

1 Title: Factors Associated with Open Access Publishing Costs in Oncology Journals

2
3 Alex Koong,¹ Ulysses G Gardner MD,² Jason Burton MD,³ Caleb Stewart MD,⁴ Petria S
4 Thompson MD,⁵ Clifton D Fuller MD PhD,¹ Ethan B Ludmir MD,¹ Michael K Rooney MD^{1*}

5
6 Affiliations:

7 ¹Department of Radiation Oncology, MD Anderson Cancer Center, Houston, TX

8 ²Kettering Health, Dayton, OH

9 ³Dartmouth-Hitchcock Medical Center, Lebanon, NH

10 ⁴Unity Health, Searcy, AR

11 ⁵St Mary's Medical Center, San Francisco, CA

12

13 *All correspondence should be sent to:

14 Michael K Rooney MD (mkrooney@mdanderson.org)

15 1-346-212-1728

16 Department of Radiation Oncology, MD Anderson Cancer Center

17 1220 Holcombe Blvd, Houston, TX 77030

18

19 Keywords: open access, article processing charges, academic publishing

20

21 Article Type: Original Article

22 Short Title: Oncology Open Access Publishing Costs

23

24 Funding: This work is supported by core resources from the NIH/NCI Cancer Center Support
25 Grant (CCSG) Radiation Oncology and Cancer Imaging Program (P30CA016672). Dr. Fuller
26 received/receives funding and salary support during the period of study execution unrelated to
27 this work from: National Institutes of Health (NIH) and National Science Foundation (NSF). Dr.
28 Fuller receives grant and infrastructure support from MD Anderson Cancer Center via: the
29 Charles and Danae Stiefel Center for Head and Neck Cancer Oropharyngeal Cancer Research
30 Program; the Program in Image-guided Cancer Therapy; and the NIH/NCI Cancer Center
31 Support Grant (CCSG) Radiation Oncology and Cancer Imaging Program (P30CA016672-44).
32 Dr. Fuller has received direct industry grant/in-kind support, honoraria, and travel funding from
33 Elekta AB unrelated to this project. Dr. Fuller has received travel, speaker honoraria and/or
34 registration fee waiver unrelated to this project from: The American Association for Physicists in
35 Medicine; the University of Alabama-Birmingham; The American Society for Clinical
36 Oncology; The Royal Australian and New Zealand College of Radiologists

37

38 Conflicts of Interest: Dr. Fuller serves as an Associate Editor for an ASCO-affiliated journal,
39 receives honoraria for this role from ASCO.

40 Prior publication: These data were presented at the 2021 ASCO Annual Meeting.

41

42 Test Pages: 12

43 Word Count: 2597

44 Abstract Word Count: 250

45 Tables and figures: 3

46 References: 10

47 Author Contributions:
48 Conceptualization: Fuller, Ludmir, Rooney
49 Data curation: Koong, Gardner, Rooney
50 Formal analysis: Koong, Gardner, Ludmir, Rooney
51 Funding acquisition: NA
52 Investigation: All authors
53 Methodology: All authors
54 Project administration, resource, software, supervision: Fuller, Ludmir, Rooney
55 Validation, visualization: Koong, Gardner, Fuller, Ludmir, Rooney
56 Writing original draft: Koong, Gardner, Rooney
57 Review and editing: All authors
58
59 Data Availability statement:
60 All data are available upon reasonable request to the corresponding author.
61

63 **Abstract:**

64 **Background:**

65 Open access (OA) publishing represents an exciting opportunity to facilitate dissemination of
66 scientific information to global audiences. However, OA publication is often associated with
67 significant article processing charges (APCs) for authors, which may thus serve as a barrier to
68 publication.

69

70 **Methods:**

71 We identified oncology journals using the SCImago Journal & Country Rank database. All
72 journals with an OA publication option and APC data openly available were included. We
73 searched journal websites and tabulated journal characteristics, including APC amount (USD),
74 OA model (hybrid vs full), 2-year impact factor (IF), H-index, number of citable documents,
75 modality/treatment specific (if applicable), and continent of origin. We generated a multiple
76 regression model to identify journal characteristics independently associated with OA APC
77 amount.

78

79 **Results:**

80 Of 367 oncology journals screened, 251 met final inclusion criteria. The median APC was 2957
81 USD (IQR 1958-3450). On univariable testing, journals with greater number of citable
82 documents ($p < 0.001$), higher IF ($p < 0.001$), higher H-index ($p < 0.001$), and those using the
83 hybrid OA model ($p < 0.001$) or originating in Europe/North America ($p < 0.001$) tended to have
84 higher APCs. In our multivariable model, number of citable documents, IF, OA publishing
85 model, and region persisted as significant predictors of processing charges.

86

87 **Conclusions:**

88 OA publication costs are greater in oncology journals that publish more citable articles, utilize
89 the hybrid OA model, have higher IF, and are based in North America or Europe. These findings
90 may inform targeted action to help the oncology community fully appreciate the benefits of open
91 science.

92

93

94 **Introduction:**

95 Open access (OA) publication grants any individual permission to view published
96 scientific articles without cost, thereby allowing free public access of content regardless of
97 geography or consumer affiliation.(1) This contrasts with traditional subscription-based
98 publishing which either require institutional subscriptions to grant journal access or require fees
99 for access to individual articles. Various OA publication models exist, although in general can be
100 considered as two broad categories. “Hybrid OA” refers to subscription-based journals that allow
101 authors an option of making individual articles OA whereas “full OA” journals publish
102 exclusively OA content.(2)

103 OA publishing allows for advancements in science and medicine to be adopted at faster
104 rates and promotes the democratization of knowledge. As such, there has been a rapid growth of
105 OA publishing, with an estimated average growth of 30% in number of published articles per
106 year since the early 1990s.(3) Clinicians and patients with complete access to relevant studies
107 can make more informed health decisions, rather than attempting to base their choices solely on
108 the subset of studies from which they have access. Many journals require authors to pay article
109 processing charges (APCs) in order to publish an OA manuscript. These fees can be significant,
110 in the ranges of thousands of US dollars (USD), and thus may inadvertently serve as a barrier to
111 OA publication, particularly for authors with limited personal or institutional resources.

112 In this study, we sought to identify and characterize journal-level factors associated with
113 APCs in oncology journals. We hypothesized that journals with higher impact factors (IF), those
114 based in the United States, and those adopting the hybrid OA model would higher APCs. Our
115 results could be used to inform policy level change aimed at promoting equity and equality in
116 access to oncologic research.

117

118 **Methods:**

119 *Journal identification*

120 The SCImago Journal & Country Rank (SJR) database (<https://www.scimagojr.com>) was
121 queried on August 19, 2020 to identify oncologic journals. The following search parameters
122 were used: subject area: “Medicine”; category: “Oncology”; region/country: “All
123 regions/countries”; types: “Journals”; Year: “2019.” Resulting journals were screened according

124 to OA publishing status. Journals with an OA publishing option (hybrid or full) and APC data
125 available via their website were included. Journals that were discontinued or written in non-
126 English language were excluded for this analysis. Journals with less than 10 published articles
127 per year were also excluded. Institutional review board approval was not necessary for this study
128 and was waived accordingly. Informed consent was not required as the included information is
129 publicly available.

130

131 *Journal evaluation*

132 For each journal meeting inclusion criteria, the journal's website was manually searched,
133 and the following data points were tabulated: APC (in USD), OA model (hybrid or full), two-
134 year IF, H-index, number of citable documents, modality specificity (yes or no), treatment site-
135 specificity (yes or no), and continent of origin (North America, Europe, or other). A journal was
136 considered modality-specific if its stated mission and scope was to publish content related to a
137 particular oncologic treatment modality (e.g. surgery, radiation therapy, etc). All APCs were
138 converted to USD equivalents for final analyses. An audit of a random 10 percent sample of the
139 data was independently performed by two authors (MKR and UGG) to ensure data accuracy,
140 precision, and reproducibility.

141

142 *Statistical analysis*

143 Data were summarized using descriptive statistics. Pearson correlation was used to
144 identify associations between continuous variables. Wilcoxon rank sum and Kruskal-Wallis
145 testing were utilized to identify differences in continuous variables. For factors with significant
146 associations on univariable testing, a multiple regression model was created to identify factors
147 independently associated with APCs. For collinear factors, only one was utilized in the
148 multivariable model. Log transformation was used for right-skewed predictive variables. All
149 analyses were performed with R 4.0.3 (R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna,
150 Austria).

151

152 **Results:**

153 Of 367 oncology journals identified in the SCImago database, 251 met final inclusion.
154 The most common reasons for exclusion were journals not having an OA publishing option or

155 not having detailed information regarding APCs on the journal website. The majority of journals
156 (62%) adopted the hybrid OA publication model and were based in Europe (47%) or North
157 America (35%). The median (interquartile range (IQR)) APC for all journals was 2957 (1958-
158 3540) USD. Twenty-five (10%) journals had APCs greater than 4000 USD. There were 10
159 journals (4%) which offered OA publication with no publication charge. The median number of
160 citable documents per year was 308; however, there was significant variation in publication
161 volume across evaluated journals. Fourteen percent of journals published fewer than 100 articles
162 per year while 11% published at least 1000 citable articles per year.

163 The Table summarizes journal baseline characteristics and the results of the univariable
164 and multivariable models to identify predictors of publication costs. Increased number of citable
165 documents ($P=0.006$), higher IF ($P<0.001$), use of the hybrid OA model ($P<0.001$), and North
166 American origin ($P<0.001$), were independently associated with increased APCs according to the
167 multivariable model. Beta coefficients are provided in the Table to estimate the effect of various
168 independent variables on APCs. For every 10-fold increase in number of citable documents and
169 journal IF, there is an estimated increase of 367 USD and 1144 USD in APC, respectively. The
170 use of the hybrid OA model was associated with an increase of 991 USD in APCs. Furthermore,
171 compared to European journals, North American journal APCs were predicted to be 838 USD
172 higher.

173 Figure 1 describes the distributions of APCs for all identified journals, displayed
174 separately for hybrid OA and full OA journals. Overall, hybrid journals had higher publication
175 costs compared to their full OA counterparts. The median APCs for hybrid and full OA journals
176 were 3260 USD and 1958 USD, respectively. Only 11% of hybrid journals charged less than
177 2000 USD for OA publication, compared to 59% of full OA journals. Furthermore, 14% of
178 hybrid journals had APCs at least 4000 USD, while only 3% of full OA journals charged this
179 amount.

180 The associations between APC, journal IF, and region of origin are summarized in Figure
181 2. Higher journal IF was associated with increased APCs; in general, journals based in Europe
182 and North America were more likely to have higher IF and publication costs. Only 21% and 18%
183 of European and North American journals had IF less than 2, respectively, compared with 42%
184 of journals housed in other regions.

185

186

187 **Discussion:**

188 In this cross-sectional analysis of OA publication practice among oncology journals, we
189 not only found that a significant portion of journals charged high fees for publication but also
190 identified multiple journal-level factors associated with higher costs. In particular, our data
191 suggest that journals using the hybrid OA model, having higher IF, publishing higher volume of
192 articles, and those housed in North America tend to charge more for authors to publish their
193 article openly. Taken together, these findings suggest that current publication standards in our
194 field may limit sharing of knowledge, particularly among select journals. These data may ideally
195 be used to inform policy-level changes aimed at improving equitable dissemination of
196 knowledge among the oncologic community.

197 The OA publication model is intended to increase the dissemination of scientific findings
198 by bypassing consumer financial barriers to article access. Indeed, prior research has shown that
199 articles published in an OA forum are more likely to be viewed and downloaded compared to
200 papers limited by a paywall.(4,5) Furthermore, growing evidence has shown that OA articles are
201 more likely to be cited in subsequent peer-reviewed literature, a phenomenon termed the “open
202 access citation advantage,” suggesting increased engagement within the scientific
203 community.(6,7) However, the benefit of open publishing is not limited to the scientific or
204 medical community alone. Particularly within the medical field and oncology more specifically,
205 OA publishing creates an opportunity for improving patient education, advocacy, and shared
206 decision making. Access to peer-reviewed literature may deter patients from seeking information
207 from less reliable sources and may further improve public trust in science and medicine. Finally,
208 because medical research is often supported through public funds, the public may have a strong
209 interest in accessing science in their role as funders, advocates, and research participants.(8)

210 Plan S is an open access initiative that stipulates research derived from public grant
211 funding must be published in a full and immediate open manner. This enterprise is supported by
212 cOAlition S, a consortium of international research funders and research performing
213 organizations. The objective of Plan S is to not only increase the number of articles published in
214 open access journals, but to ensure public funding directly leads to research that the public can
215 easily access. For full compliance with Plan S, authors must publish in OA journals or platforms,
216 publish in subscription journals and make the articles available OA (but cOAlition S will not

217 financially support OA charges), or publish OA in subscription journals under a transformative
218 arrangement (subscription publishers agree to transition to OA by 2025). In addition, Plan S is
219 working on a Journal Comparison Service, which would increase transparency in open access
220 journals by allowing APCs to be directly compared.

221 While cOAlition S is already supported by the European Commission and the European
222 Research Council (ERC), the U.S. has not yet adopted these standards and is rapidly becoming
223 an outlier in OA policy. The U.S. continues to rely heavily on traditional publishing methods that
224 require reader subscriptions to access articles, and unlike countries such as Argentina and
225 Canada, have not passed legislation requiring the use of open access publishing methods when
226 publishing federally funded research.

227 It is worthwhile to note that Plan U (Plan Universal), a research preprint initiative, offers
228 a unique compromise in the realm of open access versus traditional publishing methods. Plan U
229 advocates for all funding agencies to mandate research preprints, which would essentially
230 eliminate the time between submission and official publication. Preprints would be
231 instantaneously uploaded online, which would not only allow for an expedited peer-review
232 process from a larger number of individuals but would give everyone access to new and
233 potentially impactful research.(9) Researchers would still be able to publish in subscription-
234 based journals but would additionally release the manuscripts on preprint websites.

235 Open publication is still the optimal avenue for the sharing of many, if not all, scientific
236 articles. However, many barriers exist which may limit the ability of researchers and authors to
237 publish their work under current publishing models. Most notably is the presence of publication
238 costs in the form of APCs, which authors must pay themselves in order to publish their work.
239 This can be particularly burdensome for individuals with limited personal or institutional
240 resources, as costs of publication can be quite high. In the present study, we found that the
241 median APC was nearly 3000 USD, with 10% of oncology journals charging more than 4000
242 USD for OA publication of a single article. Many institutions and academic groups have
243 developed strategies to address APCs, such as pooled funds dedicated specifically for submission
244 fees. Furthermore, some journals have instituted waiver policies for financially vulnerable
245 populations, including submitting authors from low- and middle-income countries. However, the
246 adoption of these policies has not been universal and there is variation in the extent of discount
247 across journals.(10)

248 Significant publication costs not only create the problem of limiting shareability of the
249 science itself, but they also create a structural framework which predisposes to academic
250 inequity. Authors that are fortunate to have available personal funds or strong institutional
251 support may elect to pursue OA publication and therefore reap the benefits described previously,
252 including improved visibility. In contrast, authors unable to afford OA publication fees may need
253 to publish their work behind a paywall or, worse, may have limited options to share their
254 findings in a scientific journal altogether. Consequently, this may create a cyclical disparity in
255 academic opportunities wherein disadvantaged authors are further limited in their ability to
256 participate in and share scientific research.

257 The optimal solution to the financial crisis of OA publishing likely will not involve
258 consumer strategies to obtain funds to meet APC requirements but rather focus on reform of
259 publication practice at large. Our study provides initial support that certain journal characteristics
260 may be associated with increased risk of high publication costs; these findings may encourage
261 targeted re-evaluation and reform of APC policies among those select journals.

262 One of the most important trends identified in this analysis is the association between
263 journal IF and APCs (Figure 2). We found that for every 10-fold increase in IF, there was an
264 estimated increase of 1144 USD in this population (Table). Although IF is an imperfect metric,
265 higher impact journals are often desired forums for publication of scientific work, as they may
266 offer increased article visibility and credibility.(10) Journals with higher IF typically receive
267 higher volume of submissions and may be more selective in editorial acceptance decisions. Such
268 journals therefore also may be afforded the ability to charge higher APCs, as authors may be
269 more willing to pay more to have their article freely accessible in a highly visible and respected
270 environment. Furthermore, it is possible that high impact journals may more often publish work
271 from research groups with greater private or institutional resources and, thus, OA APCs are less
272 limiting among this population of researchers. Regardless of the underlying etiology explaining
273 this trend, the strong association between IF and APCs warrants further exploration with re-
274 evaluation of APC policies particularly among the highest impact oncology journals.

275 Our analysis also revealed a strong relationship between the type of OA publication
276 model and processing costs (Figure 1). At the time of data collection, the majority (62%) of
277 journals utilized a hybrid model wherein authors are offered the option of publishing OA after
278 paying an APC. We found that hybrid journals tended to have significantly higher OA

279 publication costs, with an estimated difference of 991 USD compared to their full OA
280 counterparts (Table). This trend likely reflects the impact of choice on author submission
281 preferences. For full OA journals publishing exclusively OA papers, authors are not granted any
282 choice and thus every submitting author is required to pay a publication fee. In contrast, with the
283 hybrid model only authors with significant interest in having their article to benefit from open
284 publication and, more importantly, those willing and able to pay the APC will elect for OA
285 publication. As a result, journals adopting the hybrid model may be able to be more stringent in
286 in their APCs without deterring potential submissions. As described above, however, this pattern
287 likely does introduce biases which hinder the ability of authors with limited resources to
288 participate in open science. Therefore, we argue that even though authors are granted choice of
289 participation in the hybrid model, these journals may actually benefit the most from modification
290 of publication standards to be less financially exclusionary of authors from differing
291 backgrounds.

292 This investigation is limited by several factors related to the study design. First, as with
293 any observational study, evaluation of causal relationships between variables is difficult.
294 However, we did attempt to consider all publicly available data with intuitive potential impact on
295 APCs when generating our multivariable model. Second, some endpoints, such as the proportion
296 of papers published OA in hybrid journals, were of interest for the scope of this investigation but
297 were not readily available online and thus may limit our ability to analyze patterns in author
298 submission preferences. Last, although we did survey all oncology journals listed in the
299 SCImago database, a minority of journals were excluded either due to lack of transparent APC
300 information or non-English language, which may limit the generalizability of our findings.

301

302 **Conclusion:**

303 OA publication has been shown to improve article visibility compared to traditional
304 subscription-based publication; however, APCs can pose a significant burden to authors and
305 researchers interested in publishing their work in an OA forum. In this cross-sectional
306 observational study of publication practices among oncology journals, we find that APCs were
307 greater in journals with higher IF, more citable documents, those originating in North America,
308 and those utilizing the hybrid OA model. These results warrant further investigation and re-
309 evaluation of publication standards to promote equitable sharing of oncologic research and

310 knowledge.

311

312

313

314

315

316

317

318

319

320

321 References:

- 322 1. Ware M, Mabe M. The STM Report: An overview of scientific and scholarly journal
323 publishing [Internet]. Digital Commons; 2015. Available from:
324 <http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/scholcom/9>
- 325 2. Laakso M, Björk BC. Hybrid open access—A longitudinal study. *Journal of Informetrics*.
326 2016 Nov;10(4):919–32.
- 327 3. Laakso M, Welling P, Bukvova H, Nyman L, Björk BC, Hedlund T. The Development of
328 Open Access Journal Publishing from 1993 to 2009. Hermes-Lima M, editor. *PLoS ONE*.
329 2011 Jun 13;6(6):e20961.
- 330 4. Davis PM. Open access, readership, citations: a randomized controlled trial of scientific
331 journal publishing. *FASEB j*. 2011 Jul;25(7):2129–34.
- 332 5. Davis PM, Lewenstein BV, Simon DH, Booth JG, Connolly MJL. Open access publishing,
333 article downloads, and citations: randomised controlled trial. *BMJ*. 2008 Jul 31;337(jul31
334 1):a568–a568.
- 335 6. Tennant JP, Waldner F, Jacques DC, Masuzzo P, Collister LB, Hartgerink ChrisHJ. The
336 academic, economic and societal impacts of Open Access: an evidence-based review.
337 *F1000Res*. 2016 Sep 21;5:632.
- 338 7. Langham-Putrow A, Bakker C, Riegelman A. Is the open access citation advantage real? A
339 systematic review of the citation of open access and subscription-based articles. Lozano S,
340 editor. *PLoS ONE*. 2021 Jun 23;16(6):e0253129.
- 341 8. Day S, Rennie S, Luo D, Tucker JD. Open to the public: paywalls and the public rationale
342 for open access medical research publishing. *Res Involv Engagem*. 2020 Dec;6(1):8.
- 343 9. Gardner UG, Thompson PS, Burton J, Stewart C, Fuller CD, Rooney MK, et al. Article
344 Processing Charge Waiver Policies as a Barrier to Oncology Scholarship in Low- and
345 Lower-Middle-Income Countries. *JCO Global Oncology*. 2021 Aug;(7):1413–7.
- 346 10. Garfield E. The History and Meaning of the Journal Impact Factor. *JAMA*. 2006 Jan
347 4;295(1):90.

348

349

350 **Table: Univariable and multivariable models to identify factors associated with journal**
 351 **article processing charges**

Characteristic	Univariable Model		Multivariable Model	
	Median (IQR) or Count (%)	<i>P</i> -value	Beta (SE) USD	<i>P</i> -value
APC (USD)	2957 (1958-3540)	NA		
Mean Number of Citable Documents per Year ^a	308 (140-536)	<0.001	367* (133)	0.006
2 year Impact Factor ^a	2.8 (2.0-4.1)	<0.001	1144* (177)	<0.001
H-index ^b	49 (30-89)	<0.001		
Site Specific				
Yes	77 (31%)	0.94		
No	174 (69%)			
Modality Specific				
Yes	35 (14%)	0.45		
No	216 (86%)			
Journal Type				
Full OA	95 (38%)	<0.001	Reference	
Hybrid OA	156 (62%)		991 (189)	<0.001
Region				
Europe	119 (47%)	<0.001	Reference	
North America	87 (35%)		838 (186)	<0.001
Other	45 (%)		-307 (213)	0.15

352
 353 ^aDue to presence of outliers, these variables were log transformed for multivariable linear
 354 modelling

355 ^bDue to collinearity with Impact Factor, the H-index was not included in the multivariable model
 356 Abbreviations: APC, article processing charge; IQR, interquartile range; OA, open access; SE;
 357 standard error USD, US dollars
 358

359 **Figure Legends:**

360 Figure 1. Distribution of article processing charges, displayed separately for journals adopting
361 full and hybrid open access publishing models

362

363 Abbreviations: APC, article processing charge; USD, US dollars

364

365

366 Figure 2. Association between impact factor and article processing charges among journals
367 housed in various global regions

368

369 Abbreviations: APC, article processing charge; USD, US dollars

370

371

372




Figure 1




Figure2