

1 Article Processing Charges Threaten Global Health Equity: Open Access is Closed 2 Science.

3
4 **Authors:** Gabriella Y. Hyman*^{1,2}, Taylor Wurdeman^{1,3}, Nikathan Kumar^{1,4}, Isaac G. Alty^{1,5}, Callum
5 Forbes^{1,6}, Robert Riviello^{1,5,6}, Nakul P. Raykar^{1,5}

6 7 **Affiliations:**

- 8 1. Program in Global Surgery and Social Change, Blavatnik Institute Department of Global Health
9 and Social Medicine, Harvard Medical School
- 10 2. Department of Surgery, University of the Witwatersrand
- 11 3. Department of Surgery, Loma Linda University, Loma Linda, CA, USA
- 12 4. Department of Surgery, University of California San Francisco, East Bay, Oakland, CA, USA
- 13 5. Department of Surgery, Brigham and Women's Hospital, Boston, MA, USA
- 14 6. Center for Equity in Global Surgery, University of Global Health Equity, Rwanda

15 16 **Qualifications:**

17 Gabriella Y. Hyman^{1,2}, MBBCh, Dip Obst, MPH
18 Taylor Wurdeman^{1,3}, MD, MPH
19 Nikathan Kumar^{1,4}, MD, MS
20 Isaac G. Alty^{1,5}, MD
21 Callum Forbes^{1,6}, MBChB
22 Robert Riviello^{1,6}, MD, MPH
23 Nakul P. Raykar^{1,5} MD, MPH

24
25 ***Corresponding author:** Gabriella Y. Hyman, email: gabriellahyman@gmail.com

26
27 **Disclosures:** None

28
29 **Funding:** Nil

30 31 **Contributions:**

32 Conceptualization and design of the study: GH, TW, CF, NR
33 Literature review and synthesis: GH, TW

- 34 Initial data collection and management: GH, TW
- 35 Methodology design: GH, TW
- 36 Quantitative statistical analysis: GH, TW
- 37 Final data cleaning, review and interpretation: GH, TW, NK, IA, CF, NR
- 38 Manuscript writing and revision: GH, TW, NK, IA, NR
- 39 Review and editing of the manuscript: GH, CF, RR NR, NK, IA
- 40 Final approval and revision: GH, RR, NR
- 41
- 42 **Words:** 3527 words
- 43

44

45 **Abstract: (Words= 285)**

46 ***Introduction***

47 The shift from subscription-based to open-access (OA) publishing sought to democratize scientific
48 knowledge by eliminating access barriers. However, article processing charges (APCs) have raised
49 concerns about equity, particularly for researchers from low- and middle-income countries (LMICs).
50 APCs shift costs from readers to authors, potentially limiting the ability of researchers to disseminate
51 their work. This study aimed to quantify the effect of APCs on equity in global surgery by examining
52 current APC costs and their association with journal metrics and LMIC authorship.

53

54 ***Methods***

55 A structured review was conducted on journals' APCs and bibliometrics using data from the Scientific
56 Journal Rankings (SJR) and PubMed. Journals were included if they actively published human health
57 research and had at least 100 articles with first author information. APC data were obtained from five
58 major publishers (Elsevier, Wiley, Oxford, Sage, and Springer Nature) and supplemented manually.
59 Journals were categorized into surgery, public health, and other groups. Data on APCs, bibliometrics
60 (SJR ranking, H-index), and first author affiliations were analyzed using linear regression models to
61 assess their relationship with APC costs and LMIC authorship.

62

63 ***Results***

64 The study included 2,001 journals with a median APC of \$3,700 USD showing no significant cost
65 differences across journal categories. The median percentage of LMIC first authors was 4%, with a
66 significant negative association between APCs and LMIC authorship: each \$500 increase in APC was
67 linked to a 0.7% decrease in LMIC first authorship. While higher APCs correlated with slightly higher
68 bibliometric indices, the academic impact was limited.

69

70 ***Conclusion***

71 APCs present a significant barrier to LMIC authors, undermining the equity goals of OA publishing.
72 Alternative funding models, such as tiered pricing or expanded waivers, are needed to ensure OA remains
73 accessible and equitable across all economic contexts.

74 _____

75

76

77 **Introduction**

78 The transition from subscription-based to open-access (OA) publishing sought to democratize knowledge
79 by removing access barriers to science(1). Removing access barriers to scientific literature should
80 promote learning, accelerate research, and advance the field by all scientists (1). However, after more
81 than two decades of pushing towards OA, the question of whether more equity has been achieved in
82 research is met with skepticism, often in relation to the article processing charges (APCs) (2,3). APCs, the
83 fees publishers charge authors to publish their science in OA journals, shift the cost of disseminating
84 literature from readers to authors (3). APCs may inadvertently restrict researchers, particularly in low-
85 resourced settings, and low-resourced fields like global surgery (4,5).

86

87 Historically, researchers published their scholarly works without payment to journals, with journals using
88 a subscription model or “closed access” (CA)(1). The subscription-based paradigm presented a challenge
89 to researchers who worked for institutions that could not afford costly subscriptions to journals to access
90 published research(BOAI 2001). This was a problem disproportionately affecting low-and-middle income
91 country (LMIC) researchers whose institutions often did not have the resources to enter into these
92 subscription agreements(1). With the advent of technological advancements, scientists and journals
93 supported the move towards free and unrestricted online availability of information. This led to the
94 mainstreaming of OA models with journals offering OA, subscription-based, or hybrid options
95 (publication beginning as subscription-based for a limited embargo period before moving to OA)(1,6).

96 The OA model exists within the Creative Commons license rules governing the dissemination of
97 scientific material (7). Additionally, academic and funding institutions often make OA a requirement for
98 publishing. APCs are intended to support the financial sustainability of OA journals and add value for
99 researchers (such as faster processing time and broader dissemination of findings), yet they introduce a
100 financial burden that may affect equity in scientific research (3,8). While APCs make research available
101 to authors without institutional affiliation for viewing, they may be prohibitive for the same researchers,
102 particularly those in LMICs who wish to publish their scientific work(9). Considering less than 10% of
103 global investment in health research is spent in LMICs, the burden of payment for publishing research
104 OA disproportionately affects researchers in LMICs where income is also significantly lower (10,11) .

105

106 Amid growing concerns among the academic global surgery community that APCs are becoming
107 increasingly unaffordable, evidence to improve understanding of the current APC model is needed. In
108 global health fields, such as academic global surgery, equity is a guiding principle and so instruments that

109 challenge equity are problematic. In addition to the cost of publishing, researchers also consider the
110 potential impact of a journal when selecting a journal. Journal bibliometrics, such as Scientific Journal
111 Rankings (SJR), impact factor (IF), or H-index, are used as proxies for quantifying the value of
112 publishing with a specific journal(12). This study aims to quantify current APC costs and assess the
113 impact of APCs on equity and journal bibliometrics in global surgery.

114

115 **Methods**

116 *Overview*

117 We performed a structured review on journals' APCs and bibliometrics. We extracted journal ranking
118 from the Scientific Journal Rankings (SJR) database and cross-referenced these with journals indexed in
119 PubMed (13). Journals were included if they were present in both databases, were actively publishing
120 (meaning the most recent article published was on or after 1 February 2023), and if they had at least 100
121 articles with first author information listed. Journals were excluded if the SJR category did not pertain to
122 "human health". Journals were categorized as open access (OA), hybrid, or closed access (subscription-
123 based). No journals uniformly defined the definition of "hybrid". Data on the following bibliometrics
124 were available and included: SJR ranking and H-index. SJR is the average number of weighted citations
125 received in a given year against the citations for documents published in that journal over the previous 3
126 years (14). A journal's H-index is the ratio of a journal's total articles (h) which have received at least h
127 citations(15).

128

129 We identified five major publishing houses that provided open-sourced datasets of APCs at the journal
130 level (Elsevier, Wiley, Oxford, Sage and Springer Nature) and manually retrieved them for JAMA. These
131 datasets were matched to the SJR dataset. Journals were categorized based on their SJR category into
132 three groups: surgery, public health, and other. A journal had one category assigned for analysis, and a
133 surgery categorization was prioritized over public health or other due to the primary focus of this study
134 being on global surgery. Where not available in publishing houses datasets, information on the publishing
135 model was retrieved through purposive searching by authors GH and TW.

136

137 *Data handling*

138 RStudio version 4.4 was used for analysis. Using the *retrez* package, we extracted article metadata from
139 the 200 most recent articles for each included journal. This included first author affiliation, which was
140 analyzed for country of affiliation. Country affiliation was categorized by income level according to the
141 World Bank Group's classifications as LMIC (which included low-income, low-and middle-income, and
142 upper-middle- income countries) or high-income country (HIC)¹⁰. Each journal's *LMIC First Author*

143 *percentage (LMIC %)*, which was used as a proxy for equity, was calculated by dividing the number of
144 articles with an LMIC first author by the total number of articles. Articles were excluded from the
145 denominator if the first author did not have an affiliation listed.

146

147 The final dataset contains the following variables: SJR ranking, H-index, country of the journal, country
148 of the publisher, SJR journal category, first author affiliation percentage (*LMIC %*), publishing model
149 (OA or hybrid), APC (\$USD), and creative common (CC) license.

150

151 *Data analysis*

152 For descriptive analysis, we depicted continuous data using median and interquartile range, and for
153 categorical data we used percentage and frequencies. Descriptive statistics are presented for the overall
154 dataset and for each defined journal category: surgery, public health, and other.

155

156 We used a linear regression to describe the relationship between APC and bibliometrics (SJR and H-
157 index). Both bibliometric values were included as validity measures for the study. We developed models
158 to analyze the relationship between standardized bibliometric rank and LMIC first authorship percentage.
159 We included standardized APC, SJR, and open access status as covariates. An interaction term was used
160 between the standardized bibliometric rank and standardized APC, as well as for access model (OA
161 versus hybrid). We standardized SJR ranking and H-index by subtracting the overall mean from each
162 value and dividing by the standard deviation. We standardized the APC by dividing it by \$500. This
163 allows for an increased ease of interpretation of the model, whereby we provide a unit of measurement
164 (\$500) for APCs for each unit increase or decrease in the model coefficient.

165

166 In order to demonstrate the relationship between median APC cost compared to income of LMIC medical
167 professionals, we constructed a color-coded map using APC as a percent of gross national income (GNI)
168 per capita (16).

169

170 **Results**

171 *Overview*


172 The final dataset consisted of 2001 journals (**Figure 1**). The full list of journals can be found in **Appendix**
173 **1**. The majority of journals were in the *other medicine* category (n=1552), with 9% (n=180) in the *public*
174 *health* category and 13% (n=269) in the *surgery* category. No journal reported an exclusively
175 subscription-based publication model, with 83% (n= 1658) reporting a hybrid over a pure OA model. The

176 overall median APC was \$3700 (IQR= \$1030) with no significant difference between journal categories
177 ($p=0.2$). The median SJR and H-index were 0.87 and 89 respectively (**Table 1**)

178

179 **Figure 1: Study flow diagram showing journals included in the analysis**

180



181

182

183 **Table 1: Characteristics of Included Journals**

184

Characteristic	Overall, N = 2,001 ¹	Other Medicine, N = 1,552 ¹	Public Health, N = 180 ¹	Surgery, N = 269 ¹	p-value ²
Article Processing Charge (\$ USD)	3,700 (3,190, 4,220)	3,700 (3,190, 4,270)	3,690 (3,190, 4,045)	3,690 (3,200, 4,118)	0.2
Scientific Journal Ranking	0.87 (0.63, 1.25)	0.89 (0.64, 1.30)	0.91 (0.64, 1.25)	0.78 (0.59, 1.03)	<0.001
H-Index	89 (59, 132)	93 (61, 140)	80 (55, 106)	79 (56, 112)	<0.001
LMIC First Author Percentage (%)	4 (1, 10)	4 (1, 9)	4 (1, 12)	4 (2, 8)	0.3
Open vs Hybrid					0.016
Hybrid	1,658 (83%)	1,278 (82%)	142 (79%)	238 (88%)	
Open	343 (17%)	274 (18%)	38 (21%)	31 (12%)	

¹ Median (IQR); n (%)

² Kruskal-Wallis rank sum test; Pearson's Chi-squared test

185

186


187 *Cost and Equity*

188 The overall median LMIC First Author Percentage was 4% (IQR= 10), with no statistically significant
 189 difference between journal categories (p=0.2) (Table 1). Of the 203 countries with data available, APCs
 190 constituted less than 5% of GNI per capita in only 7 countries. In 63 countries, the median APC
 191 constituted >95% of GNI per capita (Figure 2).

192

193 **Figure 2: Mean APC as a percentage of GNI per Capita**

194



195

196

197 One standard deviation increase in SJR was associated with a 1.14 unit increase in APC, where each unit
198 represents \$500 ($p < 0.01$). One standard deviation increase in H-index was associated with a 1.16 unit
199 increase in APC ($p < 0.01$) .

200

201 Table 2 depicts the models with LMIC first authorship percentage as a dependent variable. In model 1, a
202 one-standard deviation increase in SJR was associated with a 2.7 percentage point (67.5%) decrease in
203 LMIC authorship ($p < 0.01$). An increase in APC by \$500 was associated with a 0.7 percentage point
204 (17.5%) decrease, in LMIC authorship. Surgery journals were associated with a drop in LMIC authorship
205 percentage (1.4 percentage points, $p < 0.05$) (Figure 3). The publication model (hybrid versus open) was
206 not associated with LMIC authorship percentage ($p = 0.69$). The positive coefficient of the interaction
207 term between SJR and APC indicates that the negative association of APC on LMIC authorship
208 diminished at higher levels of SJR. Model 2, which substitutes H-Index for SJR, demonstrated similar
209 results for all covariates, with small differences in coefficients (Table 2, Figure 4).

210

211 **Table 2: Model predicting the effect of SJR and H-index on LMIC First Authorship Percentage**


	<i>Dependent variable:</i>	
	LMIC Author Percentage	
	SJR Model (1)	H-Index Model (2)
SJR (standardized)	-2.711*** (0.493)	
H-Index (standardized)		-3.055*** (0.478)
APC in USD (500)	-0.733*** (0.125)	-0.545*** (0.111)
Category: Public Health	-0.179 (0.766)	-0.589 (0.765)
Category: Surgery	-1.360** (0.645)	-1.623** (0.644)
Pub. Options: Hybrid	0.245 (0.620)	-0.272 (0.605)
SJR moderated by APC	0.165*** (0.041)	
H-Index moderated by APC		0.149*** (0.039)
Constant	12.878*** (1.009)	11.621*** (0.908)
Observations	2,001	2,001
R ²	0.045	0.054
Adjusted R ²	0.042	0.051
Residual Std. Error (df = 1994)	9.714	9.669
F Statistic (df = 6; 1994)	15.715***	18.941***

Note: *p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01

212

213


214 **Figure 3: Association between APCs, journal impact and LMIC first authorship**



215

216

217 **Figure 4: Effect of increasing SJR and APCs on LMIC first authorship**



218

219

220 *Publishing Options*

221 Several journals reported multiple creative commons (CC) licensing options for researchers (Table 3). Of
222 the 1094 for which CC licensing was retrievable, most offered the option with the most researcher rights.
223 Some journals offered more than one CC option. CC licensing options provide a standardized way to
224 describe user and owner rights of intellectual property. This guides users about what they can do to use,
225 disseminate and shared published work (7,17).

226

227 Waiver options were dependent on the publishing company for each journal. The five different waiver
228 options were variable and dependent on country or institutional agreements, or the proportion of authors
229 from LMICs. The use of waiver options is not reported with each specific journal article thus we were not
230 able to evaluate the effect of waiver options on publication practices.

231

232 Journals were either categorized as fully open access or hybrid. Fully open access journals do not offer
233 traditional subscription-based options, and instead require either no APC, an institutional agreement for
234 APC waivers, an APC waiver based on author criteria, or payment of the full APC for publication. Hybrid
235 journals offered both open access and traditional subscription-based models. The subscription-based

236 model option typically comes with no APC but has access to the public restricted, or delayed by months
237 or years.

238

239 **Table 3: Distribution of Creative Commons (CC) License options among Journals.**

CC Status	Definition ¹²	Number of Journals (%)
CC BY	Allows others to copy, distribute, display, and perform the work and derivative works based upon it, but only if they give the author or licensor the credits in the manner specified by these.	1070/1094 (97.8%)
CC BY-NC	Allows others to copy, distribute, display, and perform the work and derivative works based upon it, but for non-commercial purposes only.	525/1094 (48%)
CC BY-ND	Allows for redistribution, commercial and non-commercial, as long as it is passed along unchanged and in whole, with credit to the author.	3/1094 (0.3%)
CC BY-NC-ND	Allows others to download the works and share them with others as long as they credit the author, but they can't change them in any way or use them commercially.	452/1094 (41.3%)
CC 0	Allows practitioners to waive all their copyright and related rights, making the work available to the public domain to be used for any purpose without any conditions, unless such conditions are required by law	119/1094 (10.9%)

240

241 Discussion

242 Overview

243 This structured review describes the implications of Article Processing Charges (APCs) on researchers in
244 the field of Global Surgery. The stated goal of OA publishing, which uses APCs as a financing method, is
245 to improve accessibility of scientific research, and to make the scientific and publishing processes more
246 transparent and inclusive (1,18). Our findings regarding APC costs and the subsequent equity
247 implications are described in three key messages: (1) the financial burden of APCs is high; (2) APCs have
248 a negative impact on authorship equity, particularly affecting first authors from LMICs; and (3) the
249 correlation between bibliometrics and APCs is of limited practical, academic significance.

250

251 *Financial Burden*

252 Our findings suggest that APCs are high. When compared to countries' GNI per capita, we found that
253 only a small percentage of researchers (in the USA and Scandinavian countries) publish research where
254 APCs constitute less than 5% of GNI per capita. This means that where APCs are incurred as out-of-
255 pocket expenses for researchers, their high cost can be prohibitive for researchers who may have to
256 prioritize which data to publish, or even whether to submit for publication at all.

257

258 Alternatives to what is perceived as the conventional APC model exist. Authors have various
259 dissemination options in accordance with CC restrictions and waiver options(7,17). However, journals do
260 not report whether a publication was published using a waiver option or not, making the objective
261 evaluation of whether authors use waiver or self-cite options difficult. Furthermore, there is often no
262 guarantee of a waiver at the start of the submission process. Thus, high APCs may deter researchers from
263 submitting their research to a particular journal altogether. While we were unable to evaluate the disparate
264 definitions of the "hybrid" designation given by journals and publishers, it is possible that even when only
265 certain article types are not subject to mandatory APC charges for OA publishing, or that only certain
266 article types have the option of being published behind a paywall, a journal is designated as 'hybrid'. We
267 conducted further ad-hoc searches which revealed that many journals offer hybrid options only for certain
268 article types, maintaining an OA publishing model requiring APCs for a great portion of their offerings.
269 Thus, the designation of hybrid may overestimate the true options available to researchers within the
270 current OA model.

271

272 *Equity Implications*

273 Our analysis suggests the current APC model does not achieve its stated intentions of achieving research
274 equity. Despite the initial promise of OA to democratize science for all, our findings suggest that science
275 has been commoditized by the high cost of APCs (1). APCs are high across different journal categories
276 and publishing houses and perpetuate inequities in academia that disproportionately affect researchers
277 from LMICs (5,19). Compared with a review conducted by Morrison et al in 2021, which found the
278 average APCs across all disciplines to be \$958 and for the field of medicine to be \$1373, our study shows
279 a much higher median amount of \$3700, even for global health journals (Morrison et al. 2022). While our
280 methodology was different in terms of our search, journal categorization and focus on specific publication
281 houses, all of these APC amounts exist in stark contrast to the field of global health's core principle of
282 equity and present a barrier to advancing scientific advancements.

283

284 An increase in APC by \$500 is associated with a 0.7 percentage point decrease in LMIC first authorship.
285 Given the average LMIC authorship is 4%, these values represent large relative changes in LMIC
286 authorship percentages of 17.5% (Figure 3). This is more pronounced for specialty surgery journals where
287 LMIC first authorship dropped by 35%. This raises concerns about the exclusionary effects of APCs. A
288 previous review discussed a number of potential barriers to achieving publication equity (19). Possible
289 reasons for LMIC first authorship percentage being negatively affected by APCs are that LMIC authors
290 are more sensitive to changes in price (\$500 unit increases) as APCs are a high proportion of their annual
291 salary. Given that APCs are often paid out of pocket and much of the global surgery research in the global
292 south is unfunded, the expectation to pay APCs out of pocket would almost certainly preclude LMIC first
293 authors from the OA APC-funded model (4,10,19). It is worth noting that LMIC first authorship is
294 affected despite waiver options described for LMIC researchers (Table 3) (5) .

295

296 Several institutions and funders of biomedical research have taken steps towards making APCs more
297 affordable for researchers (21–26). However, these funding agreements between biomedical funders and
298 publishing houses only support employees or researchers funded by these institutions. This leads to an
299 increase in the proportion of researchers publishing research which has institutional funding support.
300 Many LMIC researchers are not funded through grant support, and within HICs, only a small proportion
301 of grant-funding is for global health research(11,27). Moreover, an additional layer of inequity is
302 introduced into funding cycles as researchers with large grants or institutional support are more likely to
303 be able to afford APCs, leading to more publications, and further funding.

304

305 *Academic Significance*

306 Bibliometrics are the quantitative analysis of academic publications to evaluate the publication in terms of
307 number of citations and ‘impact’ (28). SJR measures the scientific influence of the average article in the
308 journal by calculating the weighted number of citations in a given year to citable publications published in
309 the journal within the three preceding years (14) . H-index measures both the productivity and citation
310 impact of the publications of a scientist (15). The underlying assumption is that higher values in these
311 metrics reflect a greater research ‘impact’, suggesting that the work has been frequently referenced and
312 deemed influential by the academic community. This is often a core goal of researchers when selecting a
313 publication route. We found the relationship between APC and both bibliometric measures shows a weak
314 positive association for both H-index and SJR. The idea that this incremental increase is of academic
315 significance is not convincing relative to the steep associated increase in APC cost (Figure 3).

316

317 While OA was designed to resolve inequities in a subscription-based model through making research
318 more accessible for all readers, the current OA model has shifted the financial burden of publishing to the
319 author. This shift, which has led to higher APCs, has a significant financial impact on authors from
320 LMICs, and is associated with lower rates of LMIC first authorship. Therefore, the current OA model has
321 shifted the financial burden to a group that also has limited resources - LMIC authors. The financial
322 burden of APCs is not negligible in high-resourced settings either. For example, in Germany and the
323 United Kingdom, which are among the top producers of scientific publications according to the National
324 Science Foundation, APCs make up between 5-50% of GNI per capita (29). This means that APCs can be
325 prohibitive for researchers, who may be forced to choose between paying a salary, conducting further
326 research, or paying for APCs. The advancement of scientific enquiry, whether intended to improve
327 clinical outcomes or strengthen health systems, benefits from a broad range of diverse perspectives. The
328 effects of APCs on decreasing authorship diversity based on financial resources, therefore weakens
329 science in addition to being inequitable.

330

331 *Implications and Future Directions*

332 There are several options for researchers to be both cost-saving and impact-driven within the current OA
333 system. While authors may experience a sense of pressure to pay APCs, authors should reconsider the
334 options for circumventing APC costs because the OA model is not achieving its stated goals of
335 accessibility and inclusivity. APCs are not furthering equity, as shown by our LMIC first authorship
336 proxy, nor is there strong evidence that it is helping advance science in a way that is academically
337 significant as shown by our bibliometric proxy. With growing pressure from large biomedical research
338 agencies in the European Union and the United States (NIH) to publish OA, there is an opportunity to call
339 for an increase in transparency and equity(25). Authors have various choices to publish within the diverse
340 options laid out by the CC-BY framework(17,20,24). Several journals provide multiple licensing
341 pathways that would allow for the dissemination of scientific work outside the traditional OA publishing
342 model, such as self-archiving. Self-archiving can take place prior to or after publication depending on the
343 journal and access type (OA or subscription-based) and allows authors to share pre-print versions of their
344 research prior to peer-review and publication (30,31). More education and community-sensitization is
345 needed to improve authors' knowledge of the CC options available to them and to improve our
346 understanding of the factors affecting author's decisions to publish OA.

347

348 *Limitations*

349 Our study has several limitations. Firstly, journals analyzed are predominantly managed by publishing
350 houses in HICs, which may reflect a bias towards HIC perspectives and priorities. Factors such as

351 advertising, journal visibility, and author factors may affect citations more than the OA model itself and
352 may affect researchers' journal choice. The low number of LMIC first author's overall is linked to
353 complex factors extending beyond only APCs, requiring further evaluation. Waiver options for publishing
354 houses were included as opposed to individual journals. Further research is needed to improve
355 understanding around the complex factors that affect author choices of journals.

356

357 **Conclusion**

358 This review highlights financial and equity challenges posed by APCs in global surgery research. We
359 found that APCs impose a high financial burden and negatively affect authorship equity, particularly for
360 researchers from LMICs, with little justification provided by the weak correlation between bibliometrics
361 and APCs. These findings call for the exploration of alternative models such as tiered pricing and more
362 widespread availability of waivers to ensure that open access fulfills its promise of democratizing
363 knowledge across all economic contexts. This approach is essential for fostering a truly equitable
364 academic publishing environment.

365

366 **References**

- 367 1. BOAI. Budapest Open Access Initiative (BOAI) [Internet]. 2001 [cited 2024 Jul 24]. Available from:
368 <https://www.budapestopenaccessinitiative.org/>
- 369 2. Anderson R. Where Did the Open Access Movement Go Wrong?: An Interview with Richard Poynder
370 [Internet]. The Scholarly Kitchen. 2023 [cited 2024 Jul 24]. Available from:
371 <https://scholarlykitchen.sspnet.org/2023/12/07/where-did-the-open-access-movement-go-wrong-an-interview-with-richard-poynder/>
372
- 373 3. Borrego Á. Article processing charges for open access journal publishing: A review. *Learn Publ.* 2023
374 Jul;36(3):359–78.
- 375 4. Saloojee H, Pettifor JM. Maximizing Access and Minimizing Barriers to Research in Low- and
376 Middle-Income Countries: Open Access and Health Equity. *Calcif Tissue Int.* 2023 Nov
377 14;114(2):83–5.
- 378 5. Wojick M, Conner H, Farley A, Huaman E, Luyo M, Thomas-Pate S, et al. Access to evidence-based
379 care: a systematic review of trauma and surgical literature costs across resource settings. *Trauma
380 Surg Acute Care Open.* 2024 Jan;9(1):e001238.
- 381 6. Universities UK. Monitoring the Transition to Open Access [Internet]. Universities UK; 2017 Dec.
382 Available from: [https://www.universitiesuk.ac.uk/sites/default/files/uploads/Reports/monitoring-
383 transition-open-access-2017.pdf](https://www.universitiesuk.ac.uk/sites/default/files/uploads/Reports/monitoring-transition-open-access-2017.pdf)
- 384 7. Creative Commons (CC). 5.1 Open Access to Scholarship [Internet]. 2018. Available from:
385 <https://certificates.creativecommons.org/ccceducomments/chapter/6-1-open-access-to-scholarship/>

- 386 8. Yuen J, Muquit S, Whitfield PC. Correlation Between Cost of Publication and Journal Impact.
387 Comprehensive Cross-sectional Study of Exclusively Open-Access Surgical Journals. *J Surg Educ*.
388 2019 Jan 1;76(1):107–19.
- 389 9. Matheka DM, Nderitu J, Mutonga D, Otiti MI, Siegel K, Demaio AR. Open access: academic
390 publishing and its implications for knowledge equity in Kenya. *Glob Health*. 2014 Apr 9;10(1):26.
- 391 10. Viergever RF. The mismatch between the health research and development (R&D) that is needed and
392 the R&D that is undertaken: an overview of the problem, the causes, and solutions. *Glob Health*
393 *Action*. 2013 Dec;6(1):22450.
- 394 11. World Health Organization. Funding landscape for research on health, migration and displacement
395 [Internet]. 2023 [cited 2024 Aug 1]. Available from: [https://www.who.int/observatories/global-](https://www.who.int/observatories/global-observatory-on-health-research-and-development/monitoring/global-overview-of-the-major-funding-bodies-in-the-field-of-health-and-migration-research)
396 [observatory-on-health-research-and-development/monitoring/global-overview-of-the-major-funding-](https://www.who.int/observatories/global-observatory-on-health-research-and-development/monitoring/global-overview-of-the-major-funding-bodies-in-the-field-of-health-and-migration-research)
397 [bodies-in-the-field-of-health-and-migration-research](https://www.who.int/observatories/global-observatory-on-health-research-and-development/monitoring/global-overview-of-the-major-funding-bodies-in-the-field-of-health-and-migration-research)
- 398 12. Rowley J, Sbaifi L, Sugden M, Gilbert A. Factors influencing researchers' journal selection
399 decisions. *J Inf Sci*. 2022 Jun 1;48(3):321–35.
- 400 13. National Library of Medicine: Currently Indexed Journals [Internet]. 2024. Available from:
401 <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/nlmcatalog?term=currentyindexed>
- 402 14. SJR Journal Rankings [Internet]. 2024. Available from: <https://www.scimagojr.com/journalrank.php>
- 403 15. Bernard Becker Medical Library. Tools for Authors: What is the h index? [Internet]. 2024 [cited 2025
404 Jul 25]. Available from: <https://beckerguides.wustl.edu/authors/hindex>
- 405 16. The World Bank. GNI per capita [Internet]. 2024 [cited 2024 Jul 30]. Available from:
406 <https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/NY.GNP.PCAP.CD>
- 407 17. Creative Commons (CC). About CC Licenses [Internet]. [cited 2024 Aug 1]. Available from:
408 <https://creativecommons.org/share-your-work/ccllicenses/>
- 409 18. Knowledge Foundation. Open access [Internet]. [cited 2024 Sep 1]. Available from:
410 [https://www.kks.se/en/funding-and-assessment/open-access-to-research-results-and-a-broader-view-](https://www.kks.se/en/funding-and-assessment/open-access-to-research-results-and-a-broader-view-of-scientific-merit/#:~:text=When%20research%20results%20are%20made,more%20transparent%2C%20open%20and%20inclusive)
411 [of-scientific-](https://www.kks.se/en/funding-and-assessment/open-access-to-research-results-and-a-broader-view-of-scientific-merit/#:~:text=When%20research%20results%20are%20made,more%20transparent%2C%20open%20and%20inclusive)
412 [merit/#:~:text=When%20research%20results%20are%20made,more%20transparent%2C%20open%2](https://www.kks.se/en/funding-and-assessment/open-access-to-research-results-and-a-broader-view-of-scientific-merit/#:~:text=When%20research%20results%20are%20made,more%20transparent%2C%20open%20and%20inclusive)
413 [0and%20inclusive](https://www.kks.se/en/funding-and-assessment/open-access-to-research-results-and-a-broader-view-of-scientific-merit/#:~:text=When%20research%20results%20are%20made,more%20transparent%2C%20open%20and%20inclusive)
- 414 19. Hedt-Gauthier BL, Jeufack HM, Neufeld NH, Alem A, Sauer S, Odhiambo J, et al. Stuck in the
415 middle: a systematic review of authorship in collaborative health research in Africa, 2014–2016. *BMJ*
416 *Glob Health*. 2019 Oct;4(5):e001853.
- 417 20. Morrison H, Borges L, Zhao X, Kakou TL, Shanbhoug AN. Change and growth in open access
418 journal publishing and charging trends 2011–2021. *J Assoc Inf Sci Technol*. 2022 Dec;73(12):1793–
419 805.
- 420 21. Electronic Information for Libraries (EIFL). EIFL-negotiated agreements with publishers for Article
421 Processing Charges [Internet]. 2024. Available from: <https://eifl.net/apcs>


- 422 22. International Science Council. ALLEA advocates for EU-wide secondary publication rights and
423 better negotiation of ‘big deals’ [Internet]. 2022 [cited 2024 Oct 6]. Available from:
424 [https://council.science/news/allea-advocates-for-eu-wide-secondary-publication-rights-and-better-](https://council.science/news/allea-advocates-for-eu-wide-secondary-publication-rights-and-better-negotiation-of-big-deals/)
425 [negotiation-of-big-deals/](https://council.science/news/allea-advocates-for-eu-wide-secondary-publication-rights-and-better-negotiation-of-big-deals/)
- 426 23. National Institutes of Health (NIH). Request for Information on the National Institutes of Health
427 Draft Public Access Policy [Internet]. 2024. Available from:
428 [https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2024/06/18/2024-13373/request-for-information-on-the-](https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2024/06/18/2024-13373/request-for-information-on-the-national-institutes-of-health-draft-public-access-policy)
429 [national-institutes-of-health-draft-public-access-policy](https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2024/06/18/2024-13373/request-for-information-on-the-national-institutes-of-health-draft-public-access-policy)
- 430 24. National Institutes of Health (NIH)]. Open Access Publishing and Resources [Internet]. 2024.
431 Available from: <https://guides.dml.georgetown.edu/openaccess/NIHOpenAccess>
- 432 25. National Institutes of Health (NIH). APC Funding Pilot [Internet]. Available from:
433 <https://www.nihlibrary.nih.gov/apc-funding>
- 434 26. Naujokaitytė G. EU governments to rein in unfair academic publishers and unsustainable fees
435 [Internet]. 2023. Available from: [https://sciencebusiness.net/news/Universities/eu-governments-rein-](https://sciencebusiness.net/news/Universities/eu-governments-rein-unfair-academic-publishers-and-unsustainable-fees)
436 [unfair-academic-publishers-and-unsustainable-fees](https://sciencebusiness.net/news/Universities/eu-governments-rein-unfair-academic-publishers-and-unsustainable-fees)
- 437 27. Charani E, Abimbola S, Pai M, Adeyi O, Mendelson M, Laxminarayan R, et al. Funders: The missing
438 link in equitable global health research? Ventura D de FL, editor. PLOS Glob Public Health. 2022
439 Jun 3;2(6):e0000583.
- 440 28. NPAA Central Library. Bibliometrics and Research Evaluation: Home [Internet]. 2024 [cited 2024
441 Jul 24]. Available from:
442 [https://libguides.library.noaa.gov/bibliometrics#:~:text=Bibliometrics%20are%20the%20quantitative](https://libguides.library.noaa.gov/bibliometrics#:~:text=Bibliometrics%20are%20the%20quantitative%20analysis,produced%2C%20organized%2C%20and%20interrelated.)
443 [%20analysis,produced%2C%20organized%2C%20and%20interrelated.](https://libguides.library.noaa.gov/bibliometrics#:~:text=Bibliometrics%20are%20the%20quantitative%20analysis,produced%2C%20organized%2C%20and%20interrelated.)
- 444 29. National Science Foundation. Publication Output by Region, Country, or Economy and by Scientific
445 Field [Internet]. 2023 [cited 2024 Aug 1]. Available from:
446 [https://nces.nsf.gov/pubs/nsb202333/publication-output-by-region-country-or-economy-and-by-](https://nces.nsf.gov/pubs/nsb202333/publication-output-by-region-country-or-economy-and-by-scientific-field)
447 [scientific-field](https://nces.nsf.gov/pubs/nsb202333/publication-output-by-region-country-or-economy-and-by-scientific-field)
- 448 30. Nature. Self archiving and license to publish [Internet]. 2024 [cited 2024 Oct 6]. Available from:
449 <https://www.nature.com/nphys/editorial-policies/self-archiving-and-license-to-publish>
- 450 31. Springer Nature. Editorial Policies [Internet]. 2024 [cited 2024 Oct 6]. Available from:
451 <https://www.springernature.com/de/policies/editorial-policies>

452

453

APC Manuscript final figures

Figure 1: Study flow diagram showing journals included in the analysis



medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.11.22.24317779>; this version posted November 22, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

Table 1: Characteristics of Included Journals

Characteristic	Overall, N = 2,001 ¹	Other Medicine, N = 1,552 ¹	Public Health, N = 180 ¹	Surgery, N = 269 ¹	p-value ²
Article Processing Charge (\$ USD)	3,700 (3,190, 4,220)	3,700 (3,190, 4,270)	3,690 (3,190, 4,045)	3,690 (3,200, 4,118)	0.2
Scientific Journal Ranking	0.87 (0.63, 1.25)	0.89 (0.64, 1.30)	0.91 (0.64, 1.25)	0.78 (0.59, 1.03)	<0.001
H-Index	89 (59, 132)	93 (61, 140)	80 (55, 106)	79 (56, 112)	<0.001
LMIC First Author Percentage (%)	4 (1, 10)	4 (1, 9)	4 (1, 12)	4 (2, 8)	0.3
Open vs Hybrid					0.016
Hybrid	1,658 (83%)	1,278 (82%)	142 (79%)	238 (88%)	
Open	343 (17%)	274 (18%)	38 (21%)	31 (12%)	


¹ Median (IQR); n (%)

² Kruskal-Wallis rank sum test; Pearson's Chi-squared test

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.11.22.24317779>; this version posted November 22, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/) .

Figure 2: Mean APC as a percentage of GNI per Capita



medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.11.22.24317779>; this version posted November 22, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

Table 2: Model predicting the effect of SJR and H-index on LMIC First Authorship Percentage

	<i>Dependent variable:</i>	
	LMIC Author Percentage	
	SJR Model (1)	H-Index Model (2)
SJR (standardized)	-2.711*** (0.493)	
H-Index (standardized)		-3.055*** (0.478)
APC in USD (500)	-0.733*** (0.125)	-0.545*** (0.111)
Category: Public Health	-0.179 (0.766)	-0.589 (0.765)
Category: Surgery	-1.360** (0.645)	-1.623** (0.644)
Pub. Options: Hybrid	0.245 (0.829)	-0.272 (0.865)
SJR moderated by APC	0.165** (0.041)	
H-Index moderated by APC		0.149*** (0.039)
Constant	12.878*** (1.009)	11.621*** (0.908)
Observations	2,001	2,001
R ²	0.045	0.054
Adjusted R ²	0.042	0.051
Residual Std. Error (df = 1994)	9.714	9.669
F Statistic (df = 6; 1994)	15.715***	18.941***
<i>Note:</i>	*p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01	

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.11.22.24317779>; this version posted November 22, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](#).

Figure 3: Association between APCs, journal impact and LMIC first authorship





Figure 4: Effect of increasing SJR and APCs on LMIC first authorship




medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.11.22.24317779>; this version posted November 22, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

Table 3: Distribution of Creative Commons (CC) License options among Journals.

CC Status	Definition ¹²	Number of Journals (%)
CC BY	Allows others to copy, distribute, display, and perform the work and derivative works based upon it, but only if they give the author or licensor the credits in the manner specified by these.	1070/1094 (97.8%)
CC BY-NC	Allows others to copy, distribute, display, and perform the work and derivative works based upon it, but for non-commercial purposes only.	525/1094 (48%)
CC BY-ND	Allows for redistribution, commercial and non-commercial, as long as it is passed along unchanged and in whole, with credit to the author.	3/1094 (0.3%)
CC BY-NC-ND	Allows others to download the works and share them with others as long as they credit the author, but they can't change them in any way or use them commercially.	452/1094 (41.3%)
CC 0	Allows practitioners to waive all their copyright and related rights, making the work available to the public domain to be used for any purpose without any conditions, unless such conditions are required by law	119/1094 (10.9%)

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.11.22.24317779>; this version posted November 22, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](#).

Figure 1: Study flow diagram showing journals included in the analysis




medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.11.22.24317779>; this version posted November 22, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

APC Manuscript final figures

Figure 2: Mean APC as a percentage of GNI per Capita



medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.11.22.24317779>; this version posted November 22, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

APC Manuscript final figures

Figure 1: Study flow diagram showing journals included in the analysis

Figure 3: Association between APCs, journal impact and LMIC first authorship.





Figure 4: Effect of increasing SJR and APCs on LMIC first authorship



medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.11.22.24317779>; this version posted November 22, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](#).