



Wellcome Trust, Medical History/Humanities & Plan S

RHS Interim Working Paper, 9 April 2019

Margot Finn (President, RHS)

Executive Summary:

This is an interim working paper focusing on the impact of Plan S implementation on Wellcome Trust (WT)-funded Humanities researchers. WT is a major UK funder of History of Medicine and Medical Humanities. This paper uses the specific example of Wellcome-funded Humanities research to explore the implications of Plan S implementation from the perspective of researchers outside Science, Technology, Engineering, Mathematics & Medicine (STEMM) subjects. It works through practical issues relating to postgraduate students, early career researchers (ECRs), their supervisors/mentors, Principal Investigators (PIs) on WT grants, university-based academic line managers including Heads of Department, journal editors and publishing learned societies.

The paper is written primarily from the perspective of UK History researchers, and secondarily from the vantage point of UK journal editors and learned societies. However, it addresses many issues that have wider resonance for Humanities and other researchers internationally. It invites cOAlition S policy-makers to engage with the scholarly and professional goals, needs and contexts of the research community. The RHS recognises that, as a 'science' in the European sense, History shares many characteristics with STEMM disciplines.¹ However, research article production in History also differs from bioscience and broader STEMM norms in key respects. This paper offers a pragmatic examination of Plan S implementation by the WT informed by a recognition of these differences. It is not intended as an argument either for or against Plan S per se.

¹ These similarities help to explain the significant level of overlap between the RHS's response to the February 2019 Plan S consultation exercise (<https://royalhistsoc.org/plan-s-consultation-feb-2019/>), and the response of, for example, the Royal Astronomical Society (<https://ras.ac.uk/ras-policy/science-policy/plan-s-implementation-and-feedback-ras-response-2019>).

The paper takes as its starting point the WT's adoption of a Plan S compliant open access (OA) mandate, effective for all WT-funded research articles submitted to journals from 1 January 2020.² The analysis builds on but also extends beyond the 19 February 2019 WT statement, 'Open Access and Plan S: How Wellcome is Tackling Four Key Concerns'.³ The concerns identified by the Trust are:

- Whether high-quality journals will offer Plan S compliant publication routes;
- Whether researchers, and especially ECRs, will suffer professional disadvantages because of Plan S mandates;
- Whether international collaborations will be threatened by Plan S implementation;
- Whether learned societies will suffer revenue losses that threaten their operation due to Plan S implementation.

Of these four concerns, the first two are the most relevant to this paper. To these acknowledged issues, we add six further topics for consideration:

- The distinctive technical challenges for Humanities researchers posed by Plan S, including the impact of CC BY licensing;
- The absence of Equalities monitoring in current WT and Plan S implementation plans, and the potential for Plan S to impact differentially on 'protected' groups as defined by the UK 2010 Equality Act;
- The need for more systematic, comprehensive communication of the WT's OA requirements to researchers at all career stages, from PG students (who may fall within the protections against 'misleading omissions' afforded by UK consumer law) to more senior scholars;
- The urgent need to reduce the complexity and difficulty (for researchers, but also for funders) of identifying Plan S compliant journals, for example by developing a tool analogous to SHERPA/FACT);
- The apparent lack of high-quality Plan S compliant journals in the Humanities and its potential impact on WT-funded Humanities researchers, but ECRs in particular;
- Whether Plan S implementation has repercussions for accepted standards of duty of care for PG students and staff at all career stages, as understood within the UK university sector.

Part 1 contextualises journal publication in History, noting salient differences between funding and research outputs in Humanities and many STEMM subjects that have implications for Plan S.

Part 2 sketches the statutory Equalities context for researchers employed in the UK and underlines the lack of attention to Equalities issues in current WT/Plan S documentation.

² See the Trust's statement of 5 November 2018: <https://wellcome.ac.uk/news/wellcome-updating-its-open-access-policy>.

³ Robert Kiley and David Carr: <https://wellcome.ac.uk/news/open-access-and-plan-s-how-wellcome-tackling-four-key-concerns>.

Part 3 outlines the current pathways by which Plan S information is reaching WT researchers and suggests the need for improved communication by the Trust (and cOAlition S) with Humanities researchers.

Part 4 discusses Plan S liability, seeking further clarification on which types of outputs and which researchers fall within the WT mandate.

Part 5 (supplemented by Appendix I and Appendix II) examines how researchers and their supervisors/mentors/Pis can identify Plan S compliant journals for their publications. It uses the Directory of Open Access Journals (DOAJ) to test mechanisms for identifying Plan S compliant outlets. On scrutiny, many DOAJ entries prove to be out of date and most 'history of medicine' journals identified from the DOAJ are not fit for purpose for high-calibre UK History research publications. The Plan S compliance of many of the listed titles is questionable. Open Library of the Humanities (OLH) journals are likewise discussed. They do not appear to afford substantial capacity for WT-funded researchers' articles.

Part 6 offers a preliminary assessment for History researchers of the utility of alternative OA platforms developed for STEMM subjects (such as Wellcome Open Research and PLOS One).

Part 7 briefly outlines available and mooted Plan S compliance pathways for History journals and learned societies, exploring both the viability of 'flipping' and the WT's suggestion that learned society journals shift from publication to curation of original research.

Part 8 sums up the findings of the previous section, and notes key issues that require further clarification or discussion. Appendix III supplements this concluding section.

The author (president@royalhistsoc.org) welcomes corrections and comments on this interim working paper. She thanks Katherine Foxhall for additional research and Virginia Berridge, Sanjoy Bhattacharya, Michael Brown, Rosemary Cresswell, Richard Fisher, Katherine Foxhall, Catherine Holmes, Mark Jackson, Colin Jones, Michael Jubb, Lauren Kassell, Tracey Loughran, Jane Macnaughton, Peter Mandler, Jessica Reinisch, Dora Vargha, Megan Vaughan and Jane Winters for information, comments and/or corrections. All errors of fact and interpretation are the author's alone.

Table of Contents:

1	Executive Summary
5	Part 1: Disciplinary Context
7	Part 2: Equalities Monitoring
9	Part 3: Communication (Pathways and Timelines)
13	Part 4: Identification of Liable Outputs and Authors
15	Part 5: Identification of Compliant Journals
20	Part 6: Alternative Compliant Publication Platforms
24	Part 7: Journal (including Learned Society) Business Plans and Plan S
26	Part 8: Conclusions
30	Appendix I: 'Medical History' journals listed in Directory of OA Journals (DOAJ)
35	Appendix II: Journal Titles in the Open Library for the Humanities
40	Appendix III: Comprehensive list of queries for WT

Part 1: Disciplinary Context:

History (including History of Medicine) is a ‘science’ in the European sense, and as such welcomes opportunities to enhance knowledge through the circulation of new ideas, methodologies and research findings. Historians are among the Humanities researchers who serve on the advisory boards of UK OA journal initiatives such as Open Library of the Humanities (OLH); a number of History learned societies have established open access journals; many UK historians have published monographs with open access publishers such as the Humanities Digital Library, Open Book Publishers and UCL Press.⁴ The Royal Historical Society is currently (2019) shifting its ECR monograph publications to a fully subsidised OA model, working collaboratively with the Institute of Historical Research.⁵ ‘Green’ open access for research articles in ‘hybrid’ journals is well-embedded in UK History. In sum, UK historians began engaging with OA publishing well before the 2018 announcement of Plan S, and are proactively collaborating on a diverse array of OA models.

Norms of publishing in History, however, differ significantly from norms in many STEMM subjects, and the latter, not the former, have shaped the contours and expectations of Plan S. These differences problematize Plan S implementations for WT-funded historians, notwithstanding they are—through their access to WT funding—in many ways situated more closely to bioscience STEMM researchers than the bulk of History researchers in the UK and globally. Most obvious is the fact that History (including History of Medicine) is a ‘book discipline’. In REF2014, 54.8% of submitted History outputs were books or portions of books; 38.4% were journal articles. Monographs and scholarly editions of books were disproportionately the highest-ranking submitted History outputs in REF2014.⁶ Journal articles play a vital part in History publishing, but they are positioned and function differently than in STEMM subjects. A significant proportion of journal articles serve as interim stepping stones towards major monographs that are the capstone publications of extended research projects; others are freestanding, developing innovative arguments from research projects independent of monographs.

In sharp contrast to most STEMM journal articles, moreover, competitive research grants fund relatively few History research articles.⁷ Instead, a mixed economy of self-funding, institutional

⁴ Jane Winters, Council member and co-editor of the RHS’s OA book series, is among the Fellows of the Society serving on the OLH Academic Advisory Board. UK-based OA History journals include the British Society for the History of Science’s *BjHS Themes*. Fellows of the RHS whose OA books have recently appeared include for example: Donnacha Lucey and Virginia Crossman, *Healthcare in Ireland and Britain from 1850* (Humanities Digital Library, 2017), Margot Finn and Kate Smith (eds), *The East India Company at Home* (UCL Press, 2018) and Victoria Blud, Diane Heath and Einat Klafner, *Gender in Medieval Places, Spaces and Thresholds* (Humanities Digital Library, 2019).

⁵ <https://royalhistsoc.org/publications/new-historical-perspectives/>.

⁶ See the REF2014 History Sub-panel report, pages 50-58, esp. 51: <https://www.ref.ac.uk/2014/media/ref/content/expanel/member/Main%20Panel%20D%20overview%20report.pdf>.

⁷ The proportion of Plan S funded research articles in a sample of UK learned society journals undertaken in February 2019 ranged from 0% to 17%. See Royal Historical Society, ‘Plan S and UK Learned Societies: The View from History?’ (February 2019), page 43: <https://5hm1h4aktue2uejbs1hsqt31-wpengine.netdna-ssl.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/02/RHS-Plan-S-Feb-2019.pdf>. For *Social History of Medicine*, the figures for self-declared Plan S funding of articles in production between 11 February 2016 and 31 December 2017 was 21% (email from Matt Pacey, OUP, 5 April 2019).

funding and/or grant income sustains History research. Although UK historians of medicine enjoy greater access to external funding through the WT than UK historians as a whole, a significant proportion of UK medical history is not funded by grant income, or by the WT. (Internationally, where disproportionate access to funding for History of Medicine is less pronounced or non-existent, the sub-field 'looks' more like the discipline as a whole than is the case in the UK, and is less reliant on grant income than UK research).⁸ Undertaking high-calibre History research does not require specialist laboratories located within research institutes or universities. A significant number of publishing History researchers are not university employees or are employed on part-time, temporary or teaching-only contracts that do not offer funding for research or publication costs. This group includes many ECRs and most archivists and librarians, heritage professionals, local and family historians and academic emeriti. The dominant funding and employment profile in Humanities renders OA journal models that rely on payment of Article Publication Charges (APCs) by all or most authors unworkable for many History journals. In contrast, hybrid OA is a viable option for a broad and international community of Humanities researchers at all career stages.

History articles differ significantly in form and format from STEMM articles. The typical patterns of authorship, content, format and length of STEMM research articles map imperfectly onto most History articles. These outputs are characteristically sole authored, lengthy (10,000-12,000 or more words, or 15-20 or more single-spaced printed pages) and contain large numbers of (often dense) references/footnotes, in many sub-fields including substantial material in ancient and/or modern languages and/or images. Because of the characteristic mode of argumentation in History, it is very difficult/unlikely for researchers to succeed in making and defending substantial, rigorous and original arguments in very short articles. As the REF2014 History sub-panel report concluded, 'It was...observable that, in the case of articles and book chapters, relatively short contributions tended to gain fewer higher grades'.⁹ These characteristics of History research articles, which reflect principles and practices fundamental to the discipline, differ significantly from norms of evidence and argumentation in most STEMM subjects.¹⁰

Unlike STEMM researchers, Humanities researchers typically do not generate their own data. They rely instead on data generated and/or owned by others—copyright holders of texts, images, archives, material objects, 'orphaned' works and the like. The evidence bases on which historians' arguments rest—like their modes of research and argumentation—thus differ fundamentally from those of STEMM researchers. Where STEMM journal articles use graphs and images generated from their raw data to showcase and interpret their research findings,

⁸ UK history of medicine journals vary in the volume of WT-funded research articles they publish, with *Medical History* located at the high end of the spectrum compared to *Social History of Medicine*. The international disparity is evident from comparisons between the articles published in the US-based *Bulletin of the History of Medicine*, on the one hand, and *Medical History* and *Social History of Medicine*, on the other. Although the authors of articles in all three journals are international, the *Bulletin* has proportionately fewer UK-based historians, and correspondingly fewer articles that cite funding from national research councils and charities.

⁹ History sub-panel report, page 52, point 10.

¹⁰ The research articles published in the 5 March 2019 issue of *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* (US) provide a useful contrast. The 11 articles in Applied Maths, Applied Physical Sciences and Biophysics and Computational Biology are on average 5.4 pages long, with 37.6 references and an average of 7.4 authors per article. These averages are consistent with the norms in *PNAS* articles in Chemistry, Earth Sciences, Engineering and other STEMM disciplines.

many History articles use images from public or private repositories as integral evidence to support their lines of argument. However, third parties (such as museums, archives, local councils and commercial businesses) often own and/or control the images published in History articles. These organisations' terms and conditions can preclude use of the CC BY licences mandated by Plan S.¹¹

These disciplinary norms complicate 'one size fits all' OA models. They underline the need to test that Plan S-compliant journals and platforms can accommodate the distinctive types of research output required for scholarly excellence in a diverse array of disciplines. As noted in Part 5 below, most currently available non-hybrid OA History/History of Medicine journals do not publish lengthy, densely referenced, image-rich research articles. There appears to be a significant gap in the market's provision of Plan S compliant History outlets. This gap creates a significant likelihood that WT-funded historians will struggle to identify journals in which they can publish high quality research articles under the Plan S mandate. For ECRs seeking postdoctoral fellowships and permanent university contracts, these potential limitations may prove especially challenging.

Part 2: Equalities Monitoring:

The Equality Act 2010 protects the rights of English, Scottish and Welsh employees; researchers in Northern Ireland have analogous rights under a separate legislative framework. UK law recognises nine categories of 'protected characteristics': age, disability, gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex and sexual orientation. The 2010 Act provides statutory protections against discrimination in UK workplaces. It protects against both direct and indirect discrimination of persons with protected characteristics and requires UK organisations to show good cause (objective justification) for any policies that lead to indirect discrimination.¹² Chapter 3 of the EU Charter of Fundamental Rights (articles 20-26) likewise provides for equality before the law and protections against discrimination on grounds of culture, religion and language; gender; age; and disability.¹³ These legal protections contrast significantly with protected groups' actual employment experiences in scientific workplaces. Studies of pay gaps in UK universities persistently expose inequalities based on gender and race.¹⁴ Of the 222 European Research Council Council Advanced Grants awarded in 2018-19, 80% of recipients were men and only 20% women.¹⁵ 'Pay to publish' models of Plan

¹¹ As noted in the RHS 'Plan S and UK Learned Societies (page 20), many national UK repositories have marketised these assets in response to reduced Grant in Aid income from the Treasury, adding further to the cost of OA publication. Repositories under local council control likewise generate income from these collections by restricting and/or charging for reproduction rights.

¹² <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2010/15/contents> ; 'Indirect discrimination happens when there is a policy that applies in the same way for everybody but disadvantages a group of people who share a protected characteristic, and you are disadvantaged as part of this group. If this happens, the person or organisation applying the policy must show that there is a good reason for it.' <https://www.equalityhumanrights.com/en/advice-and-guidance/what-direct-and-indirect-discrimination> .

¹³ https://ec.europa.eu/info/aid-development-cooperation-fundamental-rights/your-rights-eu/know-your-rights/equality_en .

¹⁴ <https://www.theguardian.com/society/2018/mar/30/nine-out-of-10-public-sector-bodies-pay-men-more-than-women> ; <https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/education-46473269> .

¹⁵ <https://erc.europa.eu/sites/default/files/document/file/erc-2018-adg-statistics.pdf> .

S compliance that require APCs thus have the potential to entrench the longstanding disadvantages of researchers with protected characteristics and to result in indirect discrimination.

The WT has repeatedly affirmed its commitment to equal opportunities, whilst acknowledging that its past practice has fallen short on this ambition.¹⁶ United Kingdom Research and Innovation (UKRI), the body that orchestrates UK government funding of university research, has also underlined its commitment to equal opportunities. ‘Promoting equality, diversity and inclusion is an integral part of our vision to deliver new knowledge and an enriched, healthier, more sustainable and resilient society and culture, and to contribute to a prosperous economy’, it asserts, noting UKRI’s ‘unique position’ to effect change. ‘We will do so by modelling equality, diversity and inclusion in our own actions and take a strategic lead in promoting equality, diversity and inclusion in the research and innovation landscape, nationally and internationally.’¹⁷

Surprisingly (and worryingly) in this context, no reference to equal opportunities is apparent in Plan S documentation. COALition S appears to have undertaken no Equalities audit in the formulation or modelling of Plan S. No equal opportunities monitoring has been mooted or visibly put into place for this bold new initiative. Nor has the WT addressed this issue in its pioneering Plan S implementation statements. The Trust prides itself in ‘Leading by example’ in equalities policy for scientific research.¹⁸ It is not yet apparent that this leadership extends to its Plan S strategy or to engagement with the Humanities researchers funded by the Trust who fall within the Plan S mandate.

How might Plan S affect groups protected by UK equalities legislation? We know from systematic research on both Black and Minority Ethnic (BME) and women historians in UK universities that bias and discrimination against these protected groups are prevalent in university workplaces.¹⁹ Simply assuming that research funders’ OA policies are (for example) gender- or race-neutral because they do not specifically reference gender, race or ethnicity is not adequate to the task of guarding equal opportunities, diversity and inclusion. Good science (in the European sense) begins by asking questions and testing hypotheses, not by assuming that phenomena or correlations do not exist. A wider context must also be kept in view with respect to gender in particular: in STEM disciplines (excluding Medical subjects) male researchers are predominant, while in Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences the proportions of male and female staff are closer to parity.²⁰ If Plan S (including WT) implementation poses especial challenges for Humanities researchers, those challenges will fall more heavily on WT-funded female than on male researchers.

There is, further, an obvious disconnect between the groups of potentially vulnerable researchers identified by cOALition S on the one hand (ECRs and researchers in low- and middle-income countries) and protected groups as defined by UK and EU legislation, on the other hand. Plan S

¹⁶ <https://wellcome.ac.uk/news/wellcome-publishes-its-gender-pay-gap> .

¹⁷ <https://www.ukri.org/about-us/policies-and-standards/equality-diversity-and-inclusion/> .

¹⁸ <https://wellcome.ac.uk/what-we-do/our-work/diversity-and-inclusion> .

¹⁹ See the Royal Historical Society’s 2018 *Race, Ethnicity & Equality in UK History: A Report and Resource for Change* and its *Promoting Gender Equality in UK History: A Second Report and Recommendations for Good Practice*: <https://royalhistsoc.org/genderreport2018/> .

²⁰ <https://www.hesa.ac.uk/data-and-analysis/staff/areas> .

implementation guidance refers to the needs of ECRs; it also specifies that journals must ‘provide automatic APC waivers for authors from low-income countries and discounts for authors from middle-income countries’. But it commits neither journals nor Plan S funders to uphold statutory equal rights.²¹ Recognising the potential vulnerability of ECRs and researchers in low- and middle-income countries is an entirely laudable ambition, one that deserves the full support of cOAlition S, researchers, universities, journals and learned societies. (The text below references several ways in which WT implementation of Plan S may impact negatively on these groups). However, acknowledgements of the vulnerability of ECRs and researchers in countries with low- and middle-incomes in no way obviate funders’ obligations to address statutory UK equalities mandates. In many cases, of course, there may be productive intersections between these agendas: in UK universities, women and BME researchers are proportionately more numerous in History at ECR level than at senior level, for example, and many UK-based BME historians are international researchers who join the UK workforce from low-or middle-income countries of origin.²²

For universities too as employers, these are salient issues. Coalition S commits its funders to implement Plan S mandates for grantees according to any one of three potential timelines. Compliant funders can choose to apply Plan S to: ‘1) existing grants, 2) new projects/grants or, at the latest, 3) new calls’.²³ UKRI, the largest funder of UK university research, has not yet announced its schedule for Plan S implementation. The WT has opted to apply Plan S to both existing and new projects it funds with effect from 1 January 2020. Plan S implementation by the WT thus exposes some, but not other, UK university researchers to new OA mandates that may significantly restrict where and how they publish their findings. Do these restrictions fall equally on all employees—on both researchers with and without ‘protected’ characteristics? Of the History staff eligible for inclusion in both Essex’s and UCL’s REF2021 History submission, 100% of the staff whose research article submissions WT requires to be Plan S compliant from 2020 onward are women.

Whether disparities such as this are atypical or instead more pervasive is unknown. Testing for (and mitigating against) potential inequalities posed by Plan S is vitally important. Only by integrating scrutiny of equal opportunities systematically into policy formulation and implementation can we ensure that both employers and funders comply with UK and EU statutory obligations, thereby improving on the sector’s historically dismal record on equality, diversity and inclusion. The absence of any Plan S equalities monitoring currently (April 2019) precludes this scrutiny.

Part 3: Communication (Pathways and Timelines):

The WT’s decision to implement Plan S in advance of other cOAlition partners and to opt for the most precipitate of the three available timelines has inevitably entailed the Trust assuming a disproportionate burden of policy formulation and explication to stakeholders. As a first-

²¹ See section 9.1 of <https://www.coalition-s.org/implementation/>.

²² RHS, *Promoting Gender Equality*, pages 16-19; RHS, *Race, Ethnicity & Equality*, page 41.

²³ <https://www.coalition-s.org/implementation/>, point 5.

adopter, the Trust is establishing policies even as it undertakes basic research on the fit between the UK research landscape and Plan S. Working with the Association of Learned & Professional Publishers (ALPSP) and UKRI, WT has commissioned Information Power to explore Plan S compliant business models for learned societies.²⁴ An associated survey of learned society journals by Information Power opened in March and closes on 12 April 2019.²⁵

Effective communication with researchers is essential in this context, and WT has been proactive in encouraging engagement online and via a dedicated email account (openaccess@wellcome.ac.uk). However, the WT timeline poses especial challenges both to Humanities researchers (most of whom, unlike STEM scientists, do not conduct their research in formal research groups or funded centres) and to Humanities learned societies (the majority of which rely significantly, predominantly or wholly on unpaid academic labour).²⁶ The fundamentally different scale of support available for Humanities and STEM learned societies and journals demands recognition in the context of Plan S consultation and communication. The Institute of Physics has over 50,000 members and 150 paid staff members; the Royal Society of Chemistry has over 54,000 members and 529 employees.²⁷ The Royal Historical Society (the largest UK learned society for History focused on the research community) has 4,300 members and 2.1 FTE employees. The editors of UK History journals—in sharp contrast to many STEM outlets—are full-time academics who undertake these duties in addition to (not instead of) their university employment. If cOAlition S funders wish to communicate and engage meaningfully with their research communities, they will have to recognise and accommodate the fundamentally different structures, staffing and resources available to Humanities and STEM researchers, journals and subject associations.

Communication of the Plan S mandate to WT-funded Humanities researchers and prospective researchers has, to date, been neither comprehensive nor inclusive. The bullet points below identify key groups of WT Humanities researchers (beginning with the most junior and moving to the most senior), indicate the nature of any known WT communication with each group to date, and note areas in which communication/clarification is needed:

- **Prospective, Current and Past WT-funded MA Students:** WT funds Master's Studentships in Humanities and Social Science at 12 UK universities (Birkbeck, Bristol, Cambridge, KCL, LSE, LSHTM, Manchester, Newcastle, Southampton, Strathclyde, Warwick and York).²⁸ Master's programmes combine taught provision with research (concentrated in the dissertation, which some History students may later revise for publication as a research article). If WT-funded students' research does fall within the Plan S mandate, standard university best practice requires MA programmes to alert prospective applicants to this condition during the application process. Most of the available literature on consumer law and students focuses on undergraduates, but the Competition & Markets Authority (CMA) advice suggests that MA and PhD students

²⁴ <https://www.alpssp.org/news/20190201information-power-appointed-for-research-plan-s> .

²⁵ https://www.alpssp.org/write/MediaUploads/News%20article%20images/SPA_OPS_Survey_March_2019.pdf .

²⁶ RHS, 'Plan S and UK Learned Societies', pages 29-30.

²⁷ IoP information received by telephone 03/04/2019; RSC information from https://www.rsc.org/globalassets/02-about-us/corporate-information/trustees_report_2017.pdf (pages 48-49).

²⁸ <https://wellcome.ac.uk/funding/masters-awards-humanities-and-social-science> .

may also be defined as ‘consumers’. Failing to provide prospective students with information on key terms and conditions of study, so-called ‘misleading omissions’, may contravene consumer law.²⁹ Written clarification (including a statement on the WT website) is needed to clarify whether the research conducted by past, current and/or prospective WT-funded MA students fall within the Plan S mandate. If so, does this apply to all students who have had WT funding for MA research, or only to students matriculated from a specified date? Does WT intend to communicate these obligations to current and/or past students and their supervisors/programme leaders? If so, how and when? No WT communication along these lines appears to have occurred.

- **WT PhD applicants, PhD Students and Supervisors:** The Trust funds doctoral studentships undertaken in the UK, Republic of Ireland and low-and middle-income countries (as defined by the OECD). PhD students may be ‘consumers’ under UK consumer law; they are clearly also ‘researchers’, undertaking original research. When will WT notify prospective, current and past PhD students and their supervisors of any new obligations under Plan S, and inform them that Plan S may limit the number and range of journals in which they are able to publish? At present (April 2019), neither the WT website nor its ‘Sample full application form for Doctoral Students’ references Plan S.³⁰ This omission contrasts with the detailed information requested on pages 12-13 of the sample form on plans for disseminating research findings and the generation and protection of intellectual property. No direct communication by WT with current PhD students or their supervisors is known to have occurred. Discussion of publication plans, an essential aspect of PhD supervision and mentoring, cannot be undertaken effectively in this context. At present, WT-funded PhD students appear likely, compared to the wider body of History PhD students, to be disadvantaged with respect to available outlets for their research articles from 1 January 2020 onward. The proportion of WT-funded PhD students who have protected characteristics is unknown. Ensuring that ECRs are not disadvantaged by Plan S is a stated goal of cOAlition S. This goal is not reflected in current WT communication with researchers;
- **Non-university based, former WT-funded ECRs:** It is common for recent PhDs and other ECRs in History to join the ‘precariat’, alternating periods of unemployment or employment outside the university sector with service as (for example) fixed-term university Teaching Fellows. WT OA policies are known to be especially challenging for staff in these circumstances. WT conventionally manages payment of APCs and BPCs to publishers by WT via researchers’ ‘home’ institutions, but precariat ECRs lack these intermediating bodies. Research article peer review in the Humanities typically takes 3 or more (often many more) months, with ‘revise and resubmit’ or ‘major revisions’ processes—essential to quality enhancement in the discipline—entailing several more months prior to acceptance for publication. In History, revised manuscripts may be submitted for reconsideration within a few months, or many months later. For female staff who take periods of maternity leave, these intervals may be interrupted and/or more extended. The absence of a routine WT mechanism for processing APC and BPC

²⁹ See CMA, *UK Higher Education Providers—Advice on Consumer Protection Law: Helping You Comply with Your Obligations* (12 March 2015), esp. 11-12, 28-29.

³⁰ <https://wellcome.ac.uk/funding/doctoral-studentships> .

payments on behalf of ECR researchers whose funding has ended and/or who lack a stable, continuous university research employment contract acts to the disadvantage of these ECRs. Lacking access to HR advisers and university research officers, these researchers are especially vulnerable to the consequences of poor communication of funders' new OA policies. As is the case with WT-funded MA and PhD students, no WT communication with these ECRs is known to have occurred;

- **WT ECR postdoctoral researchers and University Award holders:** Career planning, REF Output reviews (held at 6-month intervals at some universities), probationary monitoring, annual appraisals and promotions bids for university staff all entail mentoring, scrutiny and decision-making about research article publication. In this context, the absence of clear and timely information to WT-funded ECRs and University Award holders acts against researchers' professional interests. ECRs in permanent posts typically work within 3-year probationary periods, with specific publication targets included in their agreed goals.³¹ The lack of information on whether/where they can publish research articles places WT-funded researchers as a group and WT-funded ECRs within that group at a disadvantage relative to their peers for employment, REF selection, probation and subsequent promotion.
- **WT Investigator Awards PIs:** PIs on WT Investigator Awards include senior researchers with substantial responsibilities both for their own research and for that of their projects' PhD students and Postdoctoral Research Fellows. WT communication with these award holders and Plan S guidance for them is reported to have been skeletal. These PIs have an especial duty of care to their (predominantly ECR) team members, most of whom will need strong publication records in order to secure their next research contracts. In the absence of effective and timely communication, this duty of care cannot be exercised;
- **WT Centres and Institutes:** The WT funds research centres that focus substantially on Medical Humanities. These include Durham University's Institute for Medical Humanities, Edinburgh University's Centre for Biomedicine, Self and Society, Exeter University's Centre for Cultures and Environments of Health and Oxford's Centre for Ethics & Humanities (including the Wellcome Unit for the History of Medicine). The Trust also funds 30 institutions through ISSFs, a scheme that includes Humanities and Social Sciences as an area of 'strategic importance'. University investment in these centres rests on the expectation that they will yield both excellent research outputs and enhanced REF income. Delivering on that promise will be challenging if Plan S impedes publication of WT-funded Humanities research. Having received very little advance notice of Plan S, Centre and Institute staff and students are now very eager indeed to discuss the impact of Plan S with WT staff.

The limitations of the official Plan S website exacerbate the limitations of WT communication on Plan S. WT interpretations of Plan S requirements are of immediate relevance only to WT-

³¹ Current examples of universities with 3-year probation periods include for example Exeter University ([https://www.exeter.ac.uk/media/universityofexeter/humanresources/exeteracademic/eanddocuments2017/Probation_process_for_Lecturer_\(E&R\).pdf](https://www.exeter.ac.uk/media/universityofexeter/humanresources/exeteracademic/eanddocuments2017/Probation_process_for_Lecturer_(E&R).pdf) and http://admin.exeter.ac.uk/personnel/~docs/guide_to_grading_and_progression_for_staff_in_academic_roles.pdf).

funded researchers and staff who supervise, mentor or line manage them. However, cOAlition S communication has much wider resonance in the UK because UKRI is a Plan S signatory. To date, the official Plan S website has remained rudimentary. Although sponsored by public bodies funded with tax income, it does not provide any information on cOAlition governance structures or meetings, does not maintain an up-to-date or consistent list of cOAlition partners and does not connect researchers, universities, learned societies or funders with statements made by Plan S representatives at public meetings. It is evident that Plan S policy is in a stage of rapid evolution, but the Plan S website does not have a clear, time-stamped mechanism for indicating what policy changes have been agreed, and when.³² For a programme designed to liberate and universalise knowledge through open access publication, Plan S is remarkable for its lack of transparency.

It will not be possible for researchers, journal editors, learned societies or universities to plan effectively for Plan S (including WT) implementation if cOAlition S makes changes to its policies and guidance but fails to signal them clearly to researchers. A system of both notification and archived versioning needs to be developed and implemented by the cOAlition as a matter of high priority. Neither routine planning for researchers and research groups nor business planning for journals and learned societies can be conducted effectively in the absence such mechanisms. COAlition S self-consciously chose to ‘accelerate’ OA; WT has opted for the most accelerated of the three available Plan S implementation plans. The onus lies on these funding bodies to provide the research community with information that is fit for purpose within the contractual terms of their study or employment.

Part 4: Identification of liable Authors and Outputs:

The WT’s definitions of what types of research fall within the remit of Plan S appear to be the most clearly articulated of the Plan S funders’ statements to date. This section builds on that useful base. It identifies three areas where WT-funded Humanities researchers would benefit from greater clarity in order to determine liability to Plan S compliance. These areas of uncertainty address basic ‘who?’, ‘what?’ and ‘when?’ questions. In many cases, the WT will likely be able to provide this clarification with ease and speed, and can readily communicate these rulings to researchers. This would reduce needless anxiety, and may also facilitate the formulation of the other cOAlition S partners’ implementation plans. In other cases, more reflection or information gathering—including discussions with the research community—may be necessary.

Who is liable to WT Plan S mandates, and when? Which WT-funded researchers fall within the Trust’s Plan S mandate? This sub-section simply sets out the logical possibilities, in chronological order. The list is designed to work through the pragmatic possibilities, not to indicate a priority order or researcher preferences:

³² As of 30 March 2019, the website (<https://www.coalition-s.org/about/>) stated that there were 13 national research funding organisations in the cOAlition, while the ‘Funders and Supporters’ page includes the logos of 15 national organisations. Connecting the twitter feeds of Plan S spokespersons (and identifying who Plan S’s official spokespersons are) would be a small positive step in the direction of good communication.

- **WT-funded authors of articles submitted after 1 January 2020 as resubmissions:** These questions apply to researchers at all career stages. Many articles are accepted by and published in History journals only after a ‘revise and resubmit’ or ‘major revision’ process. Different History journals use and interpret revision differently, but in general the author revises and resubmits the original manuscript in response to peer review reports, and the journal editors send the revised article for reconsideration by one or more of the original peer reviewers prior to making a final decision to accept or reject the article for publication. An informal survey of History journals that publish historians of medicine suggests that a minimum of 25-30% of published articles are accepted only after the revise and resubmit process. Of the 202 decisions made in 2016 and 2017 on research articles submitted to *Social History of Medicine*, 127 (62.9%) entailed revision prior to resubmission.³³ Resubmission may occur several or many months after an initial editorial assessment. Many WT-funded articles will thus likely be in this intermediate stage of development on 1 January 2020. Questions for WT: 1) Can WT-funded research articles be re-submitted to non-Plan S compliant journals after 1 January 2020 if they were originally submitted to those journals prior to 1 January 2019? 2) If so, and if the article is published, will WT pay any required APC for Gold OA?
- **WT-funded Master’s students:** As noted above, research from MA dissertations is sometimes published after the degree is awarded. Often publication will occur some years after completion of the MA degree. Questions for WT: 1) Are all researchers who previously received WT-funding for Master’s degrees restricted to Plan S compliant journals if from 1 January 2020 onward they submit articles based on research from these degrees? 2) If so, who is responsible for informing these students of this stipulation? 3) Are current WT-funded MA students (who, if full-time will typically complete their degrees in September-December 2019, or if part-time will typically complete their degrees in September-December 2020) required to submit only to Plan S compliant journals? 4) If so, who is responsible for informing these students of this stipulation?
- **WT-funded PhD students:** The questions here are similar to those for MA students, with the additional complication that successful PhD students will expect to publish not only one or more articles from their dissertation research but also, after substantial revision and additional research, a monograph. (Plan S compliance for monographs is mooted but not yet scheduled for non-WT funded researchers). Questions for WT: 1) Are all PhD researchers who previously received WT-funding for their doctoral degrees restricted to Plan S compliant journals if from 1 January 2020 onward they submit articles based on research from these degrees? 2) If so, who is responsible for informing these researchers of this stipulation? 3) Are all current WT-funded PhD students required to submit only to Plan S compliant journals from 1 January 2020 onward? 4) If so, who is responsible for informing these students of this stipulation?
- **Postdoctoral researchers who previously held WT-funding:** This query relates to postdoctoral researchers at any level of seniority, rather than to ECRs alone. Because of the nature of Humanities research, it is not unusual for researchers to use notes from

³³ History journals surveyed included *English Historical Review* and *Past & Present*. Figures for *SHM* supplied by email by Rosemary Cresswell 4 April 2019.

previous research projects years later, when they are working on new projects, which may be supported by a new funder, supported by their university or self-funded. Question for WT: 1) Is there an intended statute of limitations for researchers funded by WT in terms of Plan S liability? Do any articles broadly related to a research topic which previously received WT funding fall within the mandate, or only outputs specified in funding applications? 2) Who determines what research articles ‘count’, and how do they do so? 3) What is the status of ECRs and other researchers who have previously received WT funding but are not in university employment? If they are liable for APCs to publish their research in Plan S compliant journals, who will fund these costs, and how? Does WT expect researchers without an affiliation to pay APC (or BPC) charges and only subsequently receive reimbursement from the Trust? 4) What is the status (and access to funding for APCs) of emeritus researchers, who wish to publish research after their funding and contract of employment has ended?

What ‘counts’ as a ‘research article’ for Plan S compliance?:

WT’s working definition of what constitutes a ‘research article’ represents an important step toward clarifying what types of research publication ‘count’ for Plan S compliance. The Trust will apply Plan S requirements to ‘any article that includes original, peer-reviewed research and is submitted for publication from 1 January 2020.’³⁴ The Wellcome Open Research website provides additional granular detail on how WT defines research articles: ‘Research Articles should present original findings, such as results of basic and translational research, clinical and epidemiologic studies, or clinical trials, or the outcomes of research projects in social sciences and humanities. Null and negative findings and reanalyses of previous studies leading to new results, as well as confirmatory results, are encouraged.’³⁵ The Wellcome Open Research website proceeds to provide instructions for authors for a typology of 12 additional categories of article: method articles, study protocols, systematic reviews, software tool articles, clinical practice articles, research notes, data notes, case reports, open letters, correspondence, editorials and registered reports.

An analogous typology for Medical Humanities publications—which do not conform to the bioscience publication model outlined above—will be needed for WT-funded historians, together with clarification on which types of journal publication must be published in Plan S compliant outlets from 1 January 2020. Many peer-reviewed History journals, for example, publish substantial historiographical reviews and topical roundtables. It is unclear whether the WT defines historiography as ‘original research’. Definition issues such as these will, more broadly, be important for UKRI and other cOAlition S partners as they formulate their Plan S policies.

Part 5: Identification of Compliant Journals:

High-calibre publication of research outputs is a shared goal of UK learned societies and cOAlition S funders. The WT’s new, Plan S compliant OA policy expects researchers to ‘publish

³⁴ <https://wellcome.ac.uk/sites/default/files/wellcome-open-access-policy-2020.pdf>, page 1.

³⁵ <https://wellcomeopenresearch.org/for-authors/article-guidelines>.

their findings freely online as high-quality, peer reviewed research articles, monographs and book chapters'. These outputs must be:

- 'made freely available through PubMed Central (PMC) and Europe PMC by the official final publication date' and 'published under a Creative Commons attribution licence (CC-BY)',³⁶
- WT will pay grantholders 'reasonable' APCs for publication in OA journals and platforms if they 'are indexed by the Directory of Open Access Journals (or follow any other criteria that cOAlition S may set out in future for open access journals and platforms to be compliant)' and also 'have an agreement with the National Library of Medicine (NLM) to deposit the version of record in PMC and allow that content to be shared with Europe PMC';
- For a limited period (1 January 2020 to 31 December 2021), WT will underwrite research organisations' costs for articles published in journals with 'Jisc Collections transformative OA agreements (or an equivalent), where the agreement allows 100% of research to be published immediately as open access';
- The Trust will provide a list of approved transformative agreements at an unspecified date before 1 January 2020.

Abundant email and Twitter evidence attests that identification of Plan S compliant journals is posing substantial challenges to both Plan S funders and researchers, and is generating especially acute anxiety among WT-funded ECRs. In the absence of a Plan S-calibrated tool analogous to SHERPA/Fact, researchers (especially ECRs) will struggle to identify compliant outlets. If Plan S's requirements evolve significantly in the early implementation phase, this challenge will escalate. There is at present no list of existing Plan S compliant Humanities journals. Nor is there guidance on the Plan S or WT websites on how researchers can identify such journals. The technical requirements for Plan S compliance are highly complex and labile (as suggested above by phrases such as 'or follow any other criteria that cOAlition S may set out in future for open access journals and platforms to be compliant'). There is an urgent need for a census of existing compliant journal titles, accompanied by an assessment of their ability to meet the WT's expectation that their grantholders will 'publish their findings freely online as high-quality, peer reviewed research articles'.

The remainder of this section lays very preliminary groundwork for such an assessment, using the Directory of Open Access Journals (DOAJ) and the journals in the Open Library of Humanities (OLH) to test for the availability of potentially Plan S compliant OA journals for History of Medicine researchers. RHS lacks sufficient staffing or financial resources to undertake a full analysis of the availability and Plan S-compliance of OA History or Humanities journals. The Trust presumably will wish to commission independent research on Medical Humanities journals to advance its open access agenda whilst exercising its duty of care to WT grant holders. Here, instead, we explore two groups of OA journals specifically suggested by WT staff to WT-funded History/Humanities researchers as viable outlets for high-quality Plan S compliant research articles:.

³⁶ <https://wellcome.ac.uk/sites/default/files/wellcome-open-access-policy-2020.pdf>, points 1-3.

DOAJ and Plan S Compliant Journals for Historians of Medicine:

The first of the 14 ‘Basic mandatory criteria for Plan S compliant Open Access journals and platforms’ and ‘Mandatory quality criteria for Plan S compliant journals, platforms, and other venues’ listed in sections 9.1 and 9.2 of cOAlition S’s implementation guidance is registration in the Directory of Open Access Journals (DOAJ).³⁷ The DOAJ reportedly includes over 100 History titles among its 12,000+ journals.³⁸ Frantsvåg and Strømme’s 2019 analysis of 12,350 DOAJ titles tested for compliance with 10 of the 14 required Plan S compliance criteria, finding that only 1,085 (8.8%) of DOAJ titles met these limited criteria. As these authors note, DOAJ journals that charge APCs for OA predominantly publish STEM research, while journals that do not charge APCs predominantly publish Humanities and Social Science. They found that 25.6% of APC-charging OA journals met the 10 measured criteria, while only 2.8% of journals without APCs did so. ‘Looking at academic disciplines it is clear that the humanities and social sciences will be most affected since the open access journals in these segments are usually smaller and free to publish in’, they conclude.³⁹ Given that Frantsvåg and Strømme tested for compliance with only 10 of the 14 Plan S criteria, it is reasonable to expect that these percentages (25.6% and 2.8%, respectively) will deflate further when cOAlition S undertakes a systematic study of DOAJ titles. (Plan S’s reliance upon DOAJ, which has well-known issues with quality/reliability, has caused some bemusement in the OA community).

To test the advice on the availability of OA History of Medicine journals which WT staff have been providing WT-funded researchers by email, the author in March 2019 conducted a simple search of DOAJ using the term ‘medical history’. This search yielded 19 titles (see Appendix I for the full list, with individual annotations on each title). She undertook a rapid review of articles in recent volumes of these titles, to identify their History content and to make a preliminary analysis of quality, using the standard criteria (rigour, originality and significance) employed in assessing History outputs for REF. She also assessed the periodicity of publication, an especially important factor for ECRs seeking employment or with probationary status and (in the UK) for REF-eligible staff more broadly. In her analysis, the content of most recent articles in the majority of these journals either was not ‘History’ or failed to reach the 2* threshold required for underpinning research for Impact case studies or the 3* threshold required to attract REF Output funding for History outputs. Further, the periodicity and the language of publication of many of these journals will pose pragmatic challenges to most UK-based researchers. Four broad concerns loom especially large:

- **Sustainability** is a significant problem. Of the 19 titles, 6 (32%) had not yet published a volume for 2018, and at very least 3 (16%) have clearly ceased to publish altogether. (Two have URLs that lead to page not found messages, while the editor of a third confirmed there were no plans to publish further due to lack of funding). Of the 6 journals that lack a volume for 2018, one last appeared in 2014, three in 2016, one in

³⁷ <https://www.coalition-s.org/implementation/> .

³⁸ Seth Denbo, ‘Plan S and the Humanities: Funders Push Harder on Open Access’, <https://www.historians.org/publications-and-directories/perspectives-on-history/march-2019/plan-s-and-the-humanities-funders-push-harder-on-open-access#.XJzYRzcxwxU.twitter> .

³⁹ Jan Erik Frantsvåg and Tormod Strømme, ‘Few Open Access Journals are Plan S Compliant’, <https://www.preprints.org/manuscript/201901.0165/v1> , page 9.

2016-17 and one in 2017. For researchers planning to apply for academic employment, to make a REF output submission or to be considered for career progression/promotion, these would be highly risky target journals. Responsible mentors in the UK would be unlikely to encourage ECRs to publish in these outlets;

- **Content** is also problematic in terms of the accepted quality thresholds in History. Several of the journals contain little original historical content. Three of the 19 (16%) are focused on other disciplines: anthropology, linguistics and sociology. Several of the remaining journals publish ‘History’ in the sense that they occasionally publish obituaries or short notes on medical institutions’ histories or biographies of physicians. Several of these journals (6 of the 19, or 32%) predominantly publish clinical results or articles on professional matters (such as medical education) and are not publishing work with the characteristics (including the presentation of substantial original material and analysis, robust footnoting/referencing and significant historiographical engagement) UK historians would look for in hiring, promotion and/or REF. Few of the journals publish articles of the typical length of academic History outputs. As noted in Part 1 of this paper, short-length History outputs were, in REF2014, associated with lower scores than longer research articles and book chapters. The editorial standards of these journals do not appear to be high, for example, in terms of the use of ‘good English’, a characteristic WT specifically requires on its own OA research publication platform;⁴⁰
- **Intended readership** shapes the content and presentation of research articles in these journals in ways that detract from their scholarly rigour. The intended audiences include for example medical students and physicians—a very different readership than researchers target in most discipline-based academic History journals. The lack of sophistication in the articles’ arguments is suited to a non-specialist audience, as is the short length of the outputs. Many of these journals publish important research findings, but few of them publish high-quality History research articles suitable for REF submissions;
- **Languages other than English** predominate in many of the journals. Several of the journals publish no research articles in English. (The DOAJ descriptor often suggests that a journal publishes both in English and other languages when in fact only an English abstract is published). Publication in languages other than English is of course standard in continental European, South American and South-East Asian History journals. It would not pose an obstacle to all UK-based historians. But for the majority of WT-funded historians of medicine—a significant number of whom work in English language sources on modern British history or on topics (such as African, North American or South Asian history) in which most researchers publish in English—it will be a significant obstacle. This limitation pertains both to the submission and review process

⁴⁰ ‘Preparing a Research Article: Language’ in Wellcome Open Research specifies: ‘All articles must be written in good English. Please note that the article will not undergo editing by Wellcome Open Research before publication and a manuscript may be rejected during the initial checking process if it is deemed unintelligible and hence not suitable for peer review. For authors whose first language is not English, it may be beneficial to have the manuscript read by a native English speaker with scientific expertise. There are many commercial editing services that can provide this service at a cost to the authors.’ <https://wellcomeopenresearch.org/for-authors/article-guidelines/research-articles>. The cost of the commercial editing services referenced here contrasts with the high levels of editorial labour provided gratis by UK hybrid History journals.

and to attracting a wide readership for articles once published. Of the 19 journals, one publishes in Hungarian, one in Korean, three in Spanish, one predominantly in Latvian, one predominantly in Turkish, and one predominantly in Ukrainian.

OLH and Plan S Compliant Journals for History of Medicine:

A second possible source of OA journals for WT-funded Humanities researchers is the Open Library of Humanities (OLH). This model of OA publication rests on library membership in the OLH consortium as well as time-limited financial awards from the Australian National Science Fund and the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation.⁴¹ OLH titles have the advantage, for WT-funded researchers, of being published in English. They appear to have high editorial standards. They are often born digital and specifically designed to advance the open access agenda. It is not at present (April 2019) clear whether each (or any) of these journals meets each of the 14 Plan S technical requirements. But they are demonstrably Humanities-orientated outlets and they suffer from far fewer of the structural limitations than the 19 putative ‘medical history’ journals identified in the DOAJ.

The 24 titles published by OLH are listed in Appendix II. One journal (*Pynchon Notes*) no longer accepts new submissions. The author undertook a rapid review of recent research articles published in the 23 remaining journals, using the criteria employed for History sub-panel assessment of Output excellence in REF2014 (rigour, originality and significance). The majority of OLH journals are highly specialised, focusing on areas of research (often predominantly literary in emphasis) with relatively little overlap with the research questions and primary materials that drive WT-funded History of Medicine projects. Journals such as for example *Comics Grid: Journal of Comics Scholarship*, the *International Journal of Welsh Writing in English* and *Laboratory Phonology*, whilst excellent in themselves, are unlikely to provide most historians of medicine with an appropriate outlet for research articles. However, the *Open Library of the Humanities* megajournal may be suitable for some History of Medicine journal articles (including articles intended for REF submission). Other highly specialised OLH titles may be relevant and viable for a relatively modest number of WT-funded Humanities researchers. These include *19: Interdisciplinary Studies in the Long Nineteenth Century*, *Architectural Histories*, *Body, Space & Technology*, *Digital Medievalist*, *Quaker Studies* and *Journal of the Maternal*.

Conclusions:

A signature feature of UK-based History journals that consistently publish high-quality research is that their reviewers and editors provide substantial qualitative input into the published version of submitted research articles either after the initial review or both after initial review and after the ‘revise and resubmit’ or ‘major revisions’ process. For journals—for example, *Medical History*—that actively seek to publish authors based in low- or middle-income countries where English is not the researcher’s first language, editorial intervention to maintain high quality standards of prose often includes substantial unpaid academic labour during the revision stage.

⁴¹ <https://www.openlibhums.org/site/about/FAQ/>.

OA platforms such as Wellcome Open Research guide prospective authors to commercial editing services; the ‘medical history’ journals in the DOAJ instead often accept lower standards of English prose. The relatively low quality standards of the OA journals in DOAJ suggest that these outlets lack staff, expertise and/or funding to undertake essential editorial work (of which English prose enhancement forms only one example). For UK hybrid History journals, subscriptions underwrite a significant portion of these editorial costs, with a substantial portion of remaining labour costs and skill provided by academic reviewers’ and editors’ unpaid labour. Publishing a journal with high-calibre articles is work; it requires time, money, knowledge, expertise and stable institutional support. The inability of so many of the DOAJ ‘medical history’ titles to publish articles quarterly or at least annually contrasts sharply with the periodicity of hybrid journals such as the US-based *Bulletin of the History of Medicine* (Johns Hopkins University Press), and the UK-based *Medical History* (Cambridge University Press) and *Social History of Medicine* (Oxford University Press). The quality of the ‘medical history’ journals listed in the DOAJ suggests that the model on which they are based is fragile, with negative consequences for the journals’ quality and longevity. The DOAJ itself proves on examination to be a search tool with limited reliability and utility for Plan S implementation.

The absence of an up-to-date list of/search tool for Plan S OA journals and of a ‘seal’ to signify Plan S compliance currently (April 2019) precludes identification of journals in which WT-funded historians can submit compliant research articles from 1 January 2020. Fewer than 10% of all journals listed in the DOAJ meet 10 of the 14 Plan S compliance criteria; Humanities journals are under-represented within even this small proportion of partially compliant journals. Scrutiny of ‘medical history’ titles in the DOAJ suggests that WT-funded historians will struggle to identify Plan S compliant journals in which to publish high-quality outputs. WT-funded researchers may be able to identify alternative History or Humanities journals that are Plan S compliant and that also accept History of Medicine research articles. A preliminary assessment of OLH titles, however, suggests that the number of these journals suitable for WT-funded authors may be very modest. The implications of the lack of available outlets for high-quality research articles by WT Humanities grantholders in the early years of Plan S implementation may include disadvantages for WT-funded Humanities researchers as a group, and ECRs (including postgraduate students) in particular, with respect to academic employment prospects and career development. If, for example, BME and female historians are disproportionately concentrated at ECR (including postgraduate) level, WT-funded researchers with protected characteristics may suffer disproportionate disadvantage in this context.

Part 6: Alternative Compliant Publication Platforms:

OA ‘platforms’ afford an alternative pathway to Plan S compliance. Several such platforms have been designed to meet the needs of STEMM researchers. Some of these platforms accept Humanities and Social Science submissions. Given the complexity of Plan S technical requirements and their rapid evolution, it is unknown whether these platforms are currently Plan S compliant. However, as ‘born-OA’ outlets, they share many of the goals of cOAlition S. This section offers a very preliminary review of these platforms from the perspective of Humanities/History researchers.

PLOS ONE: <https://journals.plos.org/plosone/>

Founded in 2001 as a non-profit Open Access initiative, Public Library of Science (PLOS) aims to transform research communication by making published medical and scientific research available to the public through free online archives such as PubMed Central.⁴² PLOS reported substantial revenue losses in 2018, together with a decline in submissions and publications and a US \$ 11.1 M write-off for the failure of a new manuscript submission system.⁴³ PLOS ONE however remains (April 2019) the world's largest multidisciplinary peer-reviewed journal, accepting research from over 200 subject areas including Social Science and Humanities. If PLOS One's Plan S compliance is not yet attested, how 'History compliant' is this innovative OA platform?

- Of six editorial teams, two conceivably include Social Sciences (Behavioural & Social Sciences, Neuroscience, Mental Health; Publication Ethics) but there appears to be no editorial oversight for Medical Humanities. Only two of 29 editors have a Humanities or Social Science background;⁴⁴
- Of 508 articles tagged Medical Humanities, only one - an article on text mining - is tagged medical history;
- PLOS ONE boasts an editorial board of 8954 editors. Searching the database using the term 'History of medicine' returns 4 results, only one of whom specialises in this field.⁴⁵ Searching 'medical humanities' returns 40 results, only two of whom are based in the UK with no clear specialisation in this area, and again, only one recognised historian of medicine;⁴⁶
- PLOS journals require authors to make all data underlying their findings fully available without restriction at the time of publication, a requirement that is exceptionally challenging for much Social Sciences and Humanities research content, as discussed in Part 1 above and more fully below with respect to Wellcome Open Research.

Palgrave Communications: <https://www.nature.com/palcomms/>

First published by Palgrave Macmillan in 2015, Palgrave Communications is 'a fully open-access, online journal publishing peer-reviewed academic research across the full spectrum of the humanities and social sciences'. The journal lists Health and Medical Humanities and History as welcomed disciplines. Palgrave Communication's Plan S technical compliance is unknown at this time, but it has been designed to support publications based on funded research. What characteristics of this platform are pertinent for historians and historians of medicine?

⁴² PLOS: Our History: <https://www.plos.org/history>

⁴³ Phil Davis, 'Poor Financials Pushes PLOS to Ponder Future Prospects' (3 January 2019): <https://scholarlykitchen.sspnet.org/2019/01/03/poor-financials-pushes-plos-to-ponder-future-prospects/> .

⁴⁴ <https://journals.plos.org/plosone/s/staff-editors> and

⁴⁵ <https://journals.plos.org/plosone/static/editorial-board> In both cases the historian of medicine is Dorothy Porter.

⁴⁶ PLOS One search undertaken by Katherine Foxhall, 3 April 2019.

- There is some overlap in the editorial boards for Health and Medical Humanities (5 historians of medicine) and History (4 historians of medicine, three of whom also appear in H&MH list). However, all these individuals specialise in twentieth century history;
- Palgrave Communications is a fully open access journal with a flat rate APC of £790 for all published papers. Papers are published free and immediately online. Waivers and discounts are provided for authors based in low income countries on ‘a case-by-case basis, and may be granted in cases of financial need’;
- Palgrave Macmillan supports authors complying with funders’ open access policies, including CC-BY licences.⁴⁷
- Searching Palgrave Communications returns 22 articles in subject heading ‘health humanities’ of which 5 have a historical focus. Subject ‘history’ returns 35 items. However, of the 26 items that can be said to reflect genuinely historical research (e.g. leaving out contemporary studies which contain at most only a brief historical introduction, or literary studies) only 6 consider topics pre-dating the twentieth century, suggesting a very narrow vision of what constitutes ‘history’, and making the platform currently unsuitable for the very wide chronological range of research in medical history.⁴⁸

Wellcome Open Research: <https://wellcomeopenresearch.org/>

All articles accepted for publication on the Wellcome Open Research platform benefit from ‘immediate publication, transparent refereeing and the inclusion of all source data.’ The platform is open only to Wellcome-funded researchers.

- The Advisory Board is specifically composed to *advocate* for open access to the wider research community, rather than advise on matters pertaining to publication. It does not appear to include anyone with a background in the Medical Humanities;⁴⁹
- There does not appear to be an Editorial Board. The FAQs state that ‘Wellcome Open Research has no academic editors who make decisions to accept or reject articles or identify suitable referees’.⁵⁰ Rather, article authors are expected to lead the peer review process by continuing to suggest referees until two reviews are received. The review process is open, and names and affiliations of reviewers will be published with their reports. The ‘editorial team’ communicate with reviewers on behalf of authors, and decide only whether reviewer criteria (sufficient expertise and qualifications, and no conflicts of interest) are met.⁵¹ The Wellcome Open Research website contains no information about who the editorial team are beyond an email address, presumably because the platform is provided by F1000 (though controlled by Wellcome) an open access publishing platform for clinicians and scientists. This approach to peer-review

⁴⁷ https://www.nature.com/palcomms/about/openaccess#Article_processing_charge_APC_waivers; <https://www.springernature.com/gp/open-research/funding/funders-requiring-cc-by-for-articles>

⁴⁸ https://www.nature.com/search?order=relevance&journal=palcomms&subject=history&article_type=research

⁴⁹ <https://wellcomeopenresearch.org/advisors>

⁵⁰ ‘Why do I have to suggest referees for my article?’ <https://wellcomeopenresearch.org/faqs>

⁵¹ See Point 12 <https://wellcomeopenresearch.org/about/policies#dataavail>

departs from the blind review protocols accepted as best practice in the Humanities in the UK and internationally. It is notable that many Humanities journals introduced blind peer review as part of broader efforts to support equal opportunities. The impact of self-nominated, non-blind refereeing in Humanities on equal opportunities is unknown. Fears about the threat to rigorous peer-review have been voiced by many in the scientific community,⁵²

- WOR data availability requirements do not accommodate historical methodologies. They require that source data underlying results, and details of software used to process the results are released. Humanities researchers, as noted in Part 1 above, often do not own their data, much of which is restricted by copyright. Nor is their underlying data typically collected, configured or stored in ways that make releasing them practicable or useful for other researchers. While there is recognition in WOR that in some cases data-sharing may not be feasible, exceptions will only be made for ethical and security considerations; data protection issues; large data; data under license by a third party. This policy makes little attempt to encompass Social Science or Humanities approaches to research;⁵³
- Regarding the ‘Main Body’ of the article, there is some acknowledgement that authors in Medical Humanities may need flexibility in following the standard format (Introduction; Methods; Results; Conclusions/Discussion) ‘as long as authors ensure that they describe their methods and sources in sufficient detail for others to be able to repeat the research.’ It is not clear whether widely accepted footnote conventions constitute sufficient detail, given the requirements for sharing data discussed above.⁵⁴

Preliminary Analysis of OA Platforms:

OA platforms designed for STEMM publications represent a rapidly developing publication frontier with potential to contribute to the Plan S agenda. Their financial stability is unknown at this time, although the most recent financial statement for PLOS raises questions about the commercial viability of this model. For historians as a group and historians of medicine more particularly, these platforms as currently constructed appear to have only limited utility. OA platforms with editorial boards lack substantial subject-specific expertise in History, History of Medicine and Medical Humanities. The Wellcome Open Research platform combines immediate publication prior to peer review with transparent self-nomination of referees. This contrasts with hybrid History journals which offer substantial editorial labour to enhance quality prior to publication. In the context of high levels of bias and discrimination reported by BME and female researchers and low levels of understanding among UK historians of either unconscious bias or equalities legislation,⁵⁵ the ability of transparent self-nomination of referees (as opposed to blind peer review) to deliver equal opportunities remains to be tested.

⁵² <https://sites.google.com/view/plansopenletter/open-letter>

⁵³ <https://wellcomeopenresearch.org/about/policies#dataavail>

⁵⁴ https://wellcomeopenresearch.org/resources/Article%20Guidelines_Method%20Article.pdf

⁵⁵ RHS, *Race, Ethnicity, Equality*, esp. pages 8-9, 50-58; RHS, *Promoting Gender Equality*, esp. pages 25-27, 30-43.

Part 7: Journal (including Learned Society) Business Plans and Plan S:

UK-based History (including History of Medicine) journals have accommodated well to hybrid OA publication. This flexible model has the virtue of enabling publication by the full range of UK and international History researchers. Offering no-embargo Gold publication when APCs are paid, hybrid has hitherto allowed History research funded by external grants to meet funders' OA requirements. At the same time, the ability to submit to and publish in these journals on a level playing field without APC payment has enabled the great majority of UK and international historians, who lack access to APC funding, to publish their research, with a Green OA version of the author accepted manuscript (AAM) available after a time-limited embargo. Because hybrid OA allows but does not mandate Green OA self-archiving of AAMs, it supports a wide national and international spectrum of professional and 'citizen science' historians to publish their research findings in journals that offer substantial levels of editorial enhancement.⁵⁶ History researchers who benefit from this system include: ECRs (many of whom do not enjoy stable employment in research institutions); archivists, heritage professionals and librarians who lack access to APC funding; international researchers (including historians in low- and middle-income countries, few of whom have access to either APCs or self-archiving OA repositories); researchers such as local and family historians who conduct research outside professional frameworks; and emeritus academic staff.

Adjusting to Plan S requirements within the timescale of WT implementation does not at present appear feasible or desirable to the UK and international History journal editors or editorial boards or sponsoring learned societies from whom the author has received information to date. A meeting of History editors scheduled for 26 April 2019 will afford an opportunity for additional information-gathering. In the interim, the points below schematically outline issues relating to alternative potential pathways to Plan S for History journals:

- **Deposit of AAMs in a repository followed by no-embargo Green OA** potentially offers the least onerous potential pathway to Plan S for History journals. However, it is not unproblematic. For readers of research articles, AAMs suffer from relatively low discoverability, contain relatively high levels of error (compared to copy-edited text and corrected proofs) and lack correct (and thus fully citable) article page numbers. For authors and/or editors, obstacles to adoption include: 1) lack of access to appropriate institutional repositories for AAM self-archiving by many prospective History authors, especially ECRs, persons employed outside the university sector, and historians working outside the UK; 2) the potential (and unknown) financial costs for journals and/or learned societies of meeting Plan S's complex and labile technical requirements; 3) the potential that, in a rapidly evolving environment premised on STEMM subject publishing norms, these requirements will change within the coming year(s), adding new and unpredictable costs; 4) the obstacles posed to use of CC BY by the nature of History data and its ownership/copyright status; 5) the disconnect between WT's Plan S implementation schedule and the normal annual business cycle (setting of page and subscription costs, for example) for academic journals; 6) History journals' reliance on

⁵⁶ The breadth of the History researcher community is detailed in RHS, 'Plan S and UK Learned Societies', pages 35-39.

unpaid academic labour provided in addition to editors' full-time employment, rendering rapid change unworkable; 7) concerns that no-embargo Green OA may in the medium term reduce subscription levels and thereby compel a reduction in quality thresholds (of copy-editing, etc) and/or compromise the stability of the journal;

- **Conversion to full APC publishing** is not feasible for most high-calibre History journals because these outlets publish substantial volumes of research by UK and international researchers who lack access to funding for APCs. These researchers include many ECRs and most international History researchers. Both the APC costs (including subsidies for researchers in low- and middle-income countries) and the transaction costs of implementing APC systems may be viable for STEMM publications. They cannot be supported by the available funding and structures of Humanities research;
- **'Subscribe to Open'** models are mooted by some OA advocates as a viable, potentially Plan S compliant, pathway.⁵⁷ Subscribe to Open currently exists only as a pilot project for five journals, and aims to 'convert gated access journals to open access using existing library relationships and subscription purchases'. Subscribe to Open acknowledge that the project is contingent upon *all* subscribers continuing to subscribe to ensure enough revenue. Without such continuing support 'the journals will remain gated access'.⁵⁸ Given that this uncertainty would continue, it remains unclear whether such a pathway would comply with Plan S requirements, though editors are confident that the leaders of the Plan S initiative are supportive.⁵⁹ For libraries, this may be an attractive subscription model. For researchers and funders it has an obvious disadvantage: an article that began any given journal's financial year as OA at the start of any given year would be liable to be moved behind a paywall later in the year. No research articles required to be Plan S compliant could be published with this model;
- **Conversion to Curators of Published Research:** One alternative to 'flipping' to Plan S compliant OA that has been suggested by WT for learned society journals is a shift from publishing original research to 'curating' research published by other platforms.⁶⁰ This intriguing possibility appears to be premised on two false assumptions: 1) alternative high-quality journals and platforms are available to accommodate the volume of high-quality research articles that are now published by History learned societies; and 2) History journals, including learned society journals, do not at present contain 'curated' content;
- **Conversion to full OA with no APCs or subscription costs:** This option has obvious intellectual and moral appeal: the ability to publish high-quality History research articles without payment of either APCs or journal subscriptions would address many of the obstacles to Plan S compliance discussed above. The two obvious barriers to this model are lack of infrastructure and lack of funding. As the content and periodicity of the DOAJ 'medical history' journals eloquently attests, maintaining high editorial standards

⁵⁷ <https://wellcome.ac.uk/news/open-access-and-plan-s-how-wellcome-tackling-four-key-concerns> .

⁵⁸ The five journals in the pilot are: *Annual Review of Cancer Biology*; *Annual Review of Environment and Resources*; *Annual Review of Nuclear and Particle Science*; *Annual Review of Political Science*; *Annual Review of Public Health*.

⁵⁹ See also <https://scholarlykitchen.sspnet.org/2019/04/02/subscribe-to-open/>

⁶⁰ <https://wellcome.ac.uk/news/open-access-and-plan-s-how-wellcome-tackling-four-key-concerns> .

and a stable publication profile for History journals in the absence of either APCs or subscription charges is exceptionally challenging. The OLH titles suggest that external grant income from governments and charities may allow high quality ‘niche’ journals to flourish, although the long-term viability of this pathway is unknown. Evidence that this model can be scaled up to accommodate current levels of high-calibre research article publication in History is lacking.

In considering their business plans for 2019-2020 and beyond, History journals and learned societies will be mindful of the potential for OA publication to enhance the discipline of History nationally and internationally, to disseminate new knowledge beyond the academy and to promote the careers of History researchers. They will also be mindful of their obligations under UK law. For learned societies that are registered UK charities, these obligations will include relevant English, Northern Ireland, Scottish and Welsh charity law, including trustees’ duty of prudence.⁶¹

Part 8: Conclusions:

The executive summary outlined four questions WT has culled from preliminary researcher feedback to its Plan S implementation strategy, and added six further areas for discussion. In concluding this paper, it may be useful to return to these ten points. This section can usefully be read in conjunction with Appendix III, which provides a consolidated list of questions which, although specific to WT Plan S implementation, may prove useful for a broader community of researchers, policy-makers and cOAlition S partners as this ambitious OA programme evolves. The four concerns identified by WT are:

- **Whether high-quality journals will offer Plan S compliant publication routes?:** Given the considerations detailed in this paper, this question merits reformulation. It is more usefully expressed as: ‘Whether high-quality journals will offer Plan S compliant publication routes that are accessible to all researchers, regardless of their subject of study, institutional affiliation, status with respect to the 2010 Equality Act’s protected characteristics, career stage and/or international location?’ This paper has considered these issues primarily from the perspectives of History researchers, editors/journals and learned societies. These stakeholders are vulnerable to, but do not control, the commercial and academic publishers and the national and international funding bodies whose policy choices in coming months will answer these questions either affirmatively or negatively;
- **Whether researchers, and especially ECRs, will suffer professional disadvantages because of Plan S mandates?:** There appears to be a substantial likelihood—and, among many senior as well as ECR History researchers, there is already much anxiety—that Plan S implementation will disadvantage ECRs disproportionately. These pervasive concerns reflect the employment profile of university History, which is characterised by significant ECR precarity. They also reflect the disproportionate time-sensitivity (relative

⁶¹ This duties with respect to UK charity law are discussed more extensively in RHS, ‘Plan S and UK Learned Societies’, pages 5, 8 and 25.

to more senior staff) of publication outcomes for ECRs seeking employment or completing probation. For ECRs and their mentors, WT's accelerated Plan S timeline, coupled with the lack of clear guidance documents and targeted communication, is proving exceptionally challenging. These factors exacerbate known problems with WT OA policies for ECRs in the precariat, such as the Trust's expectation that all ECRs will have a 'home' university able to act as an intermediary in the payment of APCs and BPCs;

- **Whether international collaborations will be threatened by Plan S implementation?** International collaborations have not been examined in this paper. However, high-calibre History journals rely on their ability to publish the research of international researchers, rather than UK-based researchers alone. The dominance of the APC model in Plan S thinking and the absence of an international infrastructure for self-archiving of AAMs both pose substantial obstacles to high-quality UK History journals and learned societies in the context of Plan S. A further key issue identified in this report is the ability of non-subscription OA journals to provide sufficient editorial support for researchers (for example, from low- and middle-income countries) whose first language is not English to publish high-quality research articles. Quality of English prose is a factor WT specifically identifies as requisite for publication on its OA platform; high-quality prose also contributes to positive assessments of 'rigour' in History. Greater attention to language as a potential barrier to research collaboration is needed as WT implements Plan S;
- **Whether learned societies will suffer revenue losses that threaten their operation due to Plan S implementation?** It is premature to address this issue. History learned societies vary significantly in the proportion of income they derive from journal publication, and different models of Plan S compliance will likely have differing levels of financial impact. The immediate impact of Plan S appears instead most likely to fall on WT-funded Humanities researchers, not on Humanities learned societies or their journals. The short-term impact of Plan S for WT-funded researchers may be to reverse the trend of the past two decades—which has seen historians of medicine increasingly publish in 'mainstream' History journals—and to see them, per force, publish increasingly in edited volumes, which fall outside Plan S requirements. This trend may witness both a reduction in their access to varied publication outlets and reduced exposure to rigorous peer-review of their outputs.

The Executive Summary identified six further topics for consideration. The preliminary findings with respect to these additional topics are briefly summarised here:

- **The distinctive technical challenges for Humanities researchers posed by Plan S, including the impact of CC BY:** Plan S's CC BY mandate problematizes implementation for many Humanities researchers/journals because of the nature and ownership of their data. No official rationale for this mandate has been offered. Nor has the possibility of exceptions suited to different disciplines' distinctive sources of data been mooted. This failure of communication and comprehension reflects a much wider tendency within Plan S to assume that researchers all operate within the funding and publication norms of STEMM subjects;

- **The absence of Equalities monitoring in current WT and Plan S implementation plans, and the potential for Plan S to impact differentially on ‘protected’ groups as defined by the UK 2010 Equality Act:** Plan S identifies two groups of researchers potentially vulnerable to its policies: ECRs and persons based in low- or middle-income countries. In contrast, the absence of any reference to equal opportunities frameworks as they are understood in UK and European law is a striking feature of available Plan S documentation. This salient silence contrasts sharply with the avowed commitment to equality, diversity and inclusion articulated by WT and UKRI. To be sure, there is overlap between the two groups identified by cOAlition S as vulnerable and groups of UK researchers that have statutory protections against discrimination. For example, in History researchers with protected characteristics are present in higher proportions at ECR compared to senior levels: in 2018, 41.4% of all UK university History staff were women, while only 26.2% of History Professors were female. BME historians likewise become progressively under-represented relative to researchers racialized as ‘White’ from Master’s study to PhD to academic staff level.⁶² Given both WT’s existing funding in low- and middle-income countries and cOAlition S’s sweeping global vision, moreover, Plan S implementation will require close attention to a much broader range of protected characteristics, for example (in South Asian contexts) caste;
- **The need for more systematic, comprehensive communication** of the WT’s OA requirements to Humanities researchers at all career stages, from PG students (who may fall within the protections against ‘misleading omissions’ afforded by UK consumer law) to senior scholars, including clear definitions and guideline on which outputs and which authors fall within the mandate. Communication of Plan S information by both WT and cOAlition S has been limited in extent and variable in quality. It is neither evident that Humanities research and publication is understood by cOAlition funders, nor that it is valued. This approach contrasts with the Trust’s identification of Medical Humanities as a subject of ‘strategic importance’;
- **The urgent need to reduce the complexity and difficulty (for researchers, but also for funders) of identifying journals that are Plan S compliant:** DOAJ is demonstrably an inadequate tool for identifying Plan S compliant Humanities/History journals. WT communications with researchers that suggest otherwise are flying in the face of readily available evidence, including Frantsvåg and Strømme’s 2019 analysis. Appendix I likewise highlights the lack of fit between available DOAJ ‘history of medicine’ outlets and OA History journals that publish high-quality research articles. If, as some WT guidelines suggest, Plan S criteria are and will be labile, new and effective mechanisms for identifying compliant journals may prove even more challenging to construct and use;
- **The apparent lack of high-quality Plan S compliant journals in the Humanities and its potential impact** on WT-funded Humanities research and researchers, but ECRs in particular: This working paper suggests that there is a significant gap in the market of Plan S compliant History/Humanities journals. This gap is especially acute when WT’s (entirely legitimate and laudable) expectation that research they fund will

⁶² RHS, *Race, Ethnicity & Equality*, esp. pages 38-41.

appear in high-quality, peer-reviewed outlets is taken into consideration. In this context, and given that research articles often play important roles in developing historians' monographs, as well as providing outlets for freestanding projects, it is likely that the Trust's accelerated adoption of Plan S will prove disadvantageous to researchers it funds. This potentially negative impact may fall especially heavily on ECRs;

- **Whether Plan S implementation has repercussions for accepted standards of duty of care for PG students and staff at all career stages, as understood within the UK university sector and specified in university Human Resources guidance:**

Universities have only begun to consider the repercussions of Plan S for their research profiles. They have yet to consider the wider implications of this new policy for their postgraduate students and staff. This working paper suggests that Plan S merits scrutiny by line managers, Heads of Department, Deans, PVCs for Teaching and Research as well as Human Relations advisors. For postgraduate students and academic staff alike, Plan S introduces a new, little-understood and imperfectly communicated publication landscape. Many prospective, current and past postgraduate students, like their supervisors and staff mentors, are poorly positioned to navigate this new terrain, or to offer effective advice and guidance in this context. Lacking meaningful engagement with UK and European equalities legislation, moreover, Plan S may have important implications for universities' duty of care, including their legal obligations to students and staff with protected characteristics.

Appendix I: ‘Medical History’ journals listed in the Directory of Open Access Journals (DOAJ):

In March 2019 the author undertook a simple search of DOAJ using the term ‘medical history’. This yielded a sample of 19 journal titles (<http://bit.ly/2zPBcD0>). The most recent issues of these titles were then scrutinised in the first instance to determine whether they contained History research articles, as commonly understood within the discipline in the UK. Where this proved to be the case, a preliminary analysis was made of the quality of the recent History research articles (using the REF criteria of originality, rigour and significance as interpreted by the REF2014 History sub-panel). Annotations at the end of each entry below indicate the outcomes of these provisional assessments:

- 1) *Kaleidoscope History: Journal on the History of Culture, Science and Medicine*: (Simmelweis University, Hungary; last published volume on website is 2014): As almost all the articles are in Hungarian it is difficult to assess, but the one article in English appears to be clinical medicine. This journal is not a viable option for WT-funded historians of medicine;
- 2) *Res Medica*: (Royal Medical Society, UK; no APCs; current issue (as of March 2019) was published on 31 December 2017): ‘Res Medica accepts various types of articles that benefit our medical student audience. All our articles are peer reviewed by a student and a clinical or academic expert. Please see Peer Review Process...Historical Articles are very welcome. Topics may include the history of medicine, history of medical schools, or historical articles on medical men and women. All historical articles will be reviewed by an expert and undergo the same peer-review and editorial process as original research reports. They should be written for the general medical student audience and not specialists. The word count is 3,000. Please contact us if you have an idea or would like to discuss a potential article with the editor. At the end of the article, please include a box with the following headings, ‘what is known already’, and “what this study adds”, including 3-5 bullet points for each.’ Given the intended audience and the review process, this would conceivably be a viable place to publish material for an Impact case study but does not appear to be a viable outlet for REF outputs;
- 3) *Hygiea Internationalis: an Interdisciplinary Journal for the History of Public Health*: (Linköping University Electronic Press, Sweden; last issue 2016, and the Editor confirmed in March 2019 that due to lack of funding there are no plans to continue publishing). In consequence, this is not a viable publication option;
- 4) *Medicina*: (Academia Nacional de Medicina (Colombia)); most recent issue is November 2018; publishes in Spanish with English abstracts; based on the Abstracts, the journal appears to publish clinical results rather than History, although I have not scanned all back volumes. It does not appear to be a viable option for historians;
- 5) *The Journal of the Royal College of Physicians of Edinburgh*: (Royal College of Physicians of Edinburgh; no APCs; <http://www.rcpe.ac.uk/college/journal-royal-college-physicians-edinburgh#journal-aims> : ‘The Journal of the Royal College of Physicians of Edinburgh is the College’s quarterly, peer-reviewed journal, with an international circulation of 8,000. It has three main emphases – clinical medicine, education and medical history and humanities.’ Journal aims: ‘To facilitate medical education through the publication and

dissemination of quality original research papers. To publish a range of clinical, educational and historical material of cross-specialty interest to our international readership. To welcome submissions from a wide range of authors (not just Fellows and Members of the College), provided the paper has relevance to a general medical audience. Promote general medicine and enable physicians to keep up to date with developments in other specialties, particularly those which may impact upon their practice.’ Latest issue (2019) has 4 History articles:

<http://www.rcpe.ac.uk/college/journal/volume-49-issue-1-2019> : ‘Petr Skrabanek: the abominable no-man’ (5 pages long); ‘Neurosurgery in Aberdeen Royal Infirmary c.-1920–c.1940: knowledge, skills and styles’ (7 pages); ‘Was Thomas Wharton Jones FRS, assistant to the infamous Dr Knox, the First to recognise the blood eosinophil?’ (6 pages); ‘Sir Patrick Manson at home: 21 Queen Anne Street as a hybrid space’ (8 pages). Realistically, these would not be considered REF-able outputs by most UoAs.

- 6) *Studia Medyczne* (Poland; no APCs; publishes in English; most recent issue is vol. 34, 4 (2018) https://www.termedia.pl/Journal/Studia_Medyczne-67/Info ‘The Studia Medyczne/Medical Studies quarterly journal accepts manuscripts in English in the area of medical and health sciences and the related fields: psychology, ethics, history of medicine and health protection organisation. These can be original and review papers, and case reports. Papers on the history of medicine, letters to the editor, reviews of books and reports of scientific meetings are also admitted.’ Papers in recent issues appear to be predominantly clinical with some broadly social science articles. There is limited historical content, and this does not appear to offer historians a high-calibre outlet;
- 7) *Sanamed* (Association of Medical Doctors Sanamed Novi Pazar, Serbia; publishes in English; submission charge 40 Euro, but no APCs; <http://www.sanamed.rs/OJS/index.php/Sanamed/about/editorialPolicies#focusAndScope> ‘Sanamed is an international, peer-reviewed, open access journal This journal publishes: original articles, case reports, literature reviews, articles on history of medicine, articles for practitioners, book reviews, letters to the editor, and other medical information.’ The current issue is vol. 13 (2018): in all 3 issues for 2018, all articles are clinical or professional in content. This journal does not appear to offer historians a viable outlet;
- 8) *International Journal of Modern Anthropology*: (Tunisian Association of Anthropology). Volume 1 runs from 2008 to 2017; Volume 2 is number 11, 2018: <http://www.ata.org.tn/journal-issue11-2018.html> . The contents of 2018 are not historical; this does not appear to be a viable History outlet option;
- 9) *História, Ciências, Saúde: Manguinhos*: (Brazil; no APCs, no submission charge; does publish in English as well as Portuguese, Spanish; Castilian, French): <http://www.scielo.br/revistas/hcsm/iaboutj.htm> : ‘História, Ciências, Saúde–Manguinhos is a quarterly publication of the Casa de Oswaldo Cruz, a division within the Oswaldo Cruz Foundation that is devoted to research, teaching, and the communication of the history of science and health, and that also manages and preserves the Foundation’s cultural heritage and memory. História, Ciências, Saúde– Manguinhos was launched in July 1994, and since 1998 has also been available in a digital version. In 2000,

the journal became part of the SciELO portal. Articles are accepted in Portuguese, Spanish, and English through online submission. No fees are charged. Since 2006, some articles accepted for publication in Portuguese and Spanish have been translated into English and released in the e-journal. In addition to four regular issues, the journal publishes one to two special issues each year, in both print and digital formats. *História, Ciências, Saúde– Manguinhos* features articles that explore the production of knowledge and practices in the life sciences and health from a historical perspective, encompassing the fields' various social, political, and cultural dimensions. The journal also publishes articles on science communication and the preservation and management of cultural heritage in the realm of science and health. The journal welcomes unpublished original articles and research notes (self-contained or as part of dossiers), interviews, reviews of books and digital publications, and documents and images of historical value. All content is available online in open access format.' The current issue is March 2019. August 2018 is a special issue on 'Eugenics in Mediterranean Europe and Latin America', with substantial History content. This would not be an obvious place for most UK historians of medicine to publish, but based on the articles in this special issue it could potentially be a viable one for some UK historians of medicine;

- 10) *Asclepio: Revista de Historia de la Medicina y de la Ciencia* (Spain)
<http://asclepio.revistas.csic.es/index.php/asclepio/about/editorialPolicies#focusAndScope> 'Asclepio. Revista de Historia de la Medicina y de la Ciencia, nació en 1948 con el título Archivo Iberoamericano de Historia de la Medicina y Antropología Médica. Consagrada especialmente a la ciencia española, europea e iberoamericana, Asclepio publica artículos originales sobre historia de la ciencia, haciéndose eco de las diversas corrientes historiográficas de la disciplina. Con una periodicidad semestral está dirigida a un público especializado en historia de la ciencia, pero también a científicos de diversa formación que puedan encontrar en la historia elementos de reflexión epistemológica y social en su quehacer profesional.' The most recent issue (2018) publishes no articles in English. The content is definitely historical however. This is possibly a viable option for an historian of Spanish/Hispanic medicine;
- 11) *Acta Medica Anatolia*: (Abant Izzet Baysal University, Turkey): the homepage URL leads to: 'Hmm. We're having trouble finding that site. We can't connect to the server at www.anatoliamedica.com.' The most recent issue was published in 2016, and the content is clinical medicine. This is not a viable History option;
- 12) *Acta Medico-Historica Adriatica* (Faculty of Medicine of the University of Rijeka, Croatia): (No APCs, language of full text German, Slovenian, Croatian, English, Italian, Spanish; Castilian; <https://hrcak.srce.hr/amha?lang=en> : 'AMHA publishes reviewed papers, as well as papers that are not subject to the reviewing procedure, provided they are original and have not been submitted for consideration to any other journal. By giving their consent to be published, the authors give the journal the right for the first publication of the paper both in its printed and electronic format. Authors can publish their works in other publications, provided they cite relevant data about their paper's first publication in AMHA. There are no fees for submitting papers for consideration or for publication.' Most recent issue (2018) does contain English language history of medicine content with

- footnotes/endnotes. The references do not reflect up-to-date or comprehensive historiography, however, and the editorial board appears to be predominantly clinicians;
- 13) *Health, Culture and Society*: (Pittsburgh, publishes in French and English: <http://hcs.pitt.edu/ojs/index.php/hcs>) Editorial board predominantly medicine, public health, also Sociology and Asian Studies. Most recent issue is vol. 9–10 (2016–2017). One article has historical content but is essentially introductory and descriptive—not REF quality (1* or less). Previous annual-ish published content does not appear to be historical. This might be a viable option for a small number of UK historians of public health if the periodicity of publication were to accelerate and stabilise, but is not at present a strong or REF-compatible option;
 - 14) *Acta Medico-Historica Rigensia*: (Medical Institute, Latvia). Publishes in Latvian and English—also publishes a few articles in Russian. Other than obituaries, the one article in English in the most recent issue is ‘Honouring and Losing Knowledge: Folk Medicine Collection of the Estonian Museum of Hygiene in the Early 20th Century’. This uses archival sources but makes no reference to the secondary literature. The most recent issue was published in 2016. This is not a viable option for UK History research articles;
 - 15) *Uisabak: Korean Journal of Medical History*: published by the Korean Society for the History of Medicine, in Korean, with English abstracts only; most recent issue December 2018. The content, based on the abstracts, is historical, but it is not possible to assess the actual articles unless one reads Korean. This journal does not appear to be a viable option for most UK-based historians of medicine;
 - 16) *Journal of Research on History of Medicine* (Iran; most recent issue February 2019, articles are published in English). The articles are accompanied by end-notes and a bibliography; c. 10-15 pages including illustrations; content is predominantly descriptive with relatively little historiographical engagement.
 - 17) *Aktual'nî Pitannâ Suspîl'nîb Nauk ta Istorîi Medicini* [Joint Ukrainian-Romanian scientific journal "CURRENT ISSUES OF SOCIAL STUDIES AND HISTORY OF MEDICINE"] (Bukovinian State Medical University, Ukraine): <http://apsnim.bsmu.edu.ua/> ; ‘The journal is cover a wide range of humanitarian issues on the history of Ukraine, world history, ethnogenesis and traditional culture of the peoples of the world (ethnology, ethnology), ethnic processes in the border areas, archeology, cross-border cooperation between states, the modern Ukrainian language and literature, history of medicine, traditional medicine etc. On the journal special attention is paid to the problems of ethnic cultures: mutual influence between ethnic groups, ethnic tolerance, spiritual and material culture of ethnic communities and the specifics of the Ukrainian language etc.’ The most recent issue was 2018, although the website suggests there will be 4 issues in 2019. Most articles are in Ukrainian; there are a few in English, but they are very short—not standard REF article length.
 - 18) *Mersin Üniversitesi Tıp Fakültesi Lokman Hekim Tıp Tarihi ve Folklorik Tıp Dergisi* [*Mersin University School of Medicine Lokman Hekim Journal of History of Medicine and Folk Medicine*]: (Published in Turkey, in Turkish and English). ‘Mersin University School of Medicine Lokman Hekim Journal of History of Medicine and Folk Medicine is open access, peer-reviewed publication of Mersin University School of Medicine that publishes articles

about history of medicine and folk medicine. Published via internet for three times a year (January, May, September).’ Most research articles in Turkish, a small number in English, but quite short and not always about history of medicine (for example, ‘Investigation of Attention Levels Through Cancellation Test in Third Trimester of Pregnancy’, which states: ‘Increased metabolic needs and hyperactive hormones during pregnancy can cause some psychological changes in pregnant women. In this study, attention levels in third stages of pregnancy are aimed to investigate.’

- 19) *Revista Médica del Uruguay* (Uruguay, Language of fulltext: Spanish; Castilian, most recent issue is 2019). It is not clear in what sense these articles constitute ‘history of medicine. Their titles (vol. 35, no. 1, 2019) include: ‘rasplante pulmonar en Uruguay. Avances en curso para la consolidación del programa’, ‘Análisis de la laparoscopia diagnóstica y estudios de imagen en el manejo del dolor en fosa ilíaca derecha de etiología incierta’ and ‘Evolución histórica de la mortalidad de los pacientes internados en el Centro Nacional de Quemados entre 1995 y 2017’. The last of these, although concerned with the ‘historical evolution’ of patterns of mortality, is not historical analysis as most historians would understand it.

Appendix II: Journal Titles in the Open Library for the Humanities:

<https://www.openlibhums.org/journals/>

- 1) ***19: Interdisciplinary Studies in the Long Nineteenth Century***: ‘19 is a peer-reviewed journal dedicated to advancing interdisciplinary study in the long nineteenth century. Based at Birkbeck, University of London, 19 extends the activities of the Centre for Nineteenth-Century Studies by making the high-quality, original scholarship presented at its regular conferences, symposia and other events available to an international audience. 19 publishes two themed issues annually, each consisting of a collection of peer-reviewed articles showcasing the broadest range of new research in nineteenth-century studies, as well as special forums advancing critical debate in the field.’ [No information on any word limits, although based on most recent issue, most are significantly shorter than a standard History article (fewer than 30 endnotes, for example; predominantly literature, but some History)];
- 2) ***AsiaNetwork Exchange***: ‘The ASIANetwork Exchange is the journal of ASIANetwork, a consortium of around 160 North American colleges, that strives to strengthen the role of Asian Studies within the framework of liberal arts education. Originally a newsletter, then a journal, in Fall 2011 the Exchange became a peer-reviewed publication, catering primarily to faculty appointed in liberal arts institutions with programs in Asian Studies. The ASIANetwork Exchange seeks to publish current research, as well as high-quality pedagogical essays written by specialists and non-specialists alike. The journal's editors are particularly interested in publishing articles, book and media reviews that address the needs of the undergraduate classroom.’
- 3) ***Architectural Histories***: ‘Architectural Histories is the international, blind peer-reviewed scholarly journal of the European Architectural History Network (EAHN). The journal creates a space in which historically grounded research into all aspects of architecture and the built environment can be made public, consulted, and discussed. Architectural Histories is open to historical, historiographic, theoretical, and critical contributions that engage with architecture and the built environment from a historical perspective.’ ‘Thanks to support from the European Architectural History Network and the Open Library of the Humanities, Architectural Histories is able to waive the publication fees for contributions to the Journal.’
- 4) ***Body, Space & Technology***: ‘Body, Space & Technology (BST) is a leading journal of contemporary artistic practice and research and joined the OLH platform in Summer 2017. Since it launched in 2000, BST has built a strong reputation for scholarly quality and innovation, as well as fostering a global academic community around its published content. BST publishes research into artistic practice that engages with digital technologies, particularly as these relate to bodily interaction and creativity, and in multi-disciplinary perspectives.’
- 5) ***C21 Literature: Journal of 21st-century Writings***: ‘C21 Literature: Journal of 21st-century Writings is the journal of the British Association for Contemporary Literary Studies (BACLS). The journal is dedicated to examining the genres, forms of publication, and circulation of 21st-century writings. C21 Literature is a logical development of the

explosion of interest in 21st-century writings, seen in book groups, university courses, and the development of online publishing.’

- 6) ***Comics Grid: Journal of Comics Scholarship***: The Comics Grid: Journal of Comics Scholarship is an open access, open peer review academic journal dedicated to comics scholarship. The journal aims to make original contributions to the field of comics studies and to advance the appreciation of graphic narrative. We aim to promote comics scholarship within academia and the general public with contributions that present specialised knowledge in an accessible language. As a publishing platform we encourage digital research, public engagement and collaboration.’
- 7) ***Digital Medievalist***: ‘Digital Medievalist (DM) publishes work of original research and scholarship, theoretical articles on digital topics, notes on technological topics, commentary pieces discussing developments in the field, bibliographic and review articles, tutorials, and project reports. The journal also commissions reviews of books and major electronic sites and projects. All contributions are reviewed before publication by authorities in humanities computing. Submissions to DM should concern topics likely to be of interest to medievalists working with digital media, though they need not be exclusively medieval in focus. They should be of a length appropriate to the subject under discussion.’
- 8) ***Digital Studies / Le champ numérique***: Digital Studies / Le champ numérique is a refereed academic journal serving as a formal arena for scholarly activity and as an academic resource for researchers in the digital humanities. Submissions to DSCN focus on the intersection of technology and humanities research. Articles on the application of technology to cultural, historical, and social problems, on the societal and institutional context of such applications, and the history and development of the field of Digital Humanities. Submissions focussing on issues of the practice of the Digital Humanities in a global, multi-cultural, or multi-lingual context are particularly encouraged.’
- 9) ***Glossa: Journal of General Linguistics***: ‘Glossa is dedicated to general linguistics. The journal publishes contributions from all areas of linguistics, provided they contain theoretical implications that shed light on the nature of language and the language faculty. Contributions should be of interest to all linguists, independently of their own specialisation. Published by Ubiquity Press, the journal is financially supported by the Open Library of Humanities and the LingOA network.’
- 10) ***International Journal of Welsh Writing in English***: ‘The International Journal of Welsh Writing in English is the premier journal for current research on Welsh literature in the English language, Welsh drama and performance in English, translation, cultural studies and related areas. The journal was first published in 1995 as Welsh Writing in English: A Yearbook of Critical Essays. For a history of the journal, and listings of all previous articles and reviews published in it, please see the information provided on the website of the Association for Welsh Writing in English.’
- 11) ***Journal of British and Irish Innovative Poetry***: ‘The Journal of British and Irish Innovative Poetry centres on the poetic writings that have appeared in Britain and Ireland since the late 1950s under various categorizations. These include works that are avant-garde, underground, linguistically innovative, second-wave Modernist, non-mainstream, the British Poetry Revival, the parallel tradition, formally innovative, neo-

modernist and experimental, while also including the Cambridge School, the London School, concrete poetry, and performance writing. All of these terms have been variously adopted and contested in anthologies and the journal extends scholarly discussion of the ongoing importance of innovative poetic styles and techniques within British and Irish literature.’

- 12) ***Journal of Embodied Research***: ‘Journal of Embodied Research is the first peer-reviewed, open access, academic journal to focus specifically on the innovation and dissemination of embodied knowledge through the medium of video. With an editorial advisory board drawn from across the arts and humanities, it aims to pioneer the scholarly video article as a new form supporting development of diverse embodied research projects.’
- 13) ***Journal of Portuguese Linguistics***: ‘Journal of Portuguese Linguistics publishes high-quality papers in the field of Portuguese linguistics, including the comparison between any varieties of Portuguese and any other language(s). Published by Ubiquity Press, the journal is financially supported by the Open Library of Humanities and the LingOA network.’
- 14) ***Laboratory Phonology***: ‘Laboratory Phonology is the official journal of the Association for Laboratory Phonology. Founded in 2010, the journal publishes reports on the scientific study of all phonological / phonetic aspects of spoken and signed language through scholarly exchange across disciplines, including all domains of linguistics (phonology, phonetics, syntax, morphology, semantics, pragmatics) as well as from related disciplines, including psychology, speech & hearing science, communication science, computer science, electrical & computer engineering, and other related fields. The first six volumes of Laboratory Phonology were published by De Gruyter Mouton (the articles in these volumes are freely available here). Published by Ubiquity Press, the journal is financially supported by the Open Library of Humanities and the LingOA network.’
- 15) ***Le foucauldien***: ‘The peer-reviewed open access journal Le foucauldien (French adj. foucauldien, masculine: qui découle de la pensée de Michel Foucault ou s’y apparente) publishes interdisciplinary research along the lines of the philosopher and historian Michel Foucault (1926–1984) in English, German, and French. It mainly focuses on updating and operationalizing Foucauldian concepts and approaches in preferably plain language.’
- 16) ***Marvell Studies***: ‘Marvell Studies offers the leading edge of scholarly research on Andrew Marvell, his texts and readers, words and worlds. Marvell Studies was previously published as the Andrew Marvell Newsletter. The archive of the Newsletter is available here: <http://www.st-andrews.ac.uk/marvellsociety/newsletters/>.’
- 17) ***Open Library of the Humanities***: ‘The Open Library of Humanities journal publishes internationally-leading, rigorous and peer-reviewed scholarship across the humanities disciplines: from classics, theology and philosophy, to modern languages and literatures, film and media studies, anthropology, political theory and sociology. Our articles benefit from the latest advances in online journal publishing – with high-quality presentation, annotative functionality, robust digital preservation, strong discoverability and easy-to-share social media buttons. We publish general articles as well as special collections

focused on a particular topic or theme. Our megajournal platform means that we particularly welcome interdisciplinary articles, and we also encourage submissions in languages other than English.’

- 18) ***Open Screens***: ‘Open Screens is the open-access online journal of the British Association of Film, Television and Screen Studies. The scope of the journal is international and its vision is inter-disciplinary. It encourages innovative contributions from scholars of film, television and other screen-based media, publishing research articles, commentaries, reviews and audio-visual research-by-film-practice. In keeping with the mission of BAFTSS, contributions from both established and postgraduate scholars are considered, and contributors do not need to be members of the Association. Open Screens ranges over the historical and the contemporary, and it aims to embrace film, television, screen and media studies, as well as related disciplines across the Humanities and beyond, such as area studies, gender studies and sexuality studies.’
- 19) ***Orbit: A Journal of American Literature***: ‘Orbit is a peer-reviewed, open-access journal of contemporary American fiction from the second half of the twentieth century to the present. We publish special and general issues in a rolling format, which brings together a traditional journal article style with the latest publishing technology to ensure faster, yet prestigious, publication for authors.’
- 20) ***Pynchon Notes***: ‘Pynchon Notes was a journal devoted to studying the works of Thomas Pynchon. Running from 1979 to 2009, the journal is here preserved by the Open Library of Humanities, but does not accept any new submissions. For new articles on the works of Thomas Pynchon, related authors and adjacent fields in 20th- and 21st-century literature, please see the OLH journal *Orbit: A Journal of American Literature*.’
- 21) ***Quaker Studies***: ‘Quaker Studies is multi-disciplinary and articles submitted typically cover the subject areas of aesthetics, anthropology, architecture, art, cultural studies, history, literature, peace studies, philosophy, research methodology, sociology, theology, and women’s studies. Published by Liverpool University Press with support from the Open Library of Humanities.’
- 22) ***Studies in the Maternal***: ‘Studies in the Maternal is an international, peer-reviewed, scholarly online journal. It aims to provide a forum for contemporary critical debates on the maternal understood as lived experience, social location, political and scientific practice, economic and ethical challenge, a theoretical question, and a structural dimension in human relations, politics and ethics.’
- 23) ***Theoretical Roman History Journal***: ‘The Theoretical Roman Archaeology Journal (TRAJ) is a peer-reviewed, open access journal, providing a venue for innovative and interdisciplinary research in the field of Roman Archaeology. The journal promotes the use of theoretical approaches to the Roman past and facilitates fresh interpretations of datasets, rather than solely the presentation of archaeological data. The geographical scope of the journal is the whole of the Roman world at its greatest extent, including areas beyond the frontiers where Roman influence was evident. The journal’s temporal scope is from the Bronze Age to the Late Antique period; however, the subject of most contributions will usually range from the third century BC to the fifth century AD.’
- 24) ***Francospheres***: ‘Francosphères, which is edited at the Centre for Postcolonial Studies (CPS) in Paris and London, seeks to define and question the presence of French

language and culture across frontiers and borders, as defined by the Franco postcolonial presence, contact with French culture, and the 'France of the mind'. To this extent, it is a journal of transcultural and intercultural French Studies - about liminal spaces rather than operating within the hierarchy of 'French' or 'Francophone' culture. Taking its cue from recent advances in postcolonial and gender theory, it investigates the legitimacy of these issues within France itself as well as in post-colonial territories or territories which have never been under French control. The overall aim is to advance a dialogue about what it means to work in 'French' Studies in the 21st Century – this opens up the possibility of Medieval and Early Modern perspectives on the 'Francosphere'. Francosphères thus offers an opportunity to reflect critically on 'concentrations' of creative and counter-hegemonic endeavours in which the French language, culture or an 'idea' of Frenchness have played a determining role, thereby contributing to the development of new critical paradigms for our 'post-national' era.'

Appendix III: Comprehensive list of queries for WT:

Equalities: (see especially pages 7-9 and 28 of this working paper):

- In what ways is WT's commitment to equality, diversity and inclusion (EDI) as formulated in its EDI policies manifest in its implementation of Plan S?
- In what ways is WT's commitment to the protections afforded by the 2010 Equality Act manifest in its Plan S implementation?
- Will/how will WT monitor any effect of Plan S implementation on researchers (including postgraduate students) with protected characteristics as defined by the 2010 Equality Act?
- How is cOAlitionS's commitment to EDI manifest in Plan S and in its Plan S implementation Plan?
- Will/how will cOAlition S monitor potential EDI impacts of Plan S?
- As new partners join cOAlition S, will their membership entail any commitments to specific rights regimes with respect to Plan S implementation (such as, for example, the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights)?

Researcher Eligibility/Communication: (see esp. pages 9-13):

- Are all past, current and/or prospective (that is, applying for autumn 2019 WT funding) WT-funded Master's students required to ensure that any research articles based on their Master's and submitted to a journal from 1 January 2020 is Plan S compliant? If only some are covered by the mandate, which ones? If they fall within the mandate, who is responsible for informing them and their supervisors/universities of this requirement? When will this communication occur? If they are within the mandate and require an APC to publish in a compliant journal, will WT fund this APC? How will payment flow from WT to the relevant journal in the absence of a 'home' university?
- Are all past, current and/or prospective (that is, applying for autumn 2019 WT funding) WT-funded PhD students nationally and internationally required to ensure that any research articles based on their PhD and submitted to a journal from 1 January 2020 is Plan S compliant? If only some are covered by the mandate, which ones? If so, who is responsible for informing them and their supervisors/universities of this requirement? When will this communication occur? If they are within the mandate and require an APC to publish in a compliant journal, will WT fund this APC? How will payment flow from WT to the relevant journal in the absence of a 'home' university, whether within or outside the UK?
- Are all past, current and/or prospective WT-funded ECRs required to ensure that any research articles based on their projects and submitted to a journal from 1 January 2020 is Plan S compliant? If only some are covered by the mandate, which ones? Who is responsible for informing them and their supervisors/universities of this requirement, and when? If they are within the mandate and require APCs to publish in compliant journals, will WT fund this APC? How will payment flow from WT to the relevant journal in the absence of a 'home' university?

- With respect to current WT-funding applicants and existing award holders, who will WT contact to advise on Plan S compliance, on what timescale and by what means? What guidance will host universities receive, and when? How will changes to Plan S criteria be conveyed to these stakeholders as they evolve?

Output Eligibility/Type of Outputs:

- Are research articles originally submitted prior to 1 January 2020 to a non-compliant journal and re-submitted (following revision) after that date Plan S compliant? Will WT pay any requisite APCs for these articles?
- Does Plan S apply only to outputs specified in WT-grant applications, or extend to subsequent ‘unfunded’ research on the same broad topic undertaken thereafter?
- Beyond ‘research articles’, are other types of shorter-form output required to be Plan S compliant. For example, do historiographical reviews and journal roundtables fall within the mandate? Is there a typology similar to that WT applies to bioscience (see page 13 of working paper) which WT applies to Humanities?

Discoverability of Compliant Outlets:

- How will WT-funded Humanities researchers identify Plan S compliant journals?
- Does WT or cOAlition S intend to create a tool such as SHERPA/FACT for Plan S compliant journals? If so, what is the timeline for its creation?
- If Humanities researchers in given disciplines or sub-fields are unable to identify Plan S compliant outlets for their publications and thus to publish their research, will their eligibility for future WT funding diminish relative to researchers who have available Plan S compliant journals?
- Does WT intend to invest (finances and staff time) in the creation of new Plan S and History/Humanities compliant journals or platforms?
- WT proposes that learned society journals shift from publication of new research to curation of published research. Can you elaborate on that vision of transformation?
- In what sense does WT consider ‘Subscribe to Open’ to be compatible with Plan S?

CC BY: (see esp. pages 4-5, 23):

- What is the rationale for the CC BY (as opposed, for example, to allowing CC BY ND) requirement?
- Does cOAlition S (or WT) understand why CC BY is problematic to many Humanities (and Social Science) researchers? If so, are their grounds for reconsideration of this requirement, or for exceptions to be made where justified?