

## Streamlining Deposit:

### OJS Deposit Requirements Interviews

Prepared by:

Dr Stephann Makri, UI Lead, Centre for Information Science, City University London

Dr Ernesto Priego, Project lead, Centre for Information Science, City University London;

Andy Byers, Lead Developer, Ubiquity Press

Mauro Sánchez, Developer, Ubiquity Press

#dataspring July 2015

### Potential usefulness of depositing functionality

- P1 noted the time and effort it currently takes to deposit articles: *“Half the agro with uploading things is having to go through the process again and again. You write a paper, then you upload it to the journal, then you upload it to Mendeley and then Adademia.edu and then Figshare and it’s like arghhh! You get tired of filling in the same details over and over again. It can be quite time-consuming.”* – P1
- When asked if she currently deposited her articles using Figshare, P1 explained that it was something she intends to do, but *“just hasn’t gotten round to.”* When asked what was holding her back, she explained it was *“the rigmarole of going through the upload process again.”*
- P1 stated that streamlined depositing functionality in OJS *“would just make life simpler because you wouldn’t have to go through the whole upload process again.”*
- P2 commented *“it would be super useful if you wrote your thing for the Grid, then having an ‘export this to’ option. That would be ideal. Then having the freedom to choose whatever repository you wanted to share it with.”* Similarly P3 commented that *“from an author’s perspective there is value of ensuring that your article is in more than one place. And if there are buttons saying ‘do you want to fire this somewhere else?, good!”*
- P4 noted the potential for depositing functionality to improve take-up of Open Access publication: *“I think universities have been lacking the will to use Creative Commons and Open Access as a real way to share knowledge. So I think it would be awesome to be able to share articles with just a few clicks. It would be great!”*
- P4 also noted that depositing functionality might increase readership levels of articles: *“What you want as an author is to be read. Such effort goes into writing that I’m sure authors would want their articles to be read as widely as possible and to produce as much knowledge as they can.”*

### Requirements for depositing functionality

- P5 commented that he hoped *“it would be a kind of ‘click and submit’ process”* where users are not required to take much action. He stated: *“Usually when you have to deposit an article, a lot of the pressure or onus is placed on the submitter. So it would be great to have a repository where a person could submit a file in just about any kind of format and have the repository say ‘this is a Word file or PDF’ and deal with it accordingly. The less pressure you put on the author to make sure everything’s working well within the system, the better.”* (P5)
- P1 suggested the possibility of using depositing functionality to encourage authors to keep their work all ‘in one place,’ in a favourite data repository: *“I think it would be useful to have everything in one place. You’ll be able to find articles you’ve submitted easily because they’ll all be in one place.”* – P1. She referred to this functionality as a personal ‘vault’ of articles.
- P3 explained the importance of not only depositing articles, but also data: *“It’s always valuable to have a process where it’s prodding people to think about data.”* He noted, however, that some authors might be unaware that they have useful data to deposit (citing an example of public domain images, which may be considered research data).
- P1 and P4 expected the depositing functionality to work with an opt-in/opt-out option, *“where you could say ‘I would like to upload this to the repository’. Having it as a tick box would be great”* (P2). P4 also suggested a tick box, where users could choose which individual repositories they would like to deposit to. She commented that she would like the online depositing experience to mirror offline document sharing practice. She would want the tool to ask users: *“Now you gave me your paper and I have it in my hands, would you like me to share a copy with the next faculty? And I would say yes or no. If you say yes, they will make copies for you and you can either share them yourself or they would do it for you. And that would, of course, be better.”*
- Similarly P2 suggested the potential to automatically capture useful metadata about an article, but to have an option where the author can review the metadata about to be submitted to the repository. He commented that the advantage, for someone like him, *“who would want to put things in very different repositories, with different tags, is having the flexibility to make changes.”* (P2). Whereas for an author *“who just wants rid of the thing... there’s already something there that the editors can work with.”* (P2).
- P1 suggested the possibility of inter-linking data repositories so that authors could automatically deposit an article in multiple repositories at once. *“You could choose which repositories you wanted to submit to from a drop-down list and it would submit them all at once”* (P1). Similarly, P2 described the possibility of an ‘export’ button, where an article could be deposited on one of many repositories.
- P4 also implied the need for inter-linking repositories and suggested the plugin posing the question to users: *“Once you upload your article here, would you like to be able to share it here, here and here?”* (P4).
- When asked whether she would want depositing functionality to work in the background of OJS, or whether she would want some control, P1 commented that she would like some control over whether an individual article would be deposited in a repository and which repository or repositories the article would be submitted to. An implication is that authors should be asked during each

submission whether they want to deposit this article and where, rather than having a default setting where articles are always/never deposited in a particular repository.

- P2 explained the need to explain any errors in depositing clearly to users, stating that *“anything that makes it straightforward and flags up for you where things have gone wrong would be super useful.”* He went on to explain *“I don’t want to have to think too much about what goes on under the hood,”* but he did want to be able to revise document tagging on content and subject area depending on which repository he was depositing to.
- P3 highlighted the role depositing functionality might play in promoting best practice in article submission and depositing; reminding authors of *“the things you know you should do and sit in the back of your mind but that occasionally you might forget.”* He provided the example of being prompted to link an ORCID account during the article submission process.
- P5 expressed a need for guidance on the process of submitting and depositing an article, perhaps in the form of ‘live chat’ functionality, or an explanatory YouTube video: *“The expensive option is to have somebody available online to go through with an author the process for submitting the article, so the person submitting has a contact to make sure that everything is going alright. The cheaper option is to have a YouTube video of the process, so that people knew they were doing it correctly.”* (P5).
- P5 also expressed the need for clearer instructions as part of the holistic article submission and depositing process. He thought the reason that instructions were often unclear were because: *“they’re not thinking about the User Experience, they’re thinking about their experience as receivers of the document... I don’t know anybody who enjoys submitting articles by electronic means... We have to do it, but it’s worse than writing the paper!”* (P5).

### **Risks and challenges for depositing functionality (and mitigations)**

- P1 mentioned the possibility of users inadvertently depositing an article that they did not intend to publish publically and *“all hell breaking loose.”* P1 suggested this risk could be mitigated by having an enforced checkbox, so authors could not automatically deposit an article without first ticking the box. Simple, clear depositing instructions explaining the implications of depositing involved might also mitigate this risk.
- P2 discussed the need to create as close as possible a mapping between the article’s existing metadata and the data requirements of the repository to which the article is being submitted. He also mentioned the need to strike a balance between flexibility and control: *“You don’t want so much flexibility that people are putting things through and all that metadata is useless or incorrect. You want it to be a system where even if people enter the bare minimum metadata, it still produces something useful”* (P2). He commented that *“there needs to be a middle ground between fuss and flexibility”* (P2). Similarly, P3 used to work with an institutional repository. He highlighted the ‘big struggle’ of *“on the one hand trying to give people freedom so they’re not stuck in a bureaucratic process, where they have to wait months so that their work appears on the repository and not overburdening authors with manually having to complete all the metadata.”*

- P3 voiced a concern that metadata submitted to OJS journals “*gets lost in a way, because there’s so much emphasis on ensuring that your pre-prints are available in some form. The metadata is not presented back to you.*”
- P3 also voiced a concern that, in the current transition period of Open Access where there may be suspicion of mandates and authors may feel as though they have a ‘forced hand,’ any depositing functionality should not be ‘too radical.’ He explained: “*Platforms build around open journals understand that they have to look and feel the way people would expect. If they are too new, too radical, you know ‘we’re trying to connect you up with the universe in these different ways.’ That can disillusion some people.*” (P3).
- P3 explained the need to ‘keep the human side’ of the article submission and depositing process by not making the process ‘too automated.’ He commented: “*There will always be people who fear this becomes a pathway that is too bureaucratic, where you can never have that nice correspondence with your editor. It’s trying to keep the human side of it and not making it too automated. There is a balance to be struck.*” (P3).

### **What would determine success of depositing functionality**

- “*That people would actually use it*” (P1). When asked what would make people want to use the functionality, she mentioned the importance of visual design and straightforward navigation: “*how easy it is to visually navigate the space is really important*” (P1). An implication of this is that the interaction flow and usability of the depositing process are important.
- P3 suggested that the depositing functionality would be deemed successful if “*you don’t notice it*” and if “*it didn’t overburden you with expectations.*”
- P4 suggested the depositing functionality would be successful if it reduced depositing time for users as compared with manual depositing.
- P5 suggested the importance of usability criteria when determining success. He suggested asking usability-related questions to author such as ‘how easy was it to submit your article? What problems did you have? What didn’t you understand?’
- P5 also suggested the need for it to be easy to sort and organise articles *within* repositories: “*It could be organising articles according to author, or theme or keywords.*”
- P5 also suggested the importance of user testing throughout the design process: “*I think when it comes to submitting articles electronically, we are still in trial and error mode. People who are setting them up don’t necessarily know what testing is needed for these things*” (P5).

This document was shared on figshare as

Streamlining Deposit: OJS Deposit Requirements Interviews. Stephann Makri, Ernesto Priego, Andy Byers, Mauro Sanchez. [figshare](https://figshare.com).

Retrieved 17:07, Jul 13, 2015 (GMT)

<http://dx.doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.1481067>