

Open access in geochemistry from preprints to data sharing: past, present and future

Olivier Pourret ¹ and Dasapta Erwin Irawan ²

¹UniLaSalle, Beauvais, France ; olivier.pourret@unilasalle.fr

²Applied Geology Research Group, Faculty of Earth Sciences and Technology, Institut Teknologi Ban-dung, West Java, Indonesia. r-win@office.itb.ac.id

Abstract: In this short communication, we discuss the latest advances regarding Open Access in the Earth Sciences and geochemistry community from preprints to findable, accessible, interop-erable and reusable data following 14f session held at Goldschmidt conference (4-9 July 2021) dedicated to “Open Access in Earth Sciences”.

Keywords: open access; preprint; FAIR data; earth sciences

1. Introduction

Throughout history, the scholarly community has made numerous arguments for greater and easier public access to published research, which became known as Open Access (OA) in the early 2000s¹. Over the last 20 years, scholarly publishing has seen a significant upheaval, with the move to OA signaling a significant shift in major publishers' revenue models². Open access publication is often conflated with the author-facing business model of Article Processing Charges (APCs), whereby authors (or their institutions) pay a prespecified fee to cover the publication cost³. In 2020, 69% of fully OA journals do not levy APCs; although, perhaps counter-intuitively, 65% of articles published OA are published in journals with APCs⁴. In most cases, the APCs are covered by the government which means public money⁵. Therefore the public might pay researchers in four types of budget: research budget, journal subscription budget, APC budget, and the incentive for researchers for publishing in top-tier journals⁶.

However, OA publication had been around for a long time before APCs became popular as OA publishing got more monetized. Importantly, most journals include self-archiving rules that allow authors to disseminate their peer-reviewed work in parallel and for free: the green OA. Many reliable, long-term platforms, including institutional repositories and collaborative services, are available to pursue green OA. Moreover, pre-prints, early versions of scholarly publications, made openly available prior to peer review, that enable faster dissemination of results, increase the attention given to a study, and allow researchers to establish the primacy of their findings⁷, are now more widely considered. Eventually, OA means accessible documents and accessible language⁸ as well as the openness of all research outputs, Data, samples, and code must be handled in such a way that they are Findable, Accessible, Interoperable, and Reusable (FAIR)⁹.

Geochemical research and protecting our global environment are inextricably linked, and we must ensure that future research is conducted and presented with this in mind¹⁰.

In this opinion, we discuss the latest advances regarding OA in the Earth Sciences and geochemistry community from preprints to data sharing (Figure 1).




Figure 1 Live sketchnote from the 14fa session at Goldschmidt 2021 by Dasapta Erwin Irawan (07/07/2021).

2. What is the future of preprint in geochemistry?

The quantity of scientific articles has exploded in recent years and is expected to continue to do so in the coming years. The existing system, which is run by a few for-profit publishers, has grown prohibitively expensive for our universities¹¹. Preprints deposited in open archives can be distributed quickly, however the quality of these preprints must be guaranteed¹². With the extensive use of social media, research is being disseminated at a rapid pace. The traditional practice of publishing in for-profit journals is being questioned more and more. In recent years, scholars have increased their calls for the system to be reappropriated¹³⁻¹⁴. Many tools and systems, based on agreed standards and long-term models, facilitate these behaviors¹⁵. The main preprint services for the Earth sciences are EarthArXiv¹⁶ and

ESSOar¹⁷, which are web-based systems that allow open access publishing of non-peer-reviewed scientific publications before they are published in a peer-reviewed journal¹⁸. The use is expanding in general, but rates and completeness (data and code) of submissions differ by discipline. The preprint-to-postprint ratio trend for each subject also reveals how the various Earth sciences communities are using the service.

Another initiative, the Peer Community In (PCI)¹⁹, was designed to allow communities of researchers to review the quality of work stored in open archives and therefore assure wider distribution of high-quality knowledge²⁰. PCI provides an innovative means of disseminating our scientific findings: it is open, online, and peer-reviewed, and it is free for authors and users. PCI also promotes Open Science and scientific reproducibility by requiring the deposit of all required datasets prior to the recommendation of any preprint and allowing pre-registration of publications.

While OA to publicly published products is critical, it allows a lot of room for early reuse, feedback, and collaboration. Proposals, data, procedures, protocols, code, posters and presentations, as well as preprints, are all examples of early outputs that can be shared as part of open science. Early output sharing has become standard practice in many scientific domains, including Earth Sciences and geochemistry. However, there is insufficient but growing evidence of the increased value of sharing early outputs, both at the researcher and system level. Preprints can allow early feedback that could be considered as peer-review if concept like PiePlate (multi-faceted open peer-review) became widely used²¹. There are also still serious barriers holding researchers back, like proposals to Australian Research Council funding being rejected because they have cited preprints²². To sum up, advocates of open science should have responsibilities (i) to promote practices such as preprint publication, and (ii) to prevent them from doing harm.

3. Moving from paywall to fully open access

Subscription journals have long been a primary publisher of geochemistry research and face substantial impacts from the ongoing transition to open access publishing²³⁻²⁴. In 2020,

according to the Directory of Open Access Journals²⁵, 70% of fully OA journals in Earth Sciences do not levy APCs; although, 62% of articles published OA are published in journals with APCs⁴. Indeed, supra-national initiatives such as Plan S are seemingly showing a strong financial preference towards APC-driven gold models, while simultaneously appearing to neglect more equitable and financially sustainable green (self-archived OA) and diamond (gold, but no-APC) routes²⁴.

The European Journal of Mineralogy (EJM) is owned by four European learned Societies. EJM, published under a commercial publisher, used the open access hybrid model and decided early 2018 to switch to full open access. Two years later, Copernicus now publishes EJM as gold open access, with moderate APCs. The journal's quality and appeal have significantly increased, with greater distribution, a shorter processing time for publishing, and a cost-of-production decrease of more than 50%. Even though the number of submissions reduced from prior years, they are now returning to their previous submission rate. It suggests that the introduction of APCs, which was new to many writers, has had only a minor impact on the journal's attractiveness. Nevertheless, in order to help authors adjust, APC rates are currently below the real cost of production²⁶. APC waiver programs have also been established to assist authors who are unable to pay full charges.

Several other journals have made similar announcements like *Geochemistry, Geophysics, Geosystems* (AGU/Wiley) and *Geochemical Journal* (Geochemical Society of Japan) and will be relaunched fully OA in 2022.

Geochimica et Cosmochimica Acta (GCA) is another society-sponsored journal that is owned and published by Elsevier in a hybrid format. Only 10% of publications issued in GCA are gold OA, with no increase since 2016, most likely due to the high APCs²⁷. Subscription contracts between Elsevier and Projekt DEAL, the University of California system, and other organizations are being terminated; it has had a significant impact on GCA because of the migration to OA. Many authors, reviewers, and associate editors in these groups have decided to leave GCA. Despite these obstacles, total submissions to GCA have climbed by 23% in the last five years, owing mostly to an increase in Chinese manuscripts²⁷. These and

other effects on GCA from the move to open access publishing are beyond the journal's control, but they raise legitimate concerns about its long-term viability. Even though many other geochemistry journals have similar APCs, most researchers cannot afford to pay more than \$US 3,000 (see a list of 58 journals in Pourret et al.²³). Elsevier's attempts to develop mirror, completely gold OA journals only avoid the main issue: the cost of author-supported OA is prohibitively expensive. Geochemists have no interest in or ability to pay APCs, but they also are not inclined to put their work behind a paywall with ever-restricted access. Diamond OA journals are still too few in geochemistry²⁸ and a new journal (what about *Geokimica*) based on the model of *Volcanica* or *Tektonika* should be part of the solution. Pourret et al.²³ assess whether APCs and Journal Impact Factors (JIFs) appear to influence publication. In 2018-2019, more than 40% of publications in geochemistry were published OA, with nearly 70% of those in fully OA journals and a mean APC of US\$ 900²⁴. The others were published in hybrid journals with a mean APC of more than \$US 1,800. The number of OA papers published in hybrid journals in geochemistry and their JIF have a moderate and positive relationship, whereas the number of OA articles published in fully OA journals and the APC have a stronger positive correlation. It appears that the proportion of OA articles published in hybrid journals in geochemistry with a higher JIF tends to rise.

However, geochemists could more widely choose legal self-archiving as an equitable and sustainable way to disseminate their research and a form of rights retention. Negotiation of contracts between institutions and publishers that include blanket OA remuneration for authors at covered organizations is one conceivable future outcome. However, unless a new access paradigm emerges, the geochemical community may be forced to for-sake foundational journals in favor of alternative, low-cost or diamond OA venues (like *Geochemical Perspectives Letters* and *Volcanica* or new journals)²⁸.

4. Research data and software need to be open

Open access encourages the openness of all research outputs, including data, software, and samples, in addition to peer-reviewed research articles²⁹. To establish trust in science and to accelerate the discovery and creation of new knowledge, OA to data, tools, and samples is critical. Well-documented data and software that can be found independently of the publication and stored in a FAIR-aligned repository aids in the evaluation and replication of research³⁰. To enable for automated attribution and credit as its own research output, data and necessary software should be acknowledged in articles' reference section. When permanent identifiers are used, these citations enable linking to the work. In recent years, the increased adoption of open data rules by funding organizations and publishers has facilitated data sharing in geochemistry. Many Earth Sciences journals have adopted the FAIR principles and no longer accept data as supplemental files, instead requesting that data supporting publications be uploaded to trustworthy repositories and linked to relevant studies using permanent identifiers. Funders place similar demands on their recipients. Data contributions to geochemical data repositories like the EarthChem Library³¹ have increased significantly. GeoROC³² a leading source of geochemical and isotopic datasets, and affiliated with the Interdisciplinary Earth Data Alliance³³ has facilitated thousands of peer-reviewed articles and new geochemical research areas. The goal of GEOROC 2.0's new Digital Geochemical Data Infrastructure (DIGIS)³⁴ concept is to continue and enhance existing data collection by creating a connected platform that meets future challenges of digital data-based research and provides advanced community service. Eventually, over 500 international stakeholders and signatories are involved in the Enabling FAIR Data³⁵, which aims to put in place the practices needed to ensure that all research data is discoverable and well-documented in accordance with the FAIR principles. Overall, as a goal, open and FAIR data and software necessitates participation from everyone in the research community. However, the lack of consistent protocols and vocabularies for formatting and documenting geochemical data so that it can be trusted, reused with confidence, and easily combined with analogous datasets for advanced data analysis remains the fundamental difficulty today³⁶.

Journal editors require community-endorsed rules for data reporting in articles, which authors must follow. Data repositories, likewise, require community-endorsed criteria to ensure that the data they manage is not just discoverable and accessible online, but also reusable and compatible with data from other repositories. Standards are also required to create an ecosystem of interoperable technologies that will assist researchers and labs in managing geochemical data from collection to preservation.

International initiatives such as OneGeochemistry³⁷ to take on the development and promotion of data standards for geochemistry. Further work should be planned to strengthen the conversation between geochemical societies, geochemical data's repositories, editors and publishers, and funders.

5. Towards some inequities

The rise of OA publication may have an impact on researcher profiles and tends to shift costs from institutions to individuals³⁸. It is likely that such high expenses will continue to impose financial disparities on the research community until the geochemical community makes the decision to transition away from journal-based evaluation criteria. Although OA publishing aims to make scientific achievements more accessible to readers, there is a current tendency that some researchers prefer hybrid journals to OA ones when submitting Earth Sciences articles³⁹. In China, the world's larger producer of scientific article⁴⁰, a historical national incentive encouraging researchers to publish articles in top journals (i.e. high JIF and first quartile) categorized by the Chinese Academy of Sciences is one of the important causes for this trend in China. No need to pay APC for publishing research in a "high impact" predominantly English hybrid journal makes a contribution to the trend as well as highlighted by distribution in GCA articles (19% of article in 2021 but only 5% OA)²⁷. However, the trend may change in response to a newly launched national-level policy in China in early 2020: to ban the use of journal-based metrics as assessment criteria for academic promotion and recruitment⁴¹. Further, publishing in Chinese journals is being proposed as part of the prerequisites for application of top national awards. The policy will

give priority to considering the innovation of one's research work and significance of representative achievements in solving practical problems. A move away from high JIF journals⁴² like many organizations Worldwide (see signatories of DORA⁴³) to Chinese journals could be a real game changer as Chinese researchers produce the bulk of articles, the majority of which have page charges and are fully OA by default. Specifically, the new policy tackles perverse incentives that drive the "publish or perish" culture which might be encouraging questionable research.

Science comes from anyone and is made for all. But with the current research situation, we need to redefine it⁴⁴. Irawan and Susanto⁴⁵ use volcanology and disaster themes which can be found in scientific databases (commercial and non-profit) to determine the extent of the collaboration of geoscience researchers in the World and how they build knowledge from prior knowledge. Some of their earliest indications are that: (i) international collaboration has occurred with most of the research funding flowing from the northern hemisphere. This will (automatically) determine who is the first author, what language is used (not local language), the journal that published it (not local journal), (ii) language have the potential to distance science from the main stakeholders (local communities), (iii) minimal references to articles written in local language. Based on these indicators, it is past time for us to adapt the way we communicate scientifically, particularly if the subject of our research is located in a nation where English is not the primary language. A good example is the special issue of *Volcanica*⁴⁶ with articles from each of the volcano monitoring agencies of Latin America, all published dual-language, in English and in Spanish.

6. Concluding remark

Open access means both accessible documents and accessible language⁸. It is unfortunate that preprints are infrequently used by the geochemical community relative to the scale of the total research outputs produced, and its sustainability remains uncertain. A PCI Geochemistry would reinforce this trend. Indeed, the current APC model imposed by many journals can have deleterious effects on researchers who have no funding, especially from

lower income countries. APC must not be the next wall to face after the paywall. Therefore, it is almost mandatory for researchers coming from countries where English is not the first language, who are fortunate enough to publish their work in the “high impact journals”, to also provide the translated version of their paper to be disseminated to their national and community. Creative audio-visual work could be used for this purpose.

Scientific publications need to be returned to their main function as tools for dissemination, rather than self-promotion. Researchers should not only rely on science writers/journalists to do the outreach, but instead they should also first-handedly participate in the dissemination. We need to go a step further than the science communication we are doing today^{44, 47}.

Eventually, we encourage you to start or continue your journey towards making open and FAIR data, software, and science outreach/science communications as important part of our research culture. In-person meetings have always been seen as the best way to communicate with each other, but virtual conferences have shown undeniable advantages (including accessibility) and we are convinced that the future of events will be hybrid.

Author Contributions: Conceptualization, O.P.; writing—original draft preparation, O.P. and D.E.I.; writing—review and editing, O.P. and D.E.I.; visualization, D.E.I.; project administration, O.P.; funding acquisition, O.P.; All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

Funding: This research is partly funded by the «Science & Impacts» grant awarded to the project «Open Science in Earth Sciences» by Ambassade de France en Indonésie.

Acknowledgments: We deeply acknowledge all the speakers from the 14f session entitled “Open Access in Earth Sciences” held at Goldschmidt conference (4-9 July 2021) namely Tom Narock, Jeroen Bosman, Alain Queffelec, Jannick Ingrin, Jeffrey G Catalano, Shelley Stall, Lesley Anne I Wyborn, and Marthe Klöcking. Lonni Besançon, Alain Queffelec, Marthe Klöcking, Inna Biryukova, Pooja Mandke, and Jessica Polka are acknowledged for feedback and comments on the preprint.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

References

1. Suber, P., Open Access. MIT Press: 2012; p. 242.
2. Tennant, J. P.; Crane, H.; Crick, T.; Davila, J.; Enkhbayar, A.; Havemann, J.; Kramer, B.; Martin, R.; Masuzzo, P.; Nobes, A.; Rice, C.; Rivera-Lir, M.; Rodríguez-Fernández, B. a. e. f.; Ross-Hellauer, T.; Sattler, S.; Thacker, P. D.; Vanholsbeeck, M., Ten Hot Topics around Scholarly Publishing. *Publications* 2019, 7 (2), 34. doi:10.3390/publications7020034.
3. Pourret, O.; Irawan, D. E.; Tennant, J.; Wien, C.; Dorch, B., Comments on “Factors affecting global flow of scientific knowledge in environmental sciences” by Sonne et al. (2020). *Science of the Total Environment* 2020, 721, 136454. doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2019.136454.
4. Crawford, A. J., GOAJ6: Gold Open Access Journals 2015–2020. Cites & Insights Books: Livermore, CA, USA: 2021.
5. Irawan, D. E.; Abraham, J.; Zein, R. A.; Ridlo, I. A.; Aribowo, E. K., Open Access in Indonesia. *Development and Change* 2021, 52 (3), 651-660. doi:10.1111/dech.12637.
6. Irawan, D. E.; Abraham, J., Set them free. *Commonplace* 2021. doi:10.21428/6ffd8432.5ee70f55.
7. Bourne, P. E.; Polka, J. K.; Vale, R. D.; Kiley, R., Ten simple rules to consider regarding preprint submission. *PLoS Comput Biol* 2017, 13 (5), e1005473. doi:10.1371/journal.pcbi.1005473.
8. Irawan, D. E.; Pourret, O., Your paper is published, it's not the end of the journey. *Zenodo* 2021. doi:10.5281/zenodo.5140430.
9. Wilkinson, M. D.; Dumontier, M.; Aalbersberg, I. J.; Appleton, G.; Axton, M.; Baak, A.; Blomberg, N.; Boiten, J.-W.; da Silva Santos, L. B.; Bourne, P. E.; Bouwman, J.; Brookes, A. J.; Clark, T.; Crosas, M.; Dillo, I.; Dumon, O.; Edmunds, S.; Evelo, C. T.; Finkers, R.; Gonzalez-Beltran, A.; Gray, A. J. G.; Groth, P.; Goble, C.; Grethe, J. S.; Heringa, J.; 't Hoen,

P. A. C.; Hooft, R.; Kuhn, T.; Kok, R.; Kok, J.; Lusher, S. J.; Martone, M. E.; Mons, A.; Packer, A. L.; Persson, B.; Rocca-Serra, P.; Roos, M.; van Schaik, R.; Sansone, S.-A.; Schultes, E.; Sengstag, T.; Slater, T.; Strawn, G.; Swertz, M. A.; Thompson, M.; van der Lei, J.; van Mulligen, E.; Velterop, J.; Waagmeester, A.; Wittenburg, P.; Wolstencroft, K.; Zhao, J.; Mons, B., The FAIR Guiding Principles for scientific data management and stewardship.

Scientific Data 2016, 3, 160018. doi:10.1038/sdata.2016.18.

10. Dwivedi, A. D.; Santos, A.; Barnard, M.; Crimmins, T.; Malhotra, A.; Rod, K.; Aho, K.; Bell, S.; Bomfim, B.; Brearley, F.; Cadillo-Quiroz, H.; Chen, J.; Gough, C. M.; Graham, E. B.; Hakkenberg, C. R.; L.Haygood; Koren, G.; Lilleskov, E.; Meredith, L. K.; Naeher, S.; Z.L.Nickerson; Pourret, O.; Song, H.-S.; Stahl, M.; Taş, N.; Vargas, R.; Weintraub-Leff, S., Biogeosciences Perspectives on Integrated, Coordinated, Open, Networked (ICON) Science. Earth and Space Science Open Archive 2021. doi:doi:10.1002/essoar.10508474.2.

11. Lariviere, V.; Haustein, S.; Mongeon, P., The Oligopoly of Academic Publishers in the Digital Era. Plos One 2015, 10 (6), e0127502. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0127502.

12. Besançon, L.; Peiffer-Smadja, N.; Segalas, C.; Jiang, H.; Masuzzo, P.; Smout, C.; Billy, E.; Deforet, M.; Leyrat, C., Open science saves lives: lessons from the COVID-19 pandemic. BMC Medical Research Methodology 2021, 21 (1), 117. doi:10.1186/s12874-021-01304-y.

13. Tennant, J., Time to stop the exploitation of free academic labour. European Science Editing 2020, 46, e51839.

14. Brembs, B.; Huneman, P.; Schönbrodt, F.; Nilsson, G.; Susi, T.; Siems, R.; Perakakis, P.; Trachana, V.; Ma, L.; Rodriguez-Cuadrado, S., Replacing academic journals. Zenodo 2021. doi:10.5281/zenodo.5564003.

15. Pourret, O.; Irawan, D. E.; Tennant, J. P., On the Potential of Preprints in Geochemistry: The Good, the Bad, and the Ugly. Sustainability 2020, 12 (8). doi:10.3390/su12083360.

16. EarthArXiv <https://eartharxiv.org/>.

17. ESSOar <https://www.essoar.org/>.

18. Narock, T.; Goldstein, E. B.; Jackson, C. A.-L.; Bubeck, A. A.; Enright, A. M. L.; Farquharson, J. I.; Fernández, A.; Fernández-Blanco, D.; Girardclos, S.; Ibarra, D. E.; Lengger, S. K.; Mackay, A. W.; Venema, V.; Whitehead, B.; Ampuero, J.-P., Earth science is ready for preprints. *Eos* 2019, 100. doi:10.1029/2019EO121347.
19. Peer Community In <https://peercommunityin.org/>.
20. Guillemaud, T.; Facon, B.; Bourguet, D., Peer Community In: A free process for the recommendation of unpublished scientific papers based on peer review. In *ELPUB 2019 23rd edition of the International Conference on Electronic Publishing*, Marseille, France, 2019.
21. Boston, A., PiePlate: Proposing a visual peer-review overlay service. Zenodo 2020. doi:10.5281/zenodo.4443231.
22. Lanati, A.; Pourret, O.; Jackson, C.; Besançon, L., Research Funding Bodies Need to Follow Scientific Evidence: Preprints Are Here to Stay. *OSF Preprint* 2021. doi:10.31219/osf.io/k54pe.
23. Pourret, O.; Hursthouse, A.; Irawan, D. E.; Johannesson, K., H; Liu, H.; Poujol, M.; Tartese, R.; van Hullebusch, E., D.; Wiche, O., Open Access publishing practice in geochemistry: overview of current state and look to the future. *Heliyon* 2020, 6 (3), e03551. doi:10.1016/j.heliyon.2020.e03551.
24. Pourret, O.; Irawan, D. E.; Tennant, J. P.; Hursthouse, A.; van Hullebusch, E. D., The growth of open access publishing in geochemistry. *Results in Geochemistry* 2020, 1, 100001. doi:10.1016/j.ringeo.2020.100001.
25. Directory of Open Access Journals <https://doaj.org/>.
26. Ingrin, J., Do you know the true cost of your last publication? *Elements* 2021, 17 (2), 138. doi:10.2138/gselements.17.2.138.
27. Catalano, J., Impact of open access publication requirements on a traditional, society-sponsored geochemistry journal and potential future outcomes. *Goldschmidt Abstract* 2021. doi:10.7185/gold2021.4568.

28. Bosman, J.; Frantsvåg, J. E.; Kramer, B.; Langlais, P.-C.; Proudman, V., OA Diamond Journals Study. Part 1: Findings. Zenodo 2021. doi:10.5281/zenodo.4558704.
29. Tennant, J.; Agarwal, R.; Baždarić, K.; Brassard, D.; Crick, T.; Dunleavy, D. J.; Evans, T. R.; Gardner, N.; Gonzalez-Marquez, M.; Graziotin, D.; Tzovaras, B. G.; Gunnarsson, D.; Havemann, J.; Hosseini, M.; Katz, D. S.; Knöchelmann, M.; Madan, C.; Manghi, P.; Marocchino, A.; Masuzzo, P.; Murray-Rust, P.; Narayanaswamy, S.; Nilsson, G.; Pacheco-Mendoza, J.; Penders, B.; Pourret, O.; Rera, M.; Samuel, J.; Steiner, T.; Stojanovski, J.; Tirado, A. U.; Vos, R.; Worthington, S.; Yarkoni, T., A tale of two 'opens': intersections between Free and Open Source Software and Open Scholarship. OSF Preprint 2020. doi:<https://doi.org/10.31235/osf.io/2kxq8>.
30. Stall, S.; Yarmey, L.; Cutcher-Gershenfeld, J.; Hanson, B.; Lehnert, K.; Nosek, B.; Parsons, M.; Robinson, E.; Wyborn, L., Make scientific data FAIR. *Nature* 2019, 570 (7759), 27-29. doi:10.1038/d41586-019-01720-7.
31. EarthChem Library <https://www.earthchem.org/ecl/>.
32. GeoROC <http://georoc.mpch-mainz.gwdg.de/georoc/>.
33. Earth Data Alliance <https://www.iedadata.org/>.
34. Digital Geochemical Data Infrastructure <http://digis.geo.uni-goettingen.de>.
35. Enabling FAIR Data project
<https://copdess.org/enabling-fair-data-project/enabling-fair-project-overview/>.
36. Chamberlain, K. J.; Lehnert, K. A.; McIntosh, I. M.; Morgan, D. J.; Wörner, G., Time to change the data culture in geochemistry. *Nature Reviews Earth & Environment* 2021. doi:10.1038/s43017-021-00237-w.
37. OneGeochemistry <https://www.earthchem.org/communities/onegeochemistry/>.
38. Ross-Hellauer, T.; Reichmann, S.; Cole, N. L.; Fessler, A.; Klebel, T.; Pontika, N., Dynamics of Cumulative Advantage and Threats to Equity in Open Science - A Scoping Review. OSF Preprint 2021. doi:10.31235/osf.io/d5fz7.

39. Pourret, O.; Hedding, D., William; Ibarra, D., Enrique; Irawan, D., Erwin; Liu, H.; Tennant, J., Peter, International disparities in open access practices in the earth sciences. *European Science Editing* 2021. doi:10.3897/ese.2021.e63663.
40. Tollefson, J., China declared world's largest producer of scientific articles. *Nature* 2018, 553 (7689), 390. doi:10.1038/d41586-018-00927-4.
41. Mallapaty, S., China bans cash rewards for publishing papers. *Nature* 2020, 579 (7797), 18. doi:10.1038/d41586-020-00574-8.
42. Callaway, E., Beat it, impact factor! Publishing elite turns against controversial metric. *Nature* 2016, 535 (7611), 210-211. doi:10.1038/nature.2016.20224.
43. DORA <https://sfdora.org/signers/>.
44. Irawan, D., Erwin; Abraham, J.; Tennant, J., Peter; Pourret, O., The need for a new set of measures to assess the impact of research in earth sciences in Indonesia. *European Science Editing* 2021, 47. doi:10.3897/ese.2021.e59032.
45. Irawan, D.; Susanto, A., Is (earth) science only made for everyone who speaks English? *Goldschmidt Abstract* 2021. doi:10.7185/gold2021.3367.
46. Chevrel, O.; Wadsworth, F.; Farquharson, J.; Kushnir, A.; Heap, M.; Williams, R.; Delmelle, P.; Kennedy, B., Publishing a Special Issue of Reports from the volcano observatories in Latin America: Editorial to Special Issue on Volcano Observatories in Latin America. *Volcanica* 2021, 4 (S1), i - vi. doi:10.30909/vol.04.S1.ivi.
47. Pourret, O.; Suzuki, K.; Takahashi, Y., Our Study is Published, But the Journey is Not Finished! *Elements* 2020, 16 (4), 229-230. doi:10.2138/gselements.16.4.229.