In DIAMAS, we seek to help Open Access publishers improve their practices and the quality of their outputs. Have a look at the self-assessment checklist below and try to answer the questions! The checklist is part of the [DIAMAS](https://diamasproject.eu/) [Best practices report](https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.7859172), based on an analysis of the existing quality evaluation criteria, best practices, and assessment systems in publishing[[1]](#footnote-1) developed by international publishers associations, research funding organisations, international indexing databases, etc.

## 1 Funding

1. Do you have a clearly described open access policy indicating the fulfilment of funders’ requirements (where relevant)?
2. Do you have a clearly described open access business model?
3. Do you indicate on the homepage your funding sources, in case you receive funds from outside the publishing institution?
4. Do authors disclose financial conflicts of interest (i.e., in the Conflict of Interest statement in the manuscript)?
5. Do authors disclose all sources of funding (i.e., in the Funding acknowledgements/statements)?
6. Do you have formal, explicit, written policies for advertising in both print and electronic versions?
7. Do you have information on the website that you don’t charge Article Processing Charges (APCs) and/or Book Processing Charges (BPCs)? In case you are charging Voluntary Author Contributions (VAC), is this information publicly available on your website? Are the amounts and the structure of costs transparently stated?
8. Do you have a clear breakdown of the structure of your resources and costs, including the role of volunteer work?
9. Do you have a sustainability plan?

## 2 Ownership and governance

1. Is information about your ownership structure publicly available?
2. Is there a legal document that describes the activities?
3. Is there a document that stipulates the governance structure?
4. Does your strategic governance allow community input on the direction of the publishing service and operational governance with community representation and decision making power?
5. Is information about the ownership and management clearly indicated on the website?
6. How easy is it to identify and contact you? Is your name clearly displayed on the website? Can one contact you by telephone, email, and post?
7. Are the composition and constitution of the editorial bodies defined and publicly displayed (i.e. with the editorial team names, functions and roles; Editorial Board affiliations)?
8. Are procedures for the selection of members of the governance and editorial bodies open and publicly available?
9. Is there a regular renewal of editorial bodies?
10. Do editors-in-chief have full authority over the entire editorial content of their journal and the timing of publication of that content?
11. Do you display information about the mission (i.e. in a journal mission statement), aims and scope on the website?
12. Do reviewers retain copyright of their reviews?
13. Is ownership of all correspondence and mailing lists in the hands of a scholarly organisation?
14. Do you regulate relations between authors and the publishing entity for the content (i.e. in the form of a contract and the licensing policy)?
15. Are authors allowed to retain copyright without restriction?
16. Do you publicly display the General Terms and Conditions of the use of the infrastructure or platform?
17. Do you have a written environmental policy?

## 3 Open science practices

1. Do you have a clear open access policy?
2. Who owns copyright on contributions? Is there any transfer or granting of rights?
3. Are authors and readers well informed about IPR?
4. Are authors allowed to retain copyright?
5. Do you use the Creative Common licences (e.g. CC-BY and/or CC-BY-SA)?
6. Do you have policies on data availability and encourage the use of reporting guidelines?
7. Do you promote and experiment with open peer review (including the potential disclosure of the identity of reviewers, publicly available reviews, and the ability for a broader community to participate in the review process)?
8. Do you allow posting manuscripts in preprint repositories?
9. Do you accept manuscripts presenting and discussing negative scientific results (and those that do not meet the expected results)?
10. Do you publish/make available the research protocols and methods?
11. Do you encourage sharing of research software?
12. Are your bibliographic references openly available, structured, separable, freely accessible and reusable? Are you aligned with the Initiative for Open Citations (I4OC) and the Initiative for Open Abstracts (I4OA)?
13. Do you adhere to the TOP Guidelines of Promotion of Transparency and Openness? If you do, to which standard/s: Citation standards, Data transparency, Analytic methods (code) transparency, Research materials transparency, Design and analysis transparency, Study preregistration, Analysis plan pre-registration, and Replication? And to which level of increasing stringency - Disclosure, Requirement, or Verification?
14. Do you participate in or support research assessment reform?

## 4 Editorial quality, editorial management and research integrity

1. Do editors monitor the turnaround time for every publishing stage from manuscript receipt to publication or rejection to ensure a reasonable response time to authors and reasonable publication time?
2. Are editor roles and responsibilities (towards authors, reviewers, readers and the scientific community, journal owners, public) clearly described?
3. Do you have written editorial policies, including a written job description, specifically detailing components of editorial freedom, including the degree of control regarding editorial content, acceptance and publication, and advertising content; a mechanism to prevent inappropriate influence on the editor by others and to handle conflicts in an objective and transparent manner with the goal of conflict resolution and maintenance of trust?
4. Do you have a policy on publication ethics (for example, [COPE’s Core Practice guidance](https://publicationethics.org/core-practices)), addressing [authorship and contributorship](https://publicationethics.org/authorship), handling [complaints and appeals](https://publicationethics.org/appeals), handling [allegations of research misconduct](https://publicationethics.org/misconduct), [conflicts of interest](https://publicationethics.org/competinginterests), [data sharing and reproducibility](https://publicationethics.org/data), [ethical oversight](https://publicationethics.org/oversight), [intellectual property](https://publicationethics.org/intellectualproperty), [post-publication discussions](https://publicationethics.org/postpublication), [corrections and retractions](https://publicationethics.org/postpublication)? Do these policies address plagiarism, citation manipulation, and data falsification/fabrication, among others?
5. Do you provide publicly available clear and detailed author guidelines?
6. Do you have clear policies on authorship and contributorship, which also address chatbots and other writing assistance tools? Do you apply the CRediT taxonomy? Do you display the full names and affiliations of each author/contributor? Do you have complete and unambiguous author information supported by the author's persistent identifiers (ORCID)?
7. Do you have defined criteria for acceptance of manuscripts, preprints and other contributions?
8. Do you allow the deposit of the "Version of Record" or the "Publisher Version" in repositories?
9. Do you use the preferred open licence for journal articles (CC-BY), and other types of CC licences for book publications?
10. Do you have a data publication policy stipulating "data papers", data sharing guidelines or joint deposition of publications and data in a repository?
11. Do you have an archival, digital preservation policy and do you implement it?
12. Do you indicate compliance with the GDPR in the journal website?
13. Do you regularly review and update your policies and guidelines?
14. Do you describe your quality assurance measures on the website?
15. Do you have established procedures to ensure responsible scientific practice before, during and after publication? Have you appointed appropriate contact persons on this topic?
16. Do you comply with generally accepted reporting guidelines and adhere to bibliographic standards adopted for citations and bibliographic references to other texts, research data, methods and computer software?
17. Do you have a mechanism for regular and objective evaluation of editor performance based on predetermined and agreed-upon measures of success?
18. Do you have clearly defined reviewer roles and responsibilities? Do you provide a review framework to reviewers and do you publish it on the journal website with the process outline and evaluation criteria?
19. Do you practise one of the forms of anonymised peer review or open peer review by at least two reviewers? Do you publish review reports? Do you have any other form of evaluation of submissions by more than one person, and is this transparently specified on your website?
20. Do you take care of reviewers' recognition and awards? Do you publish the names of reviewers annually and/or do you have a publicly available list of reviewers (updated at least once a year)?
21. Do you display dates of submission and acceptance on published articles? Do you publish at least basic statistics annually on the journal/platform website, covering in particular the number of submissions, the number of reviews requested, the number of reviews received, the approval rate, and the average time between submission and publication?
22. Does the editorial team maintain the registry of submitted papers, the archive of author statements, reviewer guidelines, list of reviewers and the registry of peer-review reports?
23. Do you have a policy in place to address complaints and appeals for rejected or withdrawn manuscripts?
24. Do you provide training for editors and reviewers? Do you share your training materials?
25. Do you describe the standards or codes of ethics you use?
26. Do you have research integrity control procedures (e.g. similarity check)? Do you provide responsible reporting guidelines to authors to enable reproducibility of published works?
27. Do your institutional Research Integrity plans include journal publishing? Are there adequately trained research ethics committees who could provide support to journal editors?
28. Are authors, reviewers and editorial staff required to provide transparent declarations of conflict of interests?
29. Do editors maintain the integrity of the literature by publishing errata or corrections identifying anything of significance, retractions, expressions of concern and new versions of the publication as quickly as possible?
30. Do you have sponsor roles and responsibilities described, as well as relations between editors, sponsoring societies, or journal owners?
31. Do you allow debate post publication either on the journal site, through letters to the editor, or on an external moderated site, such as PubPeer?
32. Do you have mechanisms for correcting, revising or retracting articles after publication?

## 5 Technical Service Efficiency

1. Does the publishing infrastructure you are using/providing support online publishing workflows?
2. Is the publishing infrastructure you are using/providing regularly updated to conform to the current interoperability standards and open science principles?
3. Is the publishing infrastructure you are using/providing based on open-source software?
4. Is the publishing infrastructure you are using/providing interoperable (using widely adopted metadata standards and protocols for harvesting; supporting HTML meta tags and massive metadata export for published outputs, providing MARC records to libraries, if relevant)?
5. Is content migration enabled on the publishing infrastructure you are using/providing?
6. Is the publishing infrastructure you are using/providing supplied with basic functionalities (searching, browsing, navigation, formatted citations in multiple citation formats [styles], etc.) and a user friendly interface, in line with the needs of researchers, as the main audience? Is the user interface adjusted to low bandwidths?
7. Is the publishing infrastructure you are using/providing aligned with the W3C Web Content Accessibility Guidelines (WCAG)? Are the full-text formats aligned with these Guidelines?
8. Are text and data mining (automatic downloading, extraction and indexing of the full texts and the associated metadata) supported on the publishing infrastructure you are using/providing and is this clearly stated in the relevant policy?
9. Does the publishing infrastructure you are using/providing provide usage statistics (visits and downloads) and is it integrated with altmetric services (e.g. Altmetric, PlumX)?
10. Are technical support and maintenance, protection from viruses and malware, backing up, etc. ensured for the publishing infrastructure you are using/providing?
11. Do you provide training on using the publishing platform to relevant stakeholders?
12. Does each journal/book and article/chapter have a unique landing page (URL) and relevant persistent identifier (ISSN, ISBN, DOI) and are persistent identifiers clearly indicated?
13. Are dedicated “about” (non-article) pages displaying information about aims and scope, target audience, ownership and governance, contact information, all relevant policies and reviewer guidelines, descriptions of editorial procedures, licensing and copyright terms provided for each journal/book? Is the date when these pages were last updated provided?
14. Is publishing and archiving in at least one digital file format suitable for long term preservation supported?
15. Is the published content regularly backed up?
16. Is the published content deposited in a digital preservation service (e.g. LOCKSS, CLOCKSS, Portico)?
17. Is a table of contents or a structure that allows direct access to articles/chapters provided?
18. Are the landing pages of the published items supplied with all relevant metadata (title, full names and institutional affiliations – including country/region – of all contributing authors, abstracts and keywords, funding information), provided in the original language and English / second language, and in human and machine readable formats (e.g. HTML meta tags, XML exposed via OAI-PMH, JSON)?
19. Do you provide a bibliographic letterhead in the full text of each article, on the title page, including the name of the journal/book, ISSN, eISSN (or ISBN) volume and issue, period covered by the issue indicating months and years?
20. Are persistent identifiers for authors and contributors (ORCID), organisations (ROR), etc. clearly indicated?
21. Do you use CRediT tags to indicate contributions of the authors and is this information machine-readable ([coded in JATS xml v1.2](https://jats4r.org/credit-taxonomy).)?
22. Do you provide complete and reliable machine-readable information on funding (including as a minimum the name of the funder and the grant number/identifier)?
23. Do you provide machine readable information about the open access status and licensing embedded in the article in a standard non-proprietary format?
24. Do you regularly deposit complete metadata about publications in a registration agency (e.g. CrossRef)?
25. Do you deposit bibliographic references in a registration agency (e.g. CrossRef)?
26. Are abstracts deposited in a registration agency (e.g. CrossRef) in line with the Initiative for Open Abstracts (I4OA)?
27. Do you have quality assurance mechanisms to ensure a high quality of figures and tables (high resolution, annotations, clarity)?
28. Are the links to data, code, and other research outputs that underlie the publication and are available in external repositories, provided?
29. Is the full-text content provided in multiple file formats (PDF, HTML, XML, ePub, etc.) tagged in the XML JATS format?

## 6 Visibility, indexation, communication, marketing and impact

1. Do you control if your published content is present in:
   * general search engines
   * scholarly search engines
   * abstracting and indexing databases (multidisciplinary and disciplinary)
   * citation indexes
   * discovery services
   * aggregator databases/hosting platforms?
2. Do you make specific efforts to enhance your visibility in general and scholarly search engines (e.g. through search engine optimisation, structured metadata, sitemaps)?
3. Do you apply for inclusion of your publications in:
   * abstracting and indexing databases
   * citation indexes
   * discovery services
   * aggregator databases/hosting platforms?
4. Do you regularly control the accuracy and reliability of the information about inclusion in indexes and registries stated on your website(s)?
5. Is all your metadata available freely in the public domain (including the abstracts and references in line with the Initiative for Open Citations I4OC)?
6. Do you encourage authors to share their manuscripts by depositing them and making them immediately available in open repositories, at all stages of the publication process?
7. Do you make an effort to regularly control the accuracy and reliability of all information on your website, and avoid possible misleading information?
8. Do you keep the community of users informed of developments, policy changes, updates, new features and functionality (e.g. through newsletters, blogs, social media, direct emails, mailing lists, content alerts, notifications, RSS/Atom feed or other mechanism)?
9. Do you have a clear insight into the composition of the community of authors, reviewers, editors and readers (according to their institutional affiliation, nationality and disciplinary orientation)? Do you strive for greater diversity?
10. Have you implemented impact statements alongside published content that can be understood by a general audience and allow authors to emphasise the intention and importance of their work?
11. Do you have social media or social networking profiles that are active and regularly updated?
12. Do you actively work with the media on the popularisation of science (preparing press releases and information for journalists)?
13. Do you work with services for crediting reviewers (such as Reviewer Credits)?
14. Do you have a data protection policy and a privacy policy in line with the GDPR?
15. Do you take care that all marketing activities (including solicitation of manuscripts for your publications) are appropriate, well-targeted, and unobtrusive?
16. Do you encourage authors to share content via academic sharing services?
17. Do you inform libraries about new publications?
18. Do you actively work to support authors in promoting published content (e.g. by inviting post-publication reviews articles, inviting and moderating post-publication online comments, organising events like book promotions, sending out copies, writing press releases, working with the media)?
19. Do you publicly display a wide array of metric indicators for your publications, in a responsible way, including the following :
    * submission, acceptance, publication dates
    * article-level usage metrics, such as visits, views, downloads
    * publication-level usage metrics, such as visits, views, downloads
    * article-level impact metrics, such as citation counts
    * publication-level impact metrics
    * altmetrics indicators
    * widget showing the geographical spread of visitors?
20. Do you provide clear information about the analytics software used to generate usage metrics and methods used to collect them?

## 7 Equity, Diversity and Inclusion (EDI): multilingualism, gender equity

1. Do you have gender policies regarding the composition of editorial staff and boards and policies that strive for gender balance among peer reviewers?
2. Do you promote systematic reporting of sex and gender in research in line with the SAGER guidelines?
3. Do you have a defined policy for maintaining Diversity, Equity and Inclusion across all activities?
4. Is the policy publicly available?
5. Do you provide information/contact person(s) if a reader/user likes to communicate e.g. accessibility problems?
6. Do you collect data/statistics to monitor the success and failure of the policy?
7. Do you take action as a result of these statistics, in terms of acknowledging progress?
8. Do you take action as a result of these statistics, in terms of acknowledging missteps and creating a plan to recover from missteps and implementing it?
9. Does the EDI policy include a section for ensuring the diversity of all the relevant stakeholders?
10. Does the EDI policy have a clear route for accountability?
11. Does the EDI policy cover the site’s content and metadata?
12. Do you have a policy for multiple languages (including the use of English)?
13. Does the EDI policy cover the accessibility of the website for the visually impaired?
14. Does the EDI policy cover decision-making on content?
15. Does the EDI policy promote diversity in open science practices?
16. Does the EDI policy refer explicitly to gender equity?

1. Check out the full list of the analysed documents: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.7859247>. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)