## Conservation Biology



Comment

## Plan S and publishing: reply to Lehtomäki et al. 2019

Michael A. McCarthy, <sup>1</sup> Mark A. Burgman, <sup>2</sup> Fuwen Wei, <sup>3</sup> Frith C. Jarrad, <sup>4</sup> Carlo Rondinini, <sup>5</sup> Carolina Murcia, <sup>6,7</sup> Helene D. Marsh, <sup>8</sup> H. Resit Akçakaya, <sup>9</sup> Karen J. Esler, <sup>10</sup> Edward T. Game, <sup>11,12</sup> and Mark W. Schwartz <sup>13</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Associate Editor, Conservation Biology, School of BioSciences, The University of Melbourne, Parkville VIC 3052, Australia

<sup>2</sup>Editor in Chief, *Conservation Biology*, Centre for Environmental Policy, Imperial College London, South Kensington, London SW7 1NE, U.K.

<sup>3</sup>Regional Editor, *Conservation Biology*, Key Lab of Animal Ecology and Conservation Biology, Institute of Zoology, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing, 100101, China

<sup>4</sup>Managing Editor, Conservation Biology, School of BioSciences, The University of Melbourne, Parkville VIC 3052, Australia

<sup>5</sup>Regional Editor, *Conservation Biology*, Global Mammal Assessment Programme, Department of Biology and Biotechnologies, Sapienza University of Rome, Italy

<sup>6</sup>Regional Editor, *Conservation Biology*, Department of Natural Sciences and Mathematics, Pontificia Universidad Javeriana, Cali, 760031, Colombia

<sup>7</sup>Department of Biology, University of Florida, 220 Bartram Hall, Gainesville, FL 32611, U.S.A.

<sup>8</sup>Regional Editor, Conservation Biology, Division of Science and Engineering, James Cook University, Townsville, QLD 48111, Australia

<sup>9</sup>Regional Editor, *Conservation Biology*, Department of Ecology and Evolution, Stony Brook University, Stony Brook, NY 11790, U.S.A.

<sup>10</sup>Regional Editor, *Conservation Biology*, Department of Conservation Ecology and Entomology, Stellenbosch University, Private Bag X1, Matieland 7602, South Africa

<sup>11</sup>Editor in Chief, Conservation Letters, The Nature Conservancy, South Brisbane, QLD 4102, Australia

<sup>12</sup>The University of Queensland, St. Lucia, QLD 4067, Australia

<sup>13</sup>Editor in Chief, *Conservation Science and Practice*, Department of Environmental Science & Policy, 1 Shields Avenue, University of California, Davis, CA 95616, U.S.A.

We thank Lehtomäki et al. (2019) for widening the discussion of the Plan-S open-access initiative (https://www.coalition-s.org) in their response to Burgman et al. (2018). They provide useful links to Plan-S documentation. They are disappointed by the focus of our position, which we took to clarify a point central to the discussion of open access that we believe has received too little attention, namely, equity of access to publication.

The revised Plan-S implementation guidance mandates that from 2021, scientific publications that result from research funded by public grants must be published in compliant open-access journals. We agree with many points they make, including the aspiration for ready access to scientific results produced with public funding, a desire for more affordable publication, greater transparency in publication costs, and the use of the moniker, *subscription model*, rather than *reader pays*. We are fully aware of and share their concerns about the restrictions that arise from the subscription model. But we disagree about

the merits of alternative approaches to achieving a better system.

Lehtomäki et al. believe the current subscription model, including the hybrid option, is expensive and unfair. They claim that Plan S "partly addresses the equity issue," that "Plan S can act as a catalyst for a transformation toward a more equal and inclusive publication system," and that, "if implemented with care, it can also precipitate a more fundamental transformation in scientific publishing...." Their claims raise 3 issues: the high cost of publication, access to the literature, and equity of access to publication. These 3 issues are clearly related.

When the cost of publication is borne by readers, all 3 issues are problematic. Lehtomäki et al. suggest that under Plan S, regulation of author publication charges (APCs) may address the high cost of publication if the regulation of fees is effective. Exactly how such regulation would work is an open question. The approach in Plan S is to consider capping open-access author fees.

1203

Conservation Biology, Volume 33, No. 5, 1203–1204 © 2019 Society for Conservation Biology DOI: 10.1111/cobi.13377