## Supplement 16

Suggestions and remarks on conflicting incentives. The remarks in bold very mentioned several times.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rationale for publishing</th>
<th>Home organisation</th>
<th>Peer networks</th>
<th>National coordination</th>
<th>Research funders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>A researcher has to choose high impact + restricted access or low impact + open access</em></td>
<td><em>An organisation encourages both customer work and high impact publication, but does not provide time for both.</em></td>
<td><em>International peer networks are still very reluctant to OA publishing.</em></td>
<td><em>International active work and push for openness would change the scene and remove the discrepancy in five years.</em></td>
<td><em>Existing models for funding and merit stimulate publishing behind a paywall.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Researchers strive to highest quality, also in journals.</em></td>
<td><em>University does not have clear incentives for OA publishing for disciplines not having high quality OA journals.</em></td>
<td><em>JUFO makes it harder to be open, as individual researcher’s publication activities are evaluated by it. JUFO does not correlate with openness.</em></td>
<td><em>Changes are possible, but they demand strong international collaboration and pressure.</em></td>
<td><em>Ministry of Education and Culture is encouraging to publish according to JUFO-classes (to get funding).</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>This discrepancy in incentives is often mentioned but it is hard to verify.</em></td>
<td><em>Publishing in the best, non-open journals is a precondition for academic positions.</em></td>
<td><em>Creating clear discipline-specific guidelines and recommendations.</em></td>
<td><em>Collaboration with publishers needed.</em></td>
<td><em>Artificial quantitative metrics for funding (like JUFO) is a tricky boundary condition, and makes collaboration and OA publishing somewhat unwelcome.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Researchers should have proper education on choosing open high impact quality journals and avoiding predator journals.</em></td>
<td><em>University should have bursary for OA fees.</em></td>
<td><em>Openness should not be pivotal in metrics for research evaluation.</em></td>
<td><em>We are lacking clear shared intent on how to proceed.</em></td>
<td><em>Quantity replaces quality.</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Discipline-specific differences

- The competitive and innovative advantage provided by new type of journals is not properly understood.
- Professional and popular journals are not appreciated.
- Some disciplines still lack high quality OA journals
- Professional and popular journals are not appreciated.
- There is a significant conflict with impact, costs, and funder demands.

### Missing alternative metrics for data and publications sharing

- There is lacking understanding in self-archiving as one OA instrument.
- Self-archiving should be encouraged.
- Universities should be prohibited for using JUFO-classes for bonuses or in hiring.
- Self-archiving should be encouraged
- Pushing for recommendation for responsible evaluation of researchers nationally and internationally
- Defining sensible metrics for research work.
- Demands for just opening data sets very quickly do not encourage the collection of big and deep high quality data sets.
- Merit should be given from data and societal impact.
- Let us develop a better system to replace JUFO.
- Universities should be prohibited for...
| using JUFO-classes for bonuses or in hiring. |