechanism for the publication of scientific articles is through

129 peer-reviewed journals. These journals have operated using a subscription model, generally

130 owned and managed by a professional society or a medical publisher. Under this model, the cost

131 to individual researchers, either to access articles or publish their own research in the journals, is

132 minimal (although they contribute substantial in-kind effort through peer and editorial review).

133 Instead, institutions pay subscription fees, which can reach millions of dollars for larger

134 publishers, to gain access to articles for the institution's affiliates.^{7,8} Receipt of the *BMJ* is a

135 compulsory benefit imposed on members of the British Medical Association in return for an

136 annual membership fee.

137 However, over the past 20 years, a new model of scientific publishing emerged that relied

138 on digital “publication” rather than print distribution – open access publishing.⁵ Generally, open

139 access journals forgo subscriptions for their online content and instead make research available

140 to scholars without institutional subscriptions and to the general public. With no revenue from

141 subscriptions (or from prescription drug advertisements), some open access journals established
142 a new business model built around article processing charges (APCs).⁵ Compared to the
143 subscription journals, the APC model has shifted part of the financial burden of publishing from
144 academic institutions to individual researchers and their funders, who are responsible for APCs
145 that average \$2000 (£1568) to \$3000 (£2352) per article.^{9,10} In this way, everyone can eat the
146 picnic, but those who provide the food do so at their own cost and are additionally charged for
147 bringing it to the picnic site.

148 With almost 5000 open access journals following the APC business model,¹¹ researchers
149 are increasingly having to consider if and how they can afford to publish their research in open
150 access journals with the limited pool of funds available. While the vast majority of medical
151 researchers are supportive of the concept of open access publishing, over half listed financial
152 barriers as the primary reason they would choose not to publish in open access journals.¹²
153 Although APCs can be covered with funds from research grants or by funders directly, not all
154 research is grant funded, the structure and amount of funding that comes from grants can vary by
155 field, and the ability or willingness of funders to cover APCs differs by region.^{10,13} Additionally,
156 early career researchers or under-represented minority (URM) researchers may have more
157 limited access to grant funding or institutional funds to cover APCs, as do researchers in less
158 lucrative clinical fields like primary care and public health.¹⁴⁻¹⁶ While fee waivers are sometimes
159 granted to researchers in low- and middle-income countries or without funding, discounted APCs
160 may still be prohibitive for many researchers.^{17,18}

161 If financial barriers play such a substantial role in scientists' decisions on where to
162 publish, it is important to investigate the potential financial costs of publishing on individual
163 medical researchers. Therefore, we aimed to estimate how much individual medical researchers

164 spend on APCs over the course of a year for both a general sample of medical researchers as well
165 a sample of researchers who published in the highest impact factor clinical medicine journals in
166 2019. To measure the emotional burden of APCs on researchers, we also evaluated APC-related
167 tweets using a novel metric (The APC Twitter Whinge Score).

168

169 **METHODS**

170 **Part 1: Estimating article processing charges**

171 *Study design and sample*

172 We conducted a cross-sectional analysis of two random samples of medical researchers to
173 obtain estimates of the average amount of money that individual researchers spend on APCs each
174 year. We used Scopus to identify 250 general medical researchers and 250 medical researchers
175 who published at least one article in one of the ten highest impact factor general clinical
176 medicine journals.

177

178 *Generating a sample of general and high-impact researchers*

179 First, we downloaded the first 20000 English language research or review articles
180 published in a journal indexed in the Scopus subject area of ‘Medicine’ in 2019 (**Figure 1**), the
181 maximum data export permitted through the Scopus portal. Next, we used Scopus to identify all
182 research or review articles published in the top ten highest impact factor clinical medicine
183 journals in 2019 (according to the Journal Citation Report (JCR):¹⁹ *New England Journal of*
184 *Medicine (NEJM)*, *Lancet*, *Journal of the American Medical Association (JAMA)*, *British*
185 *Medical Journal (BMJ)*, *JAMA Internal Medicine*, *Annals of Internal Medicine*, *PLOS Medicine*,
186 *BMC Medicine*, *Mayo Clinic Proceedings*, and *Canadian Medical Association Journal*). For

187 each sample, we used a random number generator to select 500 articles. However, given the
188 broad nature of the search utilized, some articles randomly selected did not fall under the
189 category of “general clinical medicine,” or were other article types misclassified as research or
190 review articles. Therefore, the first 250 articles determined to be eligible were retained for each
191 sample (i.e., 250 general medicine articles and 250 high-impact medicine articles).

192 Next, we identified the senior-most (i.e., last) author of each research or review article
193 contained in the sample (hereafter, index researcher). Potential duplicate researchers were
194 verified and removed through a Scopus and/or Google scholar search of the researcher’s name. If
195 authorship was listed as a group, without any designated individuals, the manuscript was
196 excluded from the sample. If a group authorship was listed as the senior author, the senior-most
197 individual author on the article was used.

198

199 *Data collection*

200 Three investigators (MKE, XS, JJS) independently abstracted data, and to ensure data
201 quality, approximately 20% of each sample was abstracted in duplicate to verify consistency. All
202 uncertainties were discussed with a fourth investigator (JDW). All data abstraction and
203 validation were conducted between April 22nd and July 22nd, 2020.

204

205 *Researcher Information*

206 For the index researchers in both samples, we used the researcher’s Scopus profile to
207 collect the researcher’s name, affiliation, geographic region (based on the six World Health
208 Organization [WHO] regions),²⁰ H-index, year of first publication, and research field. Research
209 field was collected from the subject area tags listed on the researcher Scopus profile. For each

210 index researcher, we conducted a Google search of the researcher's name and screened the first
211 10 pages to identify an institutional researcher profile. If a researcher profile was available, we
212 also abstracted researcher gender, if clearly indicated in the profile or through identification of
213 gender pronouns, and training (a doctor of medicine (MD), with or without other degrees; a
214 doctor of philosophy (PhD), with or without other degrees (excluding MD); or any other
215 degrees).

216

217 *Identification of first and senior author publications in 2019*

218 Using the Scopus profile of each index researcher, we identified all of the articles
219 published in 2019 where the index researcher was listed as either the first or senior author.
220 Articles on which the index researcher was a middle author (no matter if 3 authors were listed or
221 20) were excluded, as we assumed the index researcher would not have paid any associated APC
222 as a middle author. For each article, we abstracted the corresponding journal's title and
223 determined whether the article was marked as open access in Scopus.²¹

224

225 *Journal characteristics and article processing charges*

226 We used JCR to determine the 2018 journal impact factor for each unique journal. Next,
227 we identified the journal publishing model (open access, hybrid, or subscription-based) and the
228 APCs for each journal. A hybrid journal was defined as a traditional subscription-based journal
229 with a fee-based open access publication option.²² To ascertain APCs, we first utilized publisher
230 specific databases,²³⁻³⁷ which provide lists of open access and hybrid journals from selected
231 publishers and their associated APCs. If a journal could not be identified through a publisher
232 database, we utilized the Directory of Open Access Journals (DOAJ)¹¹ to identify if the journal

233 was open access. If listed on DOAJ, the journal was considered open access and the
234 corresponding APC was collected from the provided link to the journal website on DOAJ. If the
235 publishing model of a journal could not be determined from those two sources, we relied on the
236 information provided on individual journal websites. Journals without a clear open access policy
237 (either full open access or a hybrid approach) were considered subscription-based.

238 We defined the standard APC for an open access journal as the fee associated with
239 publishing in that journal. For hybrid journals, we defined the APC as the fee associated with
240 optional open access publication. We did not include additional fees not associated with open
241 access publication, such as charges for color printing or reprints, as part of the APCs. If an APC
242 for a given journal was based on word count or page limits, we approximated the standard APC
243 using an average article (3500 words) or page count (8 pages).³⁸ In addition to the standard APC,
244 we collected the minimum APC for any journal with multiple APC options. The minimum APC
245 was defined as the lowest APC a researcher could pay given any discounts publicly listed by the
246 journal on the journal website or in the publishing database or different licensing options (e.g.
247 institutional or author membership discounts or commercial versus non-commercial licenses).

248

249 *Statistical Analysis*

250 Using descriptive statistics, we characterized the sample of both the general researchers
251 and high-impact researchers, including gender, affiliation, training, geographic region, and
252 seniority (based on H-Index and length of the researcher's career). Length of the researcher's
253 career was approximated by subtracting the year of the index researcher's first publication from
254 2020.

255 Next, we calculated the median (interquartile range) APCs paid by index researchers in
256 2019 for both groups. To do this, for each index researcher, we calculated the maximum total
257 APCs paid in 2019 by assuming that an APC was paid by the index researcher if they were the
258 first or senior author of an article. If an index researcher's article was published in an open
259 access journal with an APC listed, we assumed that the APC was paid without any discounts or
260 waivers. For any of the index researcher's articles published in either hybrid or subscription-
261 based journals, we assumed no APC was paid. Lastly, we also calculated the proportion of
262 articles published in open access journals.

263 We used the Mann Whitney U test or Mood's test as appropriate to compare median
264 APCs paid per index researcher by the characteristics noted above. For comparisons of APCs
265 paid by H-Index and length of the researcher's career, we compared researchers above and below
266 the median H-Index and across quartiles in each sample, respectively. Any unknown values were
267 considered as missing. US dollar amounts were converted to British pound sterling using the
268 average exchange rate for 2019.³⁹ All data analyses were conducted in R Version 3.6.1 and used
269 a threshold for statistical significance of 0.05.

270

271 *Sensitivity analyses*

272 We repeated the analyses above assuming that index researchers paid: (1) the minimum
273 publicly listed APCs, (2) the APCs for articles published in hybrid journals and classified as
274 "Open Access" on Scopus, (3) APCs for only their first author articles, and (4) APCs for only
275 their senior author articles.

276

277 **Part 2: The APC Twitter Whinge Score**

278 To measure the emotional burden that APCs can have on researchers, we also developed and
279 tested a novel metric - the APC Twitter Whinge Score (**Box 1**). This scoring system uses a highly
280 scientific process to manually screen and evaluate the language used to describe APCs on
281 Twitter. Nine advanced searches were conducted on Twitter to identify Tweets posted between
282 January 1, 2019 and December 31st, 2019, containing the phrases “Article cost”, “Article costs”,
283 “Article fee”, “Article processing costs”, “Article processing fee”, “Article processing charge”,
284 “Publication cost”, “Publication costs”, and “Publication fee”. One author (JDW) screened all
285 search results, identified any APC-related Tweets from individual accounts (i.e., excluding
286 Tweets from organizations or journals/publishers advertising their amazingly low APCs), and
287 characterized the tweets using the APC Twitter Whinge Score.

288

289 *Patient and Public Involvement*

290 This study was an analysis of publicly available, non-clinical data. There was no patient
291 or public involvement in any of the phases of the study, although we expect the public to be
292 broadly supportive of open access publishing since it permits access to information and does not
293 require expensive subscriptions through medical libraries.

294

295 **RESULTS**

296 After accounting for duplicate index researchers and non-English publications, our
297 sample included 241 general and 246 high-impact researchers. Among the 241 general
298 researchers, 239 (99.2%) had ‘Medicine’ listed as one of their subject areas on Scopus; all 246
299 high-impact researchers had ‘Medicine’ listed as one of their subject areas.

300

301 *Researcher characteristics*

302 Nearly all of the general researchers were affiliated with academic centers or hospitals
303 (236/241, 97.9%); 62 (25.7%) were based in the Americas, 76 (31.5%) in Europe, and 69
304 (28.6%) in the Western Pacific region (**Table 1**). An institutional profile could not be identified
305 for approximately one quarter of the researchers (62/241, 26.5%). Among the 179 researchers
306 with an institutional profile, two thirds had an MD (120/179, 67.0%) and 70 (70/179, 39.1%)
307 were women. On average, general researchers had published at least two (median: 2, IQR 0 - 4)
308 first or senior author articles in 2019, had an H-Index of 11 (median: 11.0, IQR 3.0 - 23.0), and
309 had at least a 15-year publication history.

310 The vast majority of high-impact researchers were affiliated with academic centers or
311 hospitals (213/246, 87.6%); 85.8% (211/246) were primarily based in the Americas or Europe
312 (**Table 1**). An institutional profile was identified for almost all (241/246, 98.0%) of the high-
313 impact researchers. The majority of those with an institutional profile (166/241, 68.9%) had an
314 MD and one-third (82/241, 34.0%) of the researchers were women. High-impact researchers had,
315 on average, a publication history of greater than 20 years, an H-Index of 38.5 (median: 38.5, IQR
316 22.0 - 64.0), and had published at least four first or senior author manuscripts in 2019 (median:
317 4, IQR 2 - 8).

318

319 *Article Characteristics*

320 In 2019, the 241 general researchers published 914 first or senior author research or
321 review articles in 598 unique journals. The most common journals were *Medicine* (15/914, 1.6%)
322 and the *International Journal of Molecular Sciences* (9/914, 1.0%). Among the 462 journals with
323 a 2018 JCR impact factor, the median impact factor among their articles was 2.65 (IQR 1.69-

324 3.86). The 246 high-impact researchers published 1471 original first or senior author research or
325 review articles in 604 unique journals. The most common journals were *New England Journal of*
326 *Medicine* (60/1471, 4.1%), *The Lancet* (43/1471, 2.9%), and *PLOS Medicine* (36/1471, 2.5%).
327 Among the 537 journals with a 2018 JCR impact factor, the median impact factor among their
328 articles was 5.05 (IQR 3.18-11.05).

329 Of the 914 first or senior author research or review articles published by the general
330 researchers, 414 (414/914, 45.3%) were indexed in Scopus as open access. There were 384
331 (41.6%) articles published in an APC-based journal (**Table 2**). Of the 457 (457/914, 50.7%)
332 articles published in journals with a hybrid funding model, 72 (72/457, 15.8%) were indexed as
333 open access. Among the high-impact researchers, 726 (726/1471, 49.4%) of the articles were
334 indexed in Scopus as open access. Just under one-third of all articles were published in an APC-
335 based journal (426/1471, 28.9%). Among the 870 (870/1471, 59.1%) articles published in
336 journals with a hybrid funding model, less than one-third (255/870, 29.3%) were open access.

337

338 *Article Processing Charges*

339 The journal funding model and any associated APCs could be identified for 94.1%
340 (860/914) of the first or senior research or review articles published by the general researchers
341 and 97.8% (1439/1471) of the articles published by the high-impact researchers. In 2019, the 241
342 general and 246 high-impact researchers paid an estimated total of \$497716 (£390209) and
343 \$1067869 (£837209) in APCs, respectively, for their first and senior author articles. Although
344 the median APCs paid by general clinical medical researchers was \$191 (IQR \$0 - \$2500) [£150,
345 £0 - £1960], one researcher was estimated as having paid \$30115 (£23610) in APCs (**Table 3**,
346 **Figure 2**). The median total APCs per researcher in the high-impact sample was \$2900 (IQR \$0

347 - \$5465) [£2274, £0 - £4285]; one researcher was estimated as having paid as much as \$34676
348 (£27186) in APCs.

349 In sensitivity analyses, after including potential discounts on standard APCs, the
350 minimum listed APCs general researchers could have paid for their first and senior author
351 publications in 2019 was \$0 (IQR: \$0 - \$2500) [£0, £0 - £1960] (**Table 3**). However, researchers
352 in the high-impact sample would have paid approximately \$300 less on average (median: \$2600,
353 IQR \$0 - \$5465) [£2038, £0 - £4285]. If all researchers paid the APCs for their first and senior
354 open access published in hybrid journals (as opposed to the articles being made available through
355 delayed open access due to funder requirements, at the discretion of the journal, or through other
356 mechanisms such as self-archiving) the median total APCs paid by the general and high-impact
357 researchers would have been \$739 (IQR \$0 - \$3950) [£579, £0-£3097] and \$5000 (IQR \$0 -
358 \$10879) [£3920, £0-£8529], respectively.

359 The estimated median total APCs paid did not vary across index researcher gender,
360 training, H-index, and years since first publication (**Table 4**). However, high-impact researchers
361 in the Region of the Americas did have lower median total APCs per researcher than those in
362 other regions of the world (Region of the Americas: \$1695, IQR \$0-\$3935 [£1329, £0 - £3085]
363 vs. Other regions: \$4800, IQR \$1888-\$8290 [£3763, £1480 - £6500]; $p < 0.001$).

364

365 *The APC Twitter Whinge Score*

366 Among the sample of 195 APC-related tweets posted by individuals in 2019, the majority
367 (118/195, 60.5%) were classified as publicly resentful of APCs (**Figure 3**). There were two
368 (2/203, 1.0%) additional tweets that described APCs using swears language (although, we can
369 only assume that the authors meant “Why The Fee!?” when they wrote WTF).

370 **DISCUSSION**

371 In this cross-sectional study, 241 and 246 randomly selected general and high-impact
372 medical researchers published a median of 2 and 4 first or senior author research or review
373 articles in 2019, respectively. Approximately one-third of the articles across both samples were
374 published in journals that required an APC. The median total APCs per general and high-impact
375 researcher in 2019 was \$191 [£150] and \$2900 [£2274], respectively, with one researcher who
376 may have incurred as much as \$34676 in APCs [£27186]. Across both samples, there were no
377 meaningful differences in APCs paid by gender, affiliation, or training. However, in the high-
378 impact sample, researchers from the Region of the Americas had a lower median total APCs paid
379 (\$1695) [£1329] than researchers from all other regions (\$4800) [£3763]. As open access
380 publishing with APCs becomes increasingly common, it is important to consider the financial
381 (and emotional) implications for individual researchers across different fields, settings, and
382 levels of seniority. Otherwise, we risk creating a pay-to-publish system that favors well-
383 resourced authors from well-resourced institutions and areas of the world. Without a solution that
384 works for all stakeholders, we fear that Twitter will become over-run with tweets whinging about
385 APCs.

386 Our study suggests that many general and high-impact researchers could have paid
387 thousands of dollars in APCs to publish their first and senior research and review articles in
388 2019. Across the 487 index researchers in both samples, which represents only a fraction of all
389 biomedical researchers actively publishing in 2019, the total estimated APCs was approximately
390 \$1500000 [£1176000]. Given that general researchers published a median of 2 first or senior
391 articles per year (potentially in lower impact factor journals with smaller APCs)^{40,41} it may not be
392 surprising that the median total APCs per researcher was relatively low (\$191) [£150]. However,

393 among high-impact researchers, who published a median of 4 first or senior research or review
394 articles in 2019, the median total APCs per researcher was \$2900 [£2274]. This suggests that
395 these researchers paid an APC for one of every four of their first or senior author articles.
396 Moreover, if we extrapolate our findings, individual researchers could spend a total of \$116000
397 [£90944] on publication costs over a 40-year career.

398 The rise of the APC-centered open access publishing model poses a number of serious
399 challenges for researchers.^{18,42} Approximately one-third of the first or senior research and review
400 articles published by the general and high-impact researchers were published in an open access
401 journal that required an APC. Although not all open access journals charge APCs, approximately
402 50% of all articles that are published open access are published in journals that do.⁴³ When grant
403 money or institutional discretionary funds are used to cover APCs, as is the case for
404 approximately 80% researchers in the health, biological, and life sciences,¹⁰ fewer resources are
405 available for other research-related expenses.⁴² For instance, the \$2900 [£2274] median amount
406 spent by researchers in our high-impact sample could support the attendance of multiple
407 individuals at a conference or a critical piece of research equipment (or a number of other radical
408 publication options outlined in **Figure 2**). Moreover, for researchers spending tens of thousands
409 of dollars a year on APCs, these funds could have covered the tuition of a graduate student or the
410 partial salary of a postdoctoral fellow. Second, the amount of APCs has risen dramatically in
411 recent years – at a rate nearly three times that of the expected inflation rate.^{13,44} These increases
412 have raised questions about whether APCs actually reflect the cost of publishing or if publishers
413 are driven by primarily financial motives.^{9,42} While there does not appear to be a quality
414 difference between subscription-based and open access journals,^{5,45} there is some evidence that
415 journals with higher APCs are perceived to be higher impact.^{41,45}

416 Lastly, the amount of APCs can be prohibitive to many researchers, either based on
417 field¹⁰, seniority¹⁴, disparities in research funding^{15,16}, or setting.^{18,42,46} For instance, evidence
418 suggests that researchers from countries with gross domestic products (GDP) lower than \$25000
419 [£19600] are more likely to pay APCs out of personal funds compared to researchers from
420 countries with GDPs higher than \$25000 [£19600].¹⁰ It is important to note that certain journals
421 grant fee waivers to researchers from low- and middle-income countries or to researchers
422 without funding to support publication. However, many researchers may be unaware of the
423 specific journals that do provide waivers.¹⁷ Furthermore, journal waivers do not necessarily
424 address all of the inequities imposed by APCs. For early career researchers (i.e. the first, second,
425 third, and senior authors on this manuscript!), with no established grant funding or accumulated
426 discretionary funds (i.e., the first, second, third, and senior authors on this manuscript!), even
427 discounted APCs can be prohibitive.

428 As open access publishing becomes the norm, numerous opportunities exist to address
429 the disadvantages that may prevent many researchers from paying for APCs. At the journal level,
430 increased transparency may be necessary to inform researchers from low- and middle-income
431 countries or at early stages of their careers about the waivers that are available. It is also critical
432 that funders and institutions leverage their influence to restrain the hyperinflation of APCs. In
433 2018, cOAlition S, an international consortium of research funders, launched ‘Plan S’. This
434 initiative, which aims to make all scientific publications resulting from publicly-funded research
435 immediately available open access⁴⁷, has proposed an APC fee cap.^{44,47} As more scientific
436 research is available open access, institutions can shift resources from subscriptions to a pool of
437 funds to support the expenses for early career researchers. Among universities in the United
438 Kingdom, there is an ongoing commitment to promoting open access publishing by encouraging

439 submission to open access repositories and by assisting researchers in the payment of APCs for
440 immediate open access publication.¹³ At the funder level, more agencies could embrace the
441 Gates Foundation or the Charity Open Access Fund model utilized by the Wellcome Trust,
442 where researchers supported by these funders can request coverage of any associated APCs.^{48,49}
443 Individual researchers can also increasingly choose to release their research open access through
444 venues such as pre-print servers, like *medRxiv*, without undermining their ability to publish their
445 findings in peer-reviewed journals.⁵⁰ Furthermore, so-called “Green Open Access” policies,
446 where researchers can elect to post peer-reviewed papers in open access repositories, are
447 available for many journals, although most researchers do not utilize this option.^{51–53}

448 It is important to note that limiting the amount of science that exists behind a paywall can
449 also have clear advantages for individual researchers and the public.^{43,54} Open access publishing
450 can enhance equity by improving the ability of researchers, either working in low-resource
451 settings or at institutions that cannot support the hefty cost of journal subscriptions, to access
452 publications.^{52,55} Articles published open-access can receive a citation boost compared to those
453 behind paywalls, a boon for researchers looking to increase the audience and impact of their
454 work.⁵⁶ Furthermore, APCs often serve an important purpose in the publication process. APCs
455 can be used to pay the salaries of journal editors, who are often responsible for screening a large
456 number of manuscript submissions, identifying and soliciting appropriate peer-reviewers (and
457 performing their own peer-review), and helping improve the quality of studies as they transition
458 from submission to eventual publication. Moreover, APCs could be used to pay peer reviewers
459 for their efforts - a service currently provided by researchers for free even in cases where
460 researchers are paying thousands of dollars to publish an article.⁵⁷ However, if APCs continue to
461 increase, questions will continue to be raised about journals’ potential profit motives, predatory

462 journals, and hybrid journals that receive payments from both institutions and researchers (we
463 refer to this as ‘double-dipping’). Scientific publishing is changing and it will be necessary for all
464 stakeholders to adapt.

465

466 *Limitations of this study*

467 This study is subject to certain limitations. First, we apologize for some of the
468 nomenclature used in our manuscript (i.e., “general medical researchers” and “high-impact
469 medical researchers”). We recognize the limitations of focusing on journal impact factors, and do
470 not believe that authors should be classified as “general” or “high-impact” based upon *one* senior
471 author research or review article published in one of the ten highest impact factor medical
472 journals. Perhaps, we should have classified authors as having “good” or “bad” H-indices or
473 Altmetric Attention Scores, since there seems to be universal agreement about the calculation
474 and use of those metrics.

475 Second, our estimates do not represent the actual APCs that the index researchers in our
476 sample paid. Without access to the financial records from the index researchers and journals in
477 our sample, we had to make several assumptions about the nature of APC payments, most
478 fundamentally that it was the index author who paid the APCs, rather than a funder or other
479 organization. In particular, articles for which the index researcher was a middle author were
480 excluded, as we assumed index researchers are less likely to pay associated APCs as a middle
481 author. We also did not account for situations in which APCs may have been paid by co-primary
482 or co-senior authors. Additionally, we used the most recent APCs listed on journal website,
483 which may not represent the APCs paid in 2019. For our primary analysis, we assumed that
484 researchers in our sample did not pay the optional APCs for open access publications in hybrid

485 journals. Using publicly available information, it is difficult to determine if open access
486 publications in hybrid journals were paid for by researchers or were available open access due to
487 funder requirements or journal discretion. Furthermore, we did not account for any unlisted
488 discounts or fee waivers provided by journals to researcher institutions in our analyses. Although
489 the true minimum APCs per researcher may be lower than our estimate, our results did not
490 change substantially when analyses were repeated using the lowest APCs listed by journals
491 (excluding waivers). Overall, our sensitivity analyses provide a range of what researchers are
492 likely to have paid.

493 Third, although Scopus provides a comprehensive accounting of a given researcher's
494 publication history, not all manuscripts published by a researcher may be indexed on Scopus.
495 Furthermore, Scopus may create multiple researcher profiles for the same researcher, due to
496 changing institutions or different permutations of the researcher's name. However, we attempted
497 to identify and include all researcher profiles for each index researcher. Second, we relied on
498 articles classified as 'articles' or 'reviews' on Scopus. Although this method allowed us to
499 objectively screen and classify index researcher articles, it is possible that we may have included
500 or excluded articles that were incorrectly classified by Scopus.

501

502 *Life is no picnic*

503 To draw on the picnic analogy mentioned above, the model of open access publication
504 with APCs clearly has great advantages for picnic eaters – who get free food – and for picnic site
505 owners, who can set the charges for food provision. Researchers, however, are left with the effort
506 and cost of growing the food and bringing it to the picnic site. They must then wait for it to be
507 inspected by a team of (usually unpaid) food tasters and be willing to respond to any disparaging

508 comments that these reviewers think fit to make. If they are then allowed on to the picnic site,
509 they are then charged for the privilege of laying out their meal for the public.

510 Our Twitter analysis provides evidence that this process can take its toll on all but the
511 saintliest contributors. We found that a significant number are driven to exceed the bounds of
512 polite professional discourse. This leads us to postulate that beneath the obvious advantages of
513 open access publication there may lie hidden moral and financial harms to contributors. These
514 could include arguments with colleagues at work, financial arguments with spouses who are
515 unable to appreciate the subtleties of the APC system, sleep disturbance, and even the possible
516 use of alcohol before tweeting.

517

518 *Conclusion*

519 This cross-sectional analysis suggests that clinical medical researchers paid as much as
520 \$34676 [£27186] in total APCs for their first and senior author research and review articles in
521 2019. As journals with APCs become more common, it is important to understand the cost to
522 researchers, especially those who may not have the funding or institutional resources to cover
523 these costs. If we do not address rising publication costs, we risk creating a pay-to-publish
524 system that favors well-resourced authors from well-resources institutions and areas of the
525 world. Furthermore, researchers may increasingly turn to Twitter to complain about the financial
526 costs of publishing, and demand compensation for peer-reviewing articles.

527

528

529

530

531 **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

532 **Contributors:** JDW and JSR first conceived the study idea when arguing about who would have
533 to pay the APC for one of their previous manuscripts. MKE, KN, JSR, and JDW designed this
534 study. MKE, XS, and JJS acquired the author, journal, and APC data. JDW contributed to data
535 collection by spending a full day searching and browsing Twitter (a normal day at the office).
536 MKE conducted the statistical analysis. MKE, JSR, and JDW drafted the manuscript. All authors
537 participated in the interpretation of the data and critically revised the manuscript for important
538 intellectual content, not that there is anything all that important here. MKE and JDW had full
539 access to all the data in the study and take responsibility for the integrity of the data and the
540 accuracy of the data analysis. MKE and JDW are guarantors. JDW provided supervision, and
541 despite being the senior author, begged JSR to pay the APCs.

542 **Funding:** None. Therefore, the APC for this manuscript will come from JDW's discretionary
543 piggy bank. The authors assume full responsibility for the accuracy and completeness of the
544 ideas presented.

545 **Competing interests:** All authors have completed the ICMJE uniform disclosure form
546 at www.icmje.org/coi_disclosure.pdf and declare: In the past 36 months, XS received a
547 scholarship from China Scholarship Council. KN thinks the estimated APCs are peanuts in
548 comparison to the millions of dollars her employer spends on journal subscriptions, and wonders
549 why authors who avoid APC-induced apoplexy by publishing in subscription journals so
550 infrequently self-archive their papers. RL discloses that he is an avid fan of picnics. JSR is a
551 former Associate Editor of *JAMA Internal Medicine*, a current Research Editor at *BMJ*, pays
552 thousands of dollars annually in APCs, and has received research support through Yale from
553 Johnson and Johnson to develop methods of clinical trial data sharing, from the FDA to establish

554 a Center for Excellence in Regulatory Science and Innovation (CERSI) at Yale University and
555 the Mayo Clinic (U01FD005938), from the Medical Device Innovation Consortium as part of the
556 National Evaluation System for Health Technology (NEST), from the Agency for Healthcare
557 Research and Quality (R01HS022882), from the National Heart, Lung and Blood Institute of the
558 National Institutes of Health (NIH) (R01HS025164, R01HL144644), and from the Laura and
559 John Arnold Foundation. JDW received research support through the Collaboration for Research
560 Integrity and Transparency from the Laura and John Arnold Foundation and through the Center
561 for Excellence in Regulatory Science and Innovation (CERSI) at Yale University and the Mayo
562 Clinic (U01FD005938).

563 **Patient consent:** Not required

564 **Ethical approval:** Not required

565 **Data sharing:** The dataset will be made available via a publicly accessible repository on
566 publication:

567 **Transparency:** The lead author (manuscripts guarantor) (JDW) affirms that this manuscript is
568 an honest, accurate, and transparent account of the study being reported; that no important
569 aspects of the study have been omitted; and that any discrepancies from the study as planned
570 (and, if relevant registered) have been explained.

571 **License:** The Corresponding Author has the right to grant on behalf of all authors and does grant
572 on behalf of all authors, a worldwide license to the Publishers and its licensees in perpetuity, in
573 all forms, formats and median (whether known now or created in the future), to i) publish,
574 reproduce, distribute, display and store the Contribution, ii) translate the Contribution into other
575 languages, create adaptations, reprints, include within collections and create summaries, extracts
576 and/or, abstracts of the Contribution, iii) create any other derivative work(s) based on the

577 Contribution, iv) to exploit all subsidiary rights in the Contribution, v) the inclusion of electronic
578 links from the Contribution to third party material where-ever it may be located; and, vi) license
579 any third party to do any or all of the above. The default license, a CC BY NC license, is needed.
580 This is an Open Access article distributed in accordance with the Creative Commons Attribution
581 Non Commercial (CC BY-NC 4.0) license, which permits others to distribute, remix, adapt,
582 build upon this work non-commercially, and license their derivative works on different terms,
583 provided the original work is properly cited and the use is non-commercial.
584 See: <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>.

- 615 14. Nicholas D, Rodríguez-Bravo B, Watkinson A, et al. Early career researchers and their
616 publishing and authorship practices: ECRs publishing and authorship practices. *Learn Publ.*
617 2017;30(3):205-217. doi:10.1002/leap.1102
- 618 15. Ginther DK, Schaffer WT, Schnell J, et al. Race, Ethnicity, and NIH Research Awards. *Science.*
619 2011;333(6045):1015-1019. doi:10.1126/science.1196783
- 620 16. Hoppe TA, Litovitz A, Willis KA, et al. Topic choice contributes to the lower rate of NIH
621 awards to African-American/black scientists. *Sci Adv.* 2019;5(10):eaaw7238.
622 doi:10.1126/sciadv.aaw7238
- 623 17. Lawson S. Fee Waivers for Open Access Journals. *Publications.* 2015;3(3):155-167.
624 doi:10.3390/publications3030155
- 625 18. Peterson A, Emmett A, Greenberg M. Open Access and the Author-Pays Problem: Assuring
626 Access for Readers and Authors in the Global Academic Community. *J Librariansh Sch*
627 *Commun.* 2013;1(3):eP1064. doi:10.7710/2162-3309.1064
- 628 19. InCites Journal Citation Reports. Accessed June 16, 2020.
629 [https://jcr.clarivate.com/JCRLandingPageAction.action?Init=Yes&SrcApp=IC2LS&SID=H2-
630 BzzoBH7fIbTAafOrld9xxFix2F5DwRnQm6-
631 18x2dSruBm8K4GbN6ZPQtUZbfUAx3Dx3DADCSreBC9mJb3O7KgOE12wx3Dx3D-
632 qBgNuLRjcgZrPm66fhjx2Fmwx3Dx3D-h9tQNJ9Nv4eh45yLvkdX3gx3Dx3D](https://jcr.clarivate.com/JCRLandingPageAction.action?Init=Yes&SrcApp=IC2LS&SID=H2-BzzoBH7fIbTAafOrld9xxFix2F5DwRnQm6-18x2dSruBm8K4GbN6ZPQtUZbfUAx3Dx3DADCSreBC9mJb3O7KgOE12wx3Dx3D-qBgNuLRjcgZrPm66fhjx2Fmwx3Dx3D-h9tQNJ9Nv4eh45yLvkdX3gx3Dx3D)
- 633 20. World Health Organization. WHO Regional Offices. Accessed April 20, 2020.
634 <https://www.who.int/about/who-we-are/regional-offices>
- 635 21. Elsevier. Elsevier/Impactstory agreement will make open access articles easier to find on
636 Scopus. Elsevier Connect. Accessed July 15, 2020.
637 [https://www.elsevier.com/connect/elsevier-impactstory-agreement-will-make-open-
638 access-articles-easier-to-find-on-scopus](https://www.elsevier.com/connect/elsevier-impactstory-agreement-will-make-open-access-articles-easier-to-find-on-scopus)
- 639 22. Laakso M, Björk B-C. Hybrid open access—A longitudinal study. *J Informetr.* 2016;10(4):919-
640 932. doi:10.1016/j.joi.2016.08.002
- 641 23. Article Processing Charges | Wolters-Kluwer. Accessed July 20, 2020.
642 <https://wkauthorservices.editage.com/open-access/hybrid.html>
- 643 24. Article Processing Charges | Oxford. Oxford Academic. Accessed July 20, 2020.
644 <https://academic.oup.com/journals/pages/ita-journals-a-to-z>
- 645 25. Article Processing Charges | Karger. Accessed July 20, 2020.
646 [https://www.karger.com/Journal/Index?oa=true&sub=true&dis=false&s=acta%20cytologi
647 ca&ss=&max=5&skip=0&open=null&closeSF=null](https://www.karger.com/Journal/Index?oa=true&sub=true&dis=false&s=acta%20cytologica&ss=&max=5&skip=0&open=null&closeSF=null)

- 648 26. Article Processing Charges | Taylor & Francis Online. Accessed July 20, 2020.
649 <https://www.tandfonline.com/openaccess/openjournals>
- 650 27. Article Processing Charges | SAGE Publications Ltd. Accessed July 20, 2020.
651 <https://uk.sagepub.com/en-gb/eur/pure-gold-open-access-journals-at-sage>
- 652 28. Article Processing Charges | Future Medicine. Accessed July 20, 2020.
653 <https://www.futuremedicine.com/authorguide/openaccess>
- 654 29. Article Processing Charges | Hindawi. Hindawi. Accessed July 20, 2020.
655 <https://www.hindawi.com/publish-research/authors/article-processing-charges/>
- 656 30. Article Processing Charges | MAG Online Library. Accessed July 20, 2020.
657 <https://www.magonlinelibrary.com/page/authors/openaccess>
- 658 31. Article Processing Charges | MDPI. Accessed July 20, 2020.
659 https://www.mdpi.com/apc#Journal_Specific_APCs
- 660 32. Article Processing Charges | Thieme Open. Accessed July 20, 2020.
661 <https://open.thieme.com/web/19/apcs>
- 662 33. Article Processing Charges | Emerald Publishing. Accessed July 20, 2020.
663 [https://www.emeraldgrouppublishing.com/services/authors/publish-us/publish-open-
664 access/journal#apc-charges](https://www.emeraldgrouppublishing.com/services/authors/publish-us/publish-open-access/journal#apc-charges)
- 665 34. Article Processing Charges | JMIR. Accessed July 20, 2020. <https://www.jmir.org>
- 666 35. Article Processing Charges | Springer. www.springer.com. Accessed July 20, 2020.
667 <https://www.springer.com/gp/open-access/springer-open-choice>
- 668 36. Article Processing Charges | Elsevier. Accessed July 20, 2020.
669 <https://www.elsevier.com/about/policies/pricing>
- 670 37. Article Processing Charges | SAGE Open. SAGE Publications Ltd. Published October 6, 2015.
671 Accessed July 20, 2020. [https://uk.sagepub.com/en-gb/eur/sage-choice-journal-and-
672 pricing-exceptions](https://uk.sagepub.com/en-gb/eur/sage-choice-journal-and-pricing-exceptions)
- 673 38. Falagas ME, Zarkali A, Karageorgopoulos DE, Bardakas V, Mavros MN. The Impact of Article
674 Length on the Number of Future Citations: A Bibliometric Analysis of General Medicine
675 Journals. Fortunato S, ed. *PLoS ONE*. 2013;8(2):e49476. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0049476
- 676 39. Yearly Average Currency Exchange Rates | Internal Revenue Service. Accessed July 23,
677 2020. [https://www.irs.gov/individuals/international-taxpayers/yearly-average-currency-
678 exchange-rates](https://www.irs.gov/individuals/international-taxpayers/yearly-average-currency-exchange-rates)

- 679 40. Shamseer L, Moher D, Maduekwe O, et al. Potential predatory and legitimate biomedical
680 journals: can you tell the difference? A cross-sectional comparison. *BMC Med.*
681 2017;15(1):28. doi:10.1186/s12916-017-0785-9
- 682 41. Björk B-C, Solomon D. Article processing charges in OA journals: relationship between price
683 and quality. *Scientometrics.* 2015;103(2):373-385. doi:10.1007/s11192-015-1556-z
- 684 42. Shaw DM, Elger BS. Unethical Aspects of Open Access. *Account Res.* 2018;25(7-8):409-416.
685 doi:10.1080/08989621.2018.1537789
- 686 43. Laakso M, Björk B-C. Anatomy of open access publishing: a study of longitudinal
687 development and internal structure. *BMC Med.* 2012;10(1):124. doi:10.1186/1741-7015-
688 10-124
- 689 44. Khoo SY-S. Article Processing Charge Hyperinflation and Price Insensitivity: An Open Access
690 Sequel to the Serials Crisis. *Liber Q.* 2019;29(1):1. doi:10.18352/lq.10280
- 691 45. Pollock D, Michael A. Open access mythbusting: Testing two prevailing assumptions about
692 the effects of open access adoption. *Learn Publ.* 2019;32(1):7-12. doi:10.1002/leap.1209
- 693 46. Shieber SM. Equity for Open-Access Journal Publishing. *PLoS Biol.* 2009;7(8):e1000165.
694 doi:10.1371/journal.pbio.1000165
- 695 47. “Plan S” and “cOAlition S” – Accelerating the transition to full and immediate Open Access
696 to scientific publications. Accessed July 15, 2020. <https://www.coalition-s.org/>
- 697 48. Baptista D. Charity Open Access Fund (COAF) open access spend and compliance
698 monitoring: 2017-18. Published online 2019:2664082 Bytes.
699 doi:10.6084/M9.FIGSHARE.8010617
- 700 49. Open Access Policy. Published January 1, 1AD. Accessed July 15, 2020.
701 [https://www.gatesfoundation.org/How-We-Work/General-Information/Open-Access-](https://www.gatesfoundation.org/How-We-Work/General-Information/Open-Access-Policy)
702 [Policy](https://www.gatesfoundation.org/How-We-Work/General-Information/Open-Access-Policy)
- 703 50. Massey DS, Opare MA, Wallach JD, Ross JS, Krumholz HM. Assessment of Preprint Policies
704 of Top-Ranked Clinical Journals. *JAMA Netw Open.* 2020;3(7):e2011127-e2011127.
705 doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2020.11127
- 706 51. Baffy G, Burns MM, Hoffmann B, et al. Scientific Authors in a Changing World of Scholarly
707 Communication: What Does the Future Hold? *Am J Med.* 2020;133(1):26-31.
708 doi:10.1016/j.amjmed.2019.07.028
- 709 52. Smith E, Haustein S, Mongeon P, Shu F, Ridde V, Larivière V. Knowledge sharing in global
710 health research – the impact, uptake and cost of open access to scholarly literature.
711 *Health Res Policy Syst.* 2017;15. doi:10.1186/s12961-017-0235-3

- 712 53. Button OA. Open Access Button. Accessed July 23, 2020. <https://openaccessbutton.org>
- 713 54. Cuschieri S. WASP: Is open access publishing the way forward? A review of the different
714 ways in which research papers can be published. *Early Hum Dev.* 2018;121:54-57.
715 doi:10.1016/j.earlhumdev.2018.02.017
- 716 55. Chan L, Kirsop B, Arunachalam S. Towards Open and Equitable Access to Research and
717 Knowledge for Development. *PLOS Med.* 2011;8(3):e1001016.
718 doi:10.1371/journal.pmed.1001016
- 719 56. The Open Access Citation Advantage Service (OACA). SPARC Europe. Accessed July 15, 2020.
720 [https://sparceurope.org/what-we-do/open-access/sparc-europe-open-access-](https://sparceurope.org/what-we-do/open-access/sparc-europe-open-access-resources/open-access-citation-advantage-service-oaca/)
721 [resources/open-access-citation-advantage-service-oaca/](https://sparceurope.org/what-we-do/open-access/sparc-europe-open-access-resources/open-access-citation-advantage-service-oaca/)
- 722 57. Diamandis EP. Peer review as a business transaction. *Nature.* 2015;517(7533):145-145.
723 doi:10.1038/517145a
- 724

725 **FIGURE LEGENDS**

726 **Figure 1.** A visualization of the sampling and data abstraction approach

727 **Figure 2.** Distribution of research spending on article processing charges in 2019

728 **Figure 3.** The Article Processing Charge-Related Twitter Whinge Score

Box 1. The Article Processing Charge Twitter Whinge Score ©™®	
Publicly grateful	Tweets praising or defending article processing costs
Calmly resigned	Tweets that note article processing costs, but neither tip their hand toward positive or negative; factual statements
Publicly resentful	Tweets containing strong or sarcastic language, expressing concern, anger, or regret towards article processing costs (bonus points: emoji's and GIFs)
Publicly opposed	Tweets containing swear language, not suitable for publication in a journal

729

Table 1. Characteristics of general and high-impact medical researchers		
	General researchers (N = 241)	High-Impact researchers (N = 246)
	No. (%)	
Gender		
Male	109 (45.2)	159 (64.6)
Female	70 (29.1)	82 (33.3)
Unknown/Unavailable ^a	62 (25.7)	5 (2.0)
Affiliation		
Academia/Hospital	236 (97.9)	213 (86.6)
Government	3 (1.2)	10 (4.1)
Non-governmental or non-profit	1 (0.4)	12 (4.9)
Industry	1 (0.4)	7 (2.9)
Other	0 (0.0)	2 (0.8)
Unknown/Unavailable	0 (0.0)	2 (0.8)
Training^b		
MD	120 (49.8)	166 (67.5)
PhD only	58 (24.1)	61 (24.8)
Other degree only	3 (1.2)	5 (2.0)
Unknown/Unavailable	60 (24.9)	14 (5.7)
Region		
African Region	3 (1.2)	4 (1.6)
Region of the Americas	62 (25.7)	144 (58.5)
South-East Asia Region	13 (5.4)	1 (0.4)
European Region	76 (31.5)	67 (27.2)
Eastern Mediterranean Region	18 (7.5)	4 (1.6)
Western Pacific Region	69 (28.6)	25 (10.2)
Unknown/Unavailable	0 (0.0)	1 (0.4)
H-Index, median (IQR)	11.0 (3.0, 23.0)	38.5 (22.0, 64.0)
Years since first publication, median (IQR)	15.0 (7.0, 25.0)	22.5 (14.3, 32.0)
Number of articles per author, median (IQR)		
First and senior author articles	2 (1, 5)	4 (2, 8)
Senior author articles only	2 (1, 4)	4 (2, 8)
First author articles only	0 (0, 1)	0 (0, 1)
Corresponding author articles (first or senior)	1 (0, 2)	2 (0, 4)
MD = doctor of medicine; PhD = doctor of philosophy		
^a Institutional profile was not available or author gender could not be determined through an institutional profile		
^b MD, with or without other degrees; a PhD, with or without other degrees (excluding MD); or any other degrees		
^c Based on Scopus classification		

731

Table 2. Journal funding models for the articles published by general and high-impact researchers

	No., (%)	
	General researchers	High-impact researchers
Total	914	1471
Article processing charge-based journals	384 (42.0)	426 (29.0)
Subscription-based journals	57 (6.2)	169 (11.5)
Hybrid ^a	457 (50.0)	870 (59.1)
Unknown	16 (1.8)	6 (0.4)

^a A traditional subscription-based journal with a fee-based open access publication option

732

Table 3. Article processing charges for all first and/or senior research and review articles published in 2019

	Median (Interquartile range)	
	General researchers (n = 241)	High-impact researchers (n = 246)
Standard APCs paid per year, \$	191 (0, 2500)	2900 (0, 5465)
First author articles only	0 (0, 0)	0 (0, 0)
Senior author articles only	0 (0, 0)	2800 (0, 5181)
APCs paid per year (including hybrid journals)^a, \$	739 (0, 3950)	5000 (0, 10879)
APCs paid per year (minimum)^b, \$	0 (0, 2500)	2600 (0, 5465)

APCs = article processing charges

^a A traditional subscription-based journal with a fee-based open access publication option

^b The minimum APCs paid is defined as the lowest possible APC an author could have paid given the discounts, membership options or licensing options listed on a journal website.

733

734

Table 4. Standard article processing charges for first and senior research and review articles, across researcher characteristics

General researchers (n= 241)^a				High-Impact researchers (n = 246)^a			
	Total APC per year (\$)				Total APC per year (\$)		
	No.	Median (IQR)	p-value ^b		No.	Median (IQR)	p-value ^b
Gender			0.48	Gender			0.20
Male	109	300 (0, 2950)		Male	159	2500 (0, 5380)	
Female	70	0 (0, 3502)		Female	82	3145 (0, 6387)	
Primary Affiliation			0.36	Primary Affiliation			0.45
Academia/Hospital	236	28 (0, 2500)		Academia/Hospital	213	3000 (0, 5526)	
Other	5	4420 (3070, 6160)		Other	31	1870 (0, 4950)	
Training^c			0.19	Training^c			0.13
MD	120	234 (0, 2983)		MD	166	2454 (0, 5355)	
PhD Only	58	975 (0, 4679)		PhD Only	61	3490 (1695, 7150)	
Other Degrees only	3	0 (0, 0)		Other Degree	5	0 (0, 4800)	
Region			0.32	Region			<0.001
Region of the Americas	62	0 (0, 2425)		Region of the Americas	144	1695 (0, 3935)	
Other	179	225 (0, 2865)		Other	101	4800 (1888, 8290)	
H-Index (median)			0.14	H-Index (median)			0.30
≤ 11.0	120	0 (0, 1390)		≤ 38.5	123	2500 (0, 4800)	
> 11.0	121	1302 (0, 4761)		> 38.5	123	3465 (0, 7494)	
Years since first publication (quartiles)			0.22	Years since first publication (quartiles)			0.97
< 7.0	62	0 (0, 925)		< 14.3	62	2625 (0, 4800)	
7.0 – 15.0	62	862 (0, 3165)		14.3 – 22.5	61	3000 (0, 8000)	
15.0 – 25.0	63	300 (0, 4400)		22.5 – 32.0	68	3000 (0, 6500)	
> 25.0	54	0 (0, 3513)		> 32.0	55	2800 (0, 4875)	

MD = doctor of medicine; PhD = doctor of philosophy
^aUnknown values were considered as missing for these analyses; therefore, row amounts may not sum to column total
^bCalculated using Mann Whitney U or Mood’s test as appropriate
^c MD, with or without other degrees; a PhD, with or without other degrees (excluding MD); or any other degrees

Generate random sample of journal articles

Abstract senior authors and author characteristics


Identify manuscripts published in 2019

Extract the journal each article was published in

Investigate if there are any APCs for that journal

Estimate how much a researcher pays in APCs, on average, in a given year


Sample One: All Clinical Medicine Journals




General Researcher



Sample Two: High-Impact Clinical Medicine Journals



High-Impact Researchers



Total APCs paid by researchers (US Dollars)

Other ways to spend your grant money:

Other avenues to promote your paper:

General researchers

High-impact researchers

PhD Student tuition ~ \$27,500



Part-time project manager ~ \$21,500



New laboratory equipment ~ \$15,000



Personal SAS license ~ \$8,700



Domestic US conference attendance ~ \$1,500



Mailing your paper to the top research universities in the US, Canada and Europe ~ \$30,500



A 3-page ad in the New England Journal of Medicine ~ \$27,000



Full page advertisement in The Guardian ~ \$22,500



A billboard in London for three months ~ \$11,000



Airplane banner with your abstract ~ \$3,200



Publishing on a pre-print server or open access archive ~ \$0

