

Working Group Tools R&D

Towards community-driven tools
for scholarly communication



This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement No731031

Scope and method

- Description and definition
 - A State-of-the-art not a benchmark
- Based on partners' experience and needs
 - Possible and useful developments
- Stresses the importance of Open Source
 - Necessary to build an OA Infrastructure
- First elements of an OPERAS toolbox
 - Community-driven toolbox of community-driven tools?

Analysis based on researcher's activity



State of the art of the 3 functions

Peer Reviewing

- Integrated in Open Source software (e.g. OJS) but mostly proprietary
- Innovations related to Open Peer Review

Authoring

- Current developments for online tools based on mark-up languages
- Often limited when Open Source

Publishing

- Dynamic but also confused environment proposing mature tools

Trends, Needs and Opportunities

- Trend from traditional publishing to **online collaborative** tools (XML, LateX, ...)
- Requests for **easy-to-use** and **interoperable** tools
- Risk of **lock-in** within a full suite of (proprietary) services
- Need of tools adapted to **monographs** and **SSH** area
- Opportunities for **Open Source** developments

Elements for a Toolbox

Classification table by type, function, governance

Tools	Openness	Type	Function
...
F1000 research	not open	service	Open PR, publication
FidusWriter	open	application	authoring
Fulcrum	open	application	publishing, books
Hypothes.is	open	service	OpenPR, authoring
Janeway	open	application	publishing
Libero (elife)	open	application / component	publishing
literatum	open	application	publishing
Lodel	open	application	publishing
Manifold	open	application	authoring
ManuscriptsApp	to be opened	application	authoring
OJS	open	application	PR workflow, publishing
...

Elements for a Toolbox

Criteria to select tools

- Technical: Type, Maturity, Standards...
- Usage: Usability, Community, Documentation...
- Governance: License, Ownership, Roadmap...
- Functional: Features

Elements for a Toolbox

Criteria to select tools

- Technical: Type, Maturity, Standards...
- Usage: Usability, Community, Documentation...
- Governance: License, Ownership, Roadmap...
- Functional: Features

Elements for a Toolbox

Table of comparison

- Example of Annotation Tools:

	Hypothesis	Colwiz	Paperhive	Remarq	Pundit	Bibsonomy
Social annotation	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes?
Works everywhere	Yes	No	No	Only for personal notes	Yes	No
Open source	Yes	No	partially (front end)	No	Yes	?
Non-profit	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes?
W3C standard - data model	Yes	No	In progress	Claimed	Yes	?
W3C standard - protocol	In progress	No	In progress	No	No	?
...						

Contact Point:

patrick.gendre@openedition.org

arnaud.gingold@openedition.org

Thank you for your attention.