

# HIFA discussion on healthcare professionals' experiences and perceptions of open access publishing: EDITED VERSION

From 13 October to 14 November 2025 HIFA hosted an in-depth discussion on healthcare professionals' experiences and perceptions of open access publishing, sponsored by Oxford PharmaGenesis

Details here: <https://www.hifa.org/news/hifa-announces-deep-dive-discussion-healthcare-professionals%E2%80%99-experiences-and-perceptions-open>

There were 130 messages from 25 participants in 12 countries (Australia, Cameroon, Canada, Honduras, India, Jordan, Nigeria, Norway, Switzerland, Tanzania, UK, US).

This document provides verbatim content organised under subheadings. To review other outputs see: <https://www.hifa.org/projects/open-access>

## Contents

(each heading/subheading links to corresponding section in text)

Introduction.....	4
Objectives.....	4
Definitions and scope.....	5
Open access to pharma-funded research.....	5
Acknowledgement.....	6
Week 1. What is the impact of open access (OA) on health care? .....	6
Benefits of open access.....	6
What kinds of information do health professionals need to deliver quality health care? .....	7
Example: Information for prescribers and users of medicines.....	8
Use of abstracts by health professionals.....	8
To what extent do health professionals have access to subscription journals? .....	9
To what extent do health professionals need access to original research to deliver quality health care? .....	9
What are the benefits and limitations of open access to original research for health professionals?.....	10
Direct impacts of open access to original research on quality of health care .....	10
Specific examples: from HIFA members.....	11

South Africa .....	11
Afrihealth Optonet Association .....	11
Central Hospital, Yaounde .....	12
Hospital Escuela in Tegucigalpa, Honduras .....	12
SHDEPHA+, Tanzania.....	13
Has open access to research ever saved a life?.....	13
Specific examples from Chat GPT .....	14
Update a clinical guideline.....	14
Child with fever .....	14
Early Detection of Stroke Using MRI.....	14
Antibiotic Resistance and Treatment Protocols.....	15
Early Intervention for Preterm Birth.....	15
Emergency Treatment for Cardiac Arrest .....	16
Nutritional Interventions for Malnutrition in Children.....	17
Five more ChatGPT examples from David Cawthorpe .....	17
#1 .....	18
#2 .....	18
#3 .....	19
#4 .....	19
#5 .....	20
A PubMed search for examples where OA to research has saved a life.....	21
Indirect impacts of open access to original research.....	21
Impact of OA on society.....	22
Impact of OA on the overall global evidence ecosystem .....	22
Impact of OA on evidence generation: health research.....	22
Impact of OA on the publishing and indexing of evidence .....	22
Impact of OA on evidence synthesis: systematic reviews and clinical guidelines.....	23
Impact of OA on evidence repackaging.....	23
Impact of OA on HIFA.....	23
Relevance and reliability of open access content.....	24
Quality of evidence .....	24
Examples of open access to research resources.....	25
PubMed Central .....	25
Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report .....	25
Examples of OA non-research resources (eg training materials, guidelines, health education materials) .....	26

Wikipedia.....	26
Afrihealth OptoNet .....	26
Week 2. What is your experience of OA as a healthcare professional/reader?.....	27
Positive impacts.....	27
Citations .....	27
Supporting policy and practice.....	27
Negative impacts .....	27
Epistemic impact .....	27
Week 3. What is your experience of OA as a researcher/author? .....	28
Introduction.....	28
Positive impacts.....	28
General comments.....	28
Increasing the reach and impact of research .....	28
Conception and implementation of research.....	28
Promoting research collaboration .....	29
Positive experience with preprints .....	29
Negative impacts: APCs .....	29
Other negative impacts .....	29
Predatory journals .....	29
Publisher-researcher relations .....	30
Lack of incentive for researchers.....	30
Negative perceptions of OA journals.....	30
Week 4. How would you design an OA system that retains the benefits but fixes the problems of the current OA system?.....	30
Introduction.....	30
Strengthening the global evidence ecosystem.....	31
Plan S.....	31
Plan U.....	32
Funders should stop paying APCs .....	32
Gates Open Access Policy .....	32
Potential consequences of stopping APCs.....	33
Open letter to Gates Foundation .....	34
Funders should cap APCs .....	34
We should shift the emphasis to preprints .....	36
Problems of preprints .....	36
Other considerations .....	37

Transaction agreements between academic institutions and publishers.....	37
Diamond OA journals .....	37
Governance .....	38
Co-development .....	38
Bibliodiversity.....	38
A global OA fund.....	38
Alternatives to ‘publish or perish’ .....	38
ChatGPT’s recommendation for an OA model .....	38
Week 5. Open discussion and next steps.....	40
General reflections .....	40
What do publishers think?.....	40
Case study: GHSP .....	40
Maintaining quality, ICTs and AI .....	40
Open data.....	41
Language.....	41
Impact of COVID-19 .....	41
Unanswered (or partially answered) questions (#105).....	41

WG = working group

NPW = Neil Pakenham-Walsh, moderator

## Introduction

### Objectives

WG: Healthcare professionals’ perceptions and experiences of open access publishing have not been well documented. To address this knowledge gap, we are keen to explore the following factors:

- How important is open access publishing for healthcare professionals?
- What are the perceived benefits and barriers of open access publishing for healthcare professionals, as readers and users of scientific content?
- What is the impact of \*not\* publishing open access on healthcare professionals, especially for those who \*do not\* have access via an institutional subscription?

We seek input from all stakeholders in the global evidence ecosystem

We are especially interested to hear actual practical examples and observations. For example, can you describe a situation where (lack of) access to the full text of a paper has impacted a healthcare professional's ability to optimally manage a patient?

The suggested sequence of the discussion (by week) is:

1. What is the impact of open access (OA) on health care?
2. What is your experience of OA as a healthcare professional/reader?
3. What is your experience of OA as a researcher/author?
4. How would you design an OA system that retains the benefits but fixes the problems of the current OA system?
5. Open discussion and next steps.

## Definitions and scope

WG: For the purpose of this discussion, when we refer to 'open access' we use the Budapest Open Access Initiative (BOAI) definition: 'Open access to scientific literature means free availability on the public internet, permitting any users to read, download, copy, distribute, print, search, or link to the full texts of these articles...' <https://www.budapestopenaccessinitiative.org/read/>

The term 'scientific literature' here refers to 'peer-reviewed articles and other formal publications' <https://www.sciencedirect.com/topics/social-sciences/scientific-literature>

We are particularly keen to look at open access to peer-reviewed academic research papers, which are mostly published in biomedical research journals. Such papers are typically either original primary research or secondary research such as systematic reviews. So a more specific wording of our question would be: What is the impact of open access to health research on health care?

The term 'open access' can be applied not only to research papers but to almost any type of publication: educational resources, formularies, books, clinical guidelines, editorials, commentaries, blogs, books...

NPW: By definition, open access content is more useful than closed-access content, because it can be accessed by anyone (with an internet connection) and it can be freely adapted, reused and reproduced.

Uzodinma Adirieje, Nigeria: I expect that this deep-dive discussion on open access publishing will explore its principles, benefits, and challenges in advancing equitable knowledge sharing. I expect that participants will gain a clear understanding of how open access enhances research visibility, collaboration, and global impact, especially for scholars like me who are in resource-constrained low- and middle-income countries. The discussion should also examine funding models, quality assurance, copyright, and predatory publishing concerns. By the end, we should be able to identify best practices for publishing in credible open-access journals, leveraging repositories, and aligning with policies that promote transparency, innovation, and inclusive access to scientific and academic information worldwide, especially in Africa and all developing countries globally, towards achieving the overall goals of the SDGs/Agenda 2030, and African Union's 2063 Agenda.

## Open access to pharma-funded research

Joanna Donnelly, UK: Although pharma companies fund approximately half of all biomedical research, access to a substantial amount of this biomedical research is restricted by journal paywalls. Open access publishing ensures that the highest quality peer-reviewed evidence is available to anyone who needs it, anywhere in the world. This has the potential to improve

transparency, advance medical science and, we believe, improve patient care. Our position statement on open access ultimately advocates for all research to be made free to read and reuse from the date of publication.

NPW: If all pharma-funded research were open access, would this help drive improvements in patient care?

Chris Winchester, UK: I am a co-Founder of Open Pharma, an initiative to advance the publication of pharmaceutical and biotech company results. Pharmaceutical companies now publish essentially all of their clinical trials but many of the results are stuck behind paywalls. To achieve 100% open access, they will have to persuade some of the world's most influential journals to change their policies, and offer them the same opportunity to publish open access as non-commercial funders such as the National Institutes of Health, the Gates Foundation and Wellcome Trust.

## Acknowledgement

HIFA is grateful for sponsorship from Oxford PharmaGenesis, a HealthScience communications consultancy based near Oxford UK.

## Week 1. What is the impact of open access (OA) on health care?

NPW: Our discussions over the years on HIFA have demonstrated that access to relevant, reliable healthcare information is essential for quality care. Such information is essential not only in hospital environments, but also in the home, community and primary care. And it is as essential for a family living in a remote rural area of a low-income country as it is for a tertiary care specialist.

## Benefits of open access

Joanna Donnelly, UK: The benefits of open access publishing are well established, as outlined in the UNESCO recommendations on open science (<https://www.unesco.org/en/legal-affairs/recommendation-open-science>).

NPW: The Open Access Network [open-access.net](https://open-access.network/en/information/open-access-primers/arguments...) - a platform that 'provides comprehensive information on the subject of Open Access (OA) and offers practical advice on its implementation'. <https://open-access.network/en/information/open-access-primers/arguments...>

NPW: It describes 12 benefits of open access:

1. Faster and Cost-Free Access to Scholarly Information
2. Fair Use of Taxpayers' Money, Research Funders' Guidelines
3. Open Access to Results of Publicly Funded Research
4. Greater Visibility and Citation Frequency of Publications
5. Promotion of International and Inter-Disciplinary Cooperation
6. Authors Retain the Right to Exploit their Works
7. Long-Term Availability of the Documents
8. Promotion of Research Efficiency

9. Improvement of the Information Supply and a Way Out of the Serials Crisis
10. Advantages in Networked, IT-Supported Work Environments
11. Establishing Priority
12. Good Findability via Search Engines and Indexing Services

NPW: For each of the above there is a short description. I think 1, 4, 10 and 12 would potentially have a direct impact on the availability and use of reliable healthcare information, and therefore potential impact on health care. Some of the others might have an indirect impact.

Chris Zielinski, UK: Open Access allows those wishing to read health literature to do so for free, without any paywalls, without paying heavy journal subscription costs. This is obviously very welcome, particularly in resource-poor environments.

## What kinds of information do health professionals need to deliver quality health care?

NPW: What is most useful and most reliable for health workers is repackaged information (such as clinical guidelines, formularies, educational resources, textbooks) that are rigorously developed (which normally means they are based on cumulative evidence synthesis such as systematic reviews).

Unni Gopinathan, Norway: I think for most clinical and managerial contexts, people will benefit more from synthesized and repackaged evidence—such as guidelines, policy briefs, or decision-support tools—than from direct access to primary studies, which are often inconclusive in isolation. However, for questions related to health system organization, governance, and financing, access to local research remains particularly valuable. Local studies often contain contextual insights not necessarily present in global syntheses and can inform decisions about service delivery models or participatory mechanisms. Perhaps such local evidence together with global syntheses can be useful for interpreting and applying evidence meaningfully within local contexts.

NPW: Access to the full text of original research papers is not the main priority for the vast majority of health professionals to guide their decision-making. Single research studies are seldom sufficient to inform decision-making (for reliable evidence we need the input of component 3 - those who synthesise evidence as in systematic reviews and guidelines). Further, the full text of research papers is not in a format that is useful to most users (for this we need the input of component 4 - those who repackage evidence). After all, a research paper describes the method and findings of the study, but is not designed to make recommendations. The same can be said of systematic reviews - 'Cochrane has always emphasised that systematic reviews do not make recommendations' <https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC10845861/> It is the task of guideline developers to oversee the formulation of key questions, evidence retrieval and synthesis (eg systematic reviews), and appraisal of the quality of the evidence, and on the basis of these to make recommendations.

NPW: We have discussed previously on HIFA how the term 'evidence-informed practice' continues to be misunderstood. We have heard for example that there are many healthcare providers who will base a clinical decision on the findings of a single study, misunderstanding that doing so is 'evidence-informed practice' (it isn't). Evidence-informed practice demands that

healthcare providers make their decisions on the cumulative evidence, as provided by systematic reviews (which in turn inform recommendations and guidelines).

NPW: The impact of open access on translation of evidence into practice will therefore depend not only on everyone having access to the full text, but as much (if not more) on knowing when and how such full text is to be used.

#### *Example: Information for prescribers and users of medicines*

NPW: Prescribers and users do not have access to the reliable information they need to use antibiotics responsibly, as noted by HIFA in our systematic review: How primary healthcare workers obtain information during consultations to aid safe prescribing in low-income and lower middle-income countries: a systematic review <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/32337085/>

NPW: A recent paper estimates that 30-36% of antibiotics consumed worldwide are used inappropriately, <https://bmjpublichealth.bmj.com/content/3/1/e002411>

NPW: And the latest district health study in India finds that 1 in 5 children with simple diarrhoea seen by a health worker are inappropriately given antibiotics. ('Simple' refers here to diarrhoea without blood. The presence of blood may indicate a bacterial infection that requires antibiotics) <https://www.hifa.org/about-hifa/why-hifa-needed>

NPW: Health workers need not only information on individual medicines, but, even more importantly, guidance on which antibiotic to prescribe in any given clinical context. In the UK there is a guide called the British National Formulary, paper copies of which are commonly used by health workers worldwide (many of them supplied by the Commonwealth Pharmaceutical Association). The BNF used to be freely available on the internet, but this is no longer the case. Furthermore the publisher is stopping print copies. It is hard to estimate how many lives would be saved if the BNF - and national adaptations of it - were freely available to all prescribers (and to all users) of medicines. We have asked this question before, but it is worth asking again: What if the British National Formulary was made available under an open access licence?

### Use of abstracts by health professionals

NPW: A google search identified a BMJ correspondence (2009) from a physician in the Philippines asks: Can journal abstracts alone be used for clinical decision making?

NPW: He notes: 'We recently asked some physicians practicing mostly in developing countries whether Medline abstracts are adequate for clinical decisions: 28% (15/54) categorically stated they are. Forty three percent (23/54) said no, but that they had no access to full-text journals and another 28% also said no, but they had no time to read full-text articles. One respondent did not use Medline abstracts at all. This preliminary study confirms access issues in these countries, but also the potential value for abstracts if these could be made available easily through their existing infrastructure.'

NPW: The authors didn't acknowledge the wider limitations of using single research papers to inform decisions.

NPW: 'If journal abstracts are accepted as 'current evidence' suitable for evidence-based practice, then all who are involved in the publication process -- authors, journal reviewers and editors, need to ensure that the abstract is indeed an accurate summary of the full paper.'



## To what extent do health professionals have access to subscription journals?

NPW: I am getting a sense from our discussion and one-to-one communications that access to full text of subscription journals is not a major problem for health professionals who work in a university setting, because universities typically subscribe to all the major journals. That said, I expect some universities are unable to afford to subscribe to these journals so paywalls remain a problem. Would anyone like to comment, whether from a high-income or LMIC?

Ind Trehan, United States: Great question. As someone with the privilege of working in universities in high-income countries, I've virtually never been unable to access a subscription-only article. The universities and hospitals subscribe to large numbers of journals, usually through package deals with publishers which do indeed have the benefit of allowing smaller less-profitable journals to survive. On those occasions where an article or journal was not available, our libraries can generally get access to virtually any article (or book) by borrowing from a partner university through an inter-library loan. This may take a few extra days for an article but access is almost always available, so ultimately it hasn't been a real problem yet, at least for large American universities as far as I have seen.

Ind Trehan, United States: The cost of these university [subscription] packages continues to increase and much has been written about how difficult it is for university library budgets to keep supporting these, which is especially ironic since it is often the same university researchers that are producing the content that goes into those journals, research that is often publicly funded itself. A vicious circle that has led to some high-profile disagreements between universities and publishers. It is not clear how these conflicts will play out, but one approach here has been for the university to set up agreements with certain publishers for the university to pay for their researchers' open-access fees instead of, or in addition to, paying for the subscription costs to the journals.

NPW: Some universities can benefit from Hinari, which provides free or low-cost access to many subscription journals for specific types of institutions in eligible countries. Further details are here: <https://www.research4life.org/access/eligibility/>

NPW: It would be great to hear from Hinari users. Some years ago HIFA members reported difficulties with access to Hinari, but hopefully these have now been resolved? See also: Research4Life: January 2025 Newsletter and Impact Report - <https://www.hifa.org/dgroups-rss/research4life-january-2025-newsletter-a...>

## To what extent do health professionals need access to original research to deliver quality health care?

NPW: To what extent do health professionals in different contexts require access to the full text of systematic reviews? What subset of health professionals require such access?

NPW: The full text of original research is not the most important requirement for most health professionals and patients in most circumstances. A health professional (or patient) would not normally be advised to make a healthcare decision on the basis of a single research paper. Typically their information needs are met by derivative publications, developed rigorously on the basis of evidence synthesis/systematic reviews.

NPW: What evidence do health workers need to guide their decision-making? Arguably, they do not generally need access to original primary research as this is almost always inconclusive.

NPW: Who needs access to original research and why? What information sources do health professionals most often use to guide healthcare decisions? original research papers, drug formularies, systematic reviews, clinical guidelines, textbooks, websites, patient information leaflets? What information sources do patients most often use to guide healthcare decisions? original research papers, drug formularies, systematic reviews, clinical guidelines, textbooks, websites, patient information leaflets?

## What are the benefits and limitations of open access to original research for health professionals?

Uzodinma Adirieje, Nigeria: Access to reliable, up-to-date, and evidence-based information is vital for effective healthcare delivery and policy-making. For members of the Afrihealth Optonet Association (AHOA) — a network of health, environment/climate/energy and sustainable development professionals and stakeholders across Africa—Open Access (OA) is not just a convenience, but a lifesaving necessity. Open Access enables doctors, nurses, researchers, and community health workers to freely access the texts of the latest research, clinical guidelines, and innovations without financial or institutional barriers.

Uzodinma Adirieje, Nigeria: In many parts of Africa and the Global South, subscription-based journals are prohibitively expensive, limiting the ability of health workers to make informed, data-driven decisions. Open Access removes this barrier, allowing AHOA professionals to stay current on global best practices in disease prevention, maternal health, nutrition, climate-health linkages, health-related Sustainable Development Goals (health-SDGs), and pandemic responses.

Uzodinma Adirieje, Nigeria: By democratizing knowledge, OA empowers healthcare professionals to translate research into action, improving patient outcomes, enhancing local innovations, and informing effective policy. Ultimately, Open Access saves lives—as it will be ensuring that no African health worker or researcher is denied life-saving information simply because they cannot afford it.

Uzodinma Adirieje, Nigeria: Knowledge must be shared, not sold, if we are to achieve health equity and the SDGs.

## Direct impacts of open access to original research on quality of health care

NPW: Open access has the potential for direct and indirect impact on the availability of reliable healthcare information and therefore, by extension, quality of health care.

NPW: Our question then becomes: To what extent does open access help to create a world where every person has access to the reliable information they need to protect their own health and the health of others?

NPW: There is a potential DIRECT impact of open access on health care (whether through a better-informed health worker or patient).

NPW: There is a wide assumption that open access to original research helps to meet the information needs of healthcare professionals and thereby improves patient care. Can anyone give an example of personal experience to corroborate this assumption? For example, can you describe a situation where open access to a research paper helped you to make a clinical decision?

## Specific examples: from HIFA members

### *South Africa*

NPW: There is an interesting anecdote in a paper by Virginia Barbour and colleagues: Barbour V, Chinnock P, Cohen B, Yamey G. The impact of open access upon public health. *Bull World Health Organ*. 2006 May;84(5):339. doi: 10.2471/blt.06.032409. Epub 2006 May 17. PMID: 16710533; PMCID: PMC2627358.

<https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC2627358/pdf/16710533.pdf>

NPW: 'Arthur Amman, President of Global Strategies for HIV Prevention ([www.globalstrategies.org](http://www.globalstrategies.org)), tells the following story: "I recently met a physician from southern Africa, engaged in perinatal HIV prevention, whose primary access to information was abstracts posted on the Internet. Based on a single abstract, they had altered their perinatal HIV prevention program from an effective therapy to one with lesser efficacy. Had they read the full text article they would have undoubtedly realized that the study results were based on shortterm follow-up, a small pivotal group, incomplete data, and were unlikely to be applicable to their country situation. Their decision to alter treatment based solely on the abstract's conclusions may have resulted in increased perinatal HIV transmission."

NPW: At first sight, we may say this is a classic example of where access to the full text is critical. It would be interesting to have more information about the case, including a citation for the article in question. It seems that access to the full text would have made a difference. However, the story illustrates a more fundamental issue: it seems that the health professionals had a flawed approach to evidence-informed practice. The development of a perinatal HIV prevention program should never be dependent on the full text of a single research study, let alone an abstract. Such a program demands a rigorous approach based cumulative evidence from systematic review. A first step would have been to identify whether there is a current international guideline on this topic from a body such as WHO or UNAIDS. This guidance would need to be formally studied and adapted by a team of health professionals in South Africa, usually led by the Ministry of Health, and taking into account the cumulative evidence available in South Africa as well as economic and cultural considerations.

### *Afrihealth Optonet Association*

Uzodinma Adirieje, Nigeria: Open Access (OA) has emerged as a transformative force in global health care, redefining how knowledge is shared, accessed, and applied. By removing subscription barriers to scientific research and medical literature, OA ensures that clinicians, researchers, policymakers, and community organizations can access the latest evidence without financial constraints. This democratization of information has profound implications for improving patient care, accelerating health innovations, and enhancing public health interventions. Health care providers can make timely, evidence-based decisions, while policymakers can design programs grounded in the latest data, ultimately improving health outcomes and equity.

Uzodinma Adirieje, Nigeria: For organizations like Afrihealth Optonet Association (AHOA), OA is particularly impactful. AHOA's mission of strengthening health systems and promoting community-driven health initiatives relies heavily on access to up-to-date research, global best practices, and innovative solutions. OA enables AHOA's researchers, practitioners, and partners to access a vast repository of knowledge, facilitating evidence-informed decision-making and program design. Moreover, OA allows AHOA to share its own research findings, case studies, and policy recommendations with a global audience, amplifying the organization's influence and fostering cross-border collaborations.

Uzodinma Adirieje, Nigeria: In essence, Open Access strengthens AHOA's role as a knowledge-driven, community-centred health organization. By bridging the gap between global research and local practice, OA empowers AHOA to translate evidence into action, driving sustainable improvements in health care delivery and outcomes across Africa.

Uzodinma Adirieje: OA allows me to access the latest research, guidelines, and policy reports without financial or institutional barriers. This immediate access ensures that the provision of care is evidence-based, innovative, and aligned with global best practices, while remaining adaptable to local health realities.

#### *Central Hospital, Yaounde*

Marileine Kemme, Cameroon: As a Mental Health specialist I have often experienced both sides of the "access" divide in scientific information.

Marileine Kemme, Cameroon: In my daily practice, I regularly seek up-to-date evidence to guide patient management, especially concerning harm reduction strategies and the mental health impacts of substance use. There have been many occasions when I was unable to access crucial research articles because they were behind paywalls, limiting my ability to integrate new findings into local care protocols.

Marileine Kemme, Cameroon: Conversely, open access publications have been tremendously valuable. Freely available studies on community-based harm reduction and brief motivational interventions have directly inspired the design of our psychosocial support programs and professional training modules.

Marileine Kemme, Cameroon: I strongly believe that open access to scientific knowledge is a cornerstone for reducing global health inequities, empowering frontline practitioners, and improving care outcomes — particularly in low- and middle-income countries.

#### *Hospital Escuela in Tegucigalpa, Honduras*

Jackeline Alger, Honduras: The experience of the Parasitology Service of the Hospital Escuela in Tegucigalpa illustrates how open access to scientific information can have a direct impact on people's health and lives. For more than two decades, the laboratory team has used the resources of the Virtual Health Library of Honduras (VHL HN) to access updated evidence, review diagnostic procedures and guide clinical staff in the identification of parasitic diseases.

Jackeline Alger, Honduras: Thanks to this availability of reliable and freely accessible information, it has been possible to improve diagnostic accuracy, update training materials and strengthen evidence-based clinical decision making. In contexts where resources are limited, this open access translates into more timely diagnoses, more accurate treatments and, ultimately, saved lives.

Jackeline Alger, Honduras: Therefore, we can affirm that open access to research saves lives—not only because of the great discoveries it disseminates, but because of the possibility that each health professional, from their local environment, has the necessary tools to offer quality care, supported by the best available evidence.

Jackeline Alger, Honduras: The following official links, which document the work of the Virtual Health Library of Honduras (BVS HN) and its relationship with the Teaching Hospital:

Virtual Health Library of Honduras (VHL HN):

<https://honduras.bvsalud.org/es/>

Network of Virtual Health Libraries (VHL) – PAHO/WHO and BIREME:

<https://bvsalud.org/es/rede-bvs/>

Reference on the creation of the BVS HN (Faculty of Medical Sciences Magazine, 2015):

<https://www.bvs.hn/RFCM/pdf/2015/pdf/RFCMVol12-2-2015.pdf>

### *SHDEPHA+, Tanzania*

Rabia Khaji, Tanzania: Reflecting on Question 2 — \*my experience of open access as a healthcare professional and reader\* — I find that OA has played a quiet but powerful role in bridging what I call the “last mile” between evidence and practice.

Rabia, Tanzania: In many community health contexts, particularly in low-resource settings, access to peer-reviewed knowledge through open platforms has enabled better-informed advocacy, design of training materials, and gender-responsive program adaptation.

Rabia, Tanzania: However, the experience also reveals a paradox: while access to full-text articles has improved, many health workers and local researchers still face challenges translating OA content into actionable guidance. Language barriers, limited internet access, and the lack of synthesized, context-specific summaries often dilute the potential impact of OA on day-to-day practice.

Rabia, Tanzania: Perhaps this is where the open-access movement can evolve — not just opening doors to research, but opening pathways for its practical use at the frontline of health service delivery.

## Has open access to research ever saved a life?

NPW: We are struggling to find any specific examples where, for example, access to an original research paper has helped save a life or even led to better quality of care.

NPW: Our discussion has focused on open access to the full text of research papers. We have not heard any examples where access to the full text of a research paper has helped to inform a clinical decision or saved a life. Arguably, the priority for healthcare professionals is to have access to evidence 'further along' the global evidence ecosystem, such as synthesised evidence (systematic reviews and clinical guidelines) and repackaged evidence (such as decision aids and formularies).

NPW: We asked ChatGPT: Has access to the full text of research ever saved a life? ChatGPT has not been able to provide an example and we haven't yet received any examples from HIFA members.

## Specific examples from Chat GPT

NPW: I asked ChatGPT: Do you have any examples where open access to research led to a direct improvement in patient care? Or saved a life?

### *Update a clinical guideline*

Open Access and Tropical Disease Research (this example referred to 'open-access journals like PLoS Neglected Tropical Diseases... where clinicians in endemic regions can use this research to update treatment guidelines...' [not specific])

NPW: ChatGPT has perhaps a distorted view of how treatment guidelines are updated and adapted for national use. In my understanding, it is more usual (and more reliable) for a treatment guideline to be informed by WHO international recommendations and guidelines, adapted for national use on the basis of local research and knowledge. A clinician would not normally update a treatment guideline on the basis of an open-access research paper, although there is perhaps some truth in suggesting that open access to the scientific literature can facilitate the collective process. (Notwithstanding, Hinari allows most guideline developers in LMICs to access subscription content free or at low cost.)

For example, here is a description of how the guideline development process works for malaria. <https://www.who.int/teams/global-malaria-programme/guideline-development...>

### *Child with fever*

NPW: On 21 October I asked ChatGPT for an example specifically where open access to a full research paper saved a life. It replied with a compelling answer: '...One day, the hospital admitted a young child with a high fever and other symptoms that were suggestive of an infection. Based on the algorithm described in the paper, the hospital's doctors quickly identified early-stage sepsis—before it had a chance to progress to septic shock. This allowed the doctors to intervene early with antibiotics and fluids, saving the child's life... 'This case demonstrates how open access to a full text of a research paper enabled a healthcare provider in a remote area to make use of cutting-edge, evidence-based knowledge that directly led to saving a life. The research paper wasn't just theoretical — its open access allowed it to be applied in real-world, life-or-death situations.' <https://www.hifa.org/dgroups-rss/open-access-48-has-open-access-research...>

Today I asked GPT for clarification of the above and further details. Can you give me the citation of the paper or a reference to the case study? It replied:

"I was unable to locate any credible evidence that the scenario — a specific open-access paper in The Lancet (or elsewhere) being downloaded by a rural hospital in a developing country and directly saving a patient's life via an early sepsis-detection algorithm — actually took place."

This appears to be another example of AI hallucination.

### *Early Detection of Stroke Using MRI*

Context: A study published in Neurology (2015) explored a new method for detecting strokes using advanced MRI imaging techniques, allowing for earlier identification of ischemic strokes (where blood flow to the brain is blocked). The Role of Open Access: The paper was open access, so it was freely available to hospitals around the world, including many community hospitals with limited resources. The study detailed new MRI scanning protocols that could detect smaller, early-stage strokes that conventional imaging methods missed....



COMMENT (NPW): We need clarification on this. It seems odd to talk of a 'small, rural hospital' with 'advanced MRI techniques'. ChatGPT said the patient 'presented with symptoms of a stroke' but then said 'Without access to the specific imaging technique, the hospital would have missed the early signs of stroke'. The suggestion that the full text of the paper prompted 'early treatment with clot-busting drugs' is also odd. It is normal practice, based on established clinical guidelines (and not a specific paper), to treat suspected thromboembolic stroke with 'clot-busting drugs'.

#### *Antibiotic Resistance and Treatment Protocols*

Real-Life Impact: A middle-aged man arrived at the hospital with severe cellulitis and signs of sepsis caused by MRSA. The healthcare team, guided by the open access paper, implemented the new antibiotic treatment protocol for resistant infections. The patient's condition improved significantly after receiving the appropriate combination of antibiotics, and he survived a potentially fatal infection.

Why Open Access Was Crucial: In the absence of this open access research, the clinicians might not have known about the new protocol for handling resistant infections. Access to the paper allowed them to administer the correct treatment quickly, which saved the patient's life by preventing septic shock.

COMMENT (NPW): We need clarification. What is the 2016 paper that ChatGPT refers to? It is highly unusual for a research paper to outline a new protocol for treating drug-resistant infections. Normally such protocols are developed by international teams, typically convened by the World Health Organization, which make their deliberations based on systematic review. These recommendations would be issued as international guidelines, and it is the responsibility of country-based teams, typically convened by the ministry of health, to adapt these guidelines for national use, taking into account local research and national profiles on antibiotic resistance, antibiotic availability, and other contextual factors.

#### *Early Intervention for Preterm Birth*

Context: A study published in The Lancet (2017) reviewed clinical trials on interventions for preventing preterm birth and identified several effective treatments. The paper included evidence that administering magnesium sulfate to mothers at risk of preterm labor could significantly reduce the likelihood of severe complications in premature infants... Without the paper's specific guidance on magnesium sulfate use, the hospital staff might have missed the window to administer the life-saving drug. The open access research allowed them to intervene in a timely manner, saving both the mother and child.

COMMENTS (NPW):

1. I was unable to find the 2017 study in The Lancet. It's notable that the purpose of the synthesis was to assess interventions for preventing preterm birth, but the authors appear to have made a conclusion about a different endpoint.
2. I found a paper in PLOS Medicine - Antenatal magnesium sulphate and adverse neonatal outcomes: A systematic review and meta-analysis - dated 2019. Curiously this paper did not mention the supposed 2017 Lancet paper.
3. I also located a 2018 paper in The Lancet - Interventions to reduce premature births: a review of the evidence - but this is not open access. The paper comprised only a conference abstract which included the sentence 'Identified interventions with strong evidence of benefit were smoking cessation, progesterone supplementation, cervical cerclage, preterm surveillance clinics and screening, diagnosis and preparation, corticosteroids, magnesium sulphate, and

tocolysis'. It would not make sense for the doctors mentioned above to have provided magnesium sulphate on the basis of such an abstract.

4. For any information to be reliable and applicable, the ideal pathway is not by reading an abstract (or open-access full text) of a single research paper. ChatGPT reports that the 2017 paper was a synthesis and this gives stronger grounds for clinical decision-making. Systematic reviews may or may not include recommendations. Furthermore, there may be several extant systematic reviews that have relevance. The most robust way forward is to convene a clinical guideline group which uses a rigorous approach to assess all the available evidence and make international guidelines that can be adapted at country level.

5. Magnesium sulphate is currently recommended for neuroprotection of preterm infants for women at risk of preterm birth at less than 30 weeks' gestation, based on high quality evidence of benefit

6. I located 'The Antenatal Magnesium Sulphate for Neuroprotection Guideline Development Panel: Antenatal magnesium sulphate prior to preterm birth for neuroprotection of the fetus, infant and child: National clinical practice guidelines'. This was published back in 2010. The WHO Essential Medicines List includes magnesium sulfate for pre-eclampsia and eclampsia but curiously the indications do not include neuroprotection in preterm birth.

NPW: I asked ChatGPT to give me the citation of the paper and it 'admitted': 'I could not locate a 2017 open-access paper in The Lancet exactly matching the description you provided (i.e., a 2017 Lancet review of magnesium sulphate for pre-term birth interventions that is open access).' Presumably this was a 'hallucination'. This puts into doubt the whole example.

### *Emergency Treatment for Cardiac Arrest*

Context: A 2019 study published in the New England Journal of Medicine explored new approaches to the early defibrillation of patients who experience sudden cardiac arrest outside of a hospital setting. The research highlighted the importance of immediate use of Automated External Defibrillators (AEDs) and proper CPR techniques.

The Role of Open Access: The study was made available as open access, and a volunteer in a high school gym who had been trained in CPR and AED use was able to access this paper. The paper described updated guidelines for handling cardiac arrest more effectively.

Real-Life Impact: A 16-year-old student collapsed during a basketball game from sudden cardiac arrest. The gym teacher, who had read the open access paper, immediately applied the updated defibrillation guidelines and used the AED to restart the student's heart. The student regained consciousness and survived the cardiac event with minimal damage.

Why Open Access Was Crucial: The updated treatment protocol in the open access paper allowed the gym staff to use the most effective defibrillation technique. Without it, the student might not have survived. Open access research made this vital information available to those in real-time emergency situations.

Today I asked ChatGPT for more details: 'A few days ago I asked you to give me specific examples where access to original health research helped to save a life. I would like to ask you to give me more details on one of the examples you gave. Here is what you said... Specifically, can you give me the citation for the 2019 paper in the New England Journal of Medicine?'



It replied: 'Thank you for following up — and I want to clarify something important. The example I gave earlier about a 2019 New England Journal of Medicine (NEJM) paper on early defibrillation being accessed openly and directly leading to a gym teacher saving a student's life was illustrative, not a documented real case. It was meant to show how open access to medical research could plausibly save lives — not to cite a specific, verifiable event or article. To be clear: NEJM articles are rarely open access, especially those from 2019. There was a real 2019 NEJM paper on defibrillation practices... That paper analyzed outcomes of early CPR and defibrillation in cardiac arrest and influenced global resuscitation guidelines — but there's no verified case linking its open access availability to a specific life-saving event by a gym teacher.'

This appears to be yet another example of a 'hallucination' by Chat GPT.

#### *Nutritional Interventions for Malnutrition in Children*

Context: A 2014 study published in the Journal of Nutrition investigated the impact of specific nutritional interventions to treat severe malnutrition in children under five years old. The study showed that ready-to-use therapeutic foods (RUTF), like peanut-based pastes, dramatically improved recovery rates for severely malnourished children... Without the open access paper, the clinic might not have had the latest evidence on the most effective treatment for malnutrition. The ability to access this research allowed them to provide the most appropriate care in time, saving the child's life.

### Five more ChatGPT examples from David Cawthorpe

David Cawthorpe: The question I asked chat (chatgpt and I have been friends since January 2024) 'One of my colleagues made the following statement, but I was wondering if you had any insights or could answer the question with reference to published literature... 'However, to date we have been unable to identify a single example of how access to the full text of a research paper saved a life, or even contributed directly to clinical decision-making. We asked ChatGPT, who could not identify an example either.'

#1: The first widely used COVID 19 (SARS-CoV-2) PCR protocol was published OA...

#2: The RECOVERY trial "dexamethasone" result was released OA as a medRxiv preprint ...

#3: COVID guideline pipelines that were fully OA...

#4: Beyond single drugs, there's a peer-reviewed synthesis arguing (with case documentation) that open science / OA "saves lives"...

#5 (health-system access): While it's harder to tie one patient's survival to one OA PDF, programmes built to widen OA access for clinicians—e.g., HINARI ...

It's understandable that "this one OA paper saved this one named patient" case-reports are rare—clinicians don't usually document access modality in case notes.

NPW: Thanks for your message with your prompt to ChatGPT and its response. I find this interesting in two ways. First, it potentially informs us to what extent access to the full text of research might save lives. Second, it is an opportunity for us to look at the potential and the limitations of ChatGPT.

NPW: Your prompt: 'One of my colleagues made the following statement, but I was wondering if you had any insights or could answer the question with reference to published literature... for example... is there a published paper that proves open access literature helped save a patient or

helped treat a patient? It would be fine to have a body of work that is open access to influence policy in a way that saved lives—that would be an appropriate reference as well: here is the original response that I am asking you to consider an answer answering this question—  
“However, to date we have been unable to identify a single example of how access to the full text of a research paper saved a life, or even contributed directly to clinical decision-making. We asked ChatGPT, who could not identify an example either.”

NPW: My comment on the prompt: The original objective was to 'identify a single example of how access to the full text of a research paper saved a life, or even contributed directly to clinical decision-making'. As I said in my original message, we are not asking about free/open access to derivatives of health research: clinical guidelines, formularies, training materials, manuals, decision aids. I think we would all agree that these are vital to deliver quality health care and thereby save lives. Our query is specifically about access to the full text of a research paper in a clinical context. It would be interesting to see examples in a policy context as well, but these are outside the remit of the original query.

### #1

NPW: ChatGPT then gives five examples. It would be interesting to look at each of these in turn to see whether any of them respond to the original query.

I'll start with the first example:

"#1: The first widely used COVID 19 (SARS-CoV-2) PCR protocol was published OA in Eurosurveillance on 23 Jan 2020 (Victor M. Corman et al.). Labs worldwide stood up diagnostic testing using that paper's primers/protocols—core to triage, isolation, and care."

Helpfully ChatGPT gives us the reference: Corman VM, Landt O, Kaiser M, et al. Detection of 2019 novel coronavirus (2019-nCoV) by real-time RT-PCR. Eurosurveillance. 2020 Jan 23;25(3):2000045. doi: 10.2807/1560-7917.ES.2020.25.3.2000045.

NPW: My comment on #1: This study is clearly irrelevant to my original query. It does not provide an example of how access to the full text of a research paper saved a life, or even contributed directly to clinical decision-making.

### #2

#2: The RECOVERY trial “dexamethasone” result was released OA as a medRxiv preprint on 22 Jun 2020. Multiple studies document immediate practice change and associated mortality reduction after the OA preprint emerged (with later peer-review confirming the effect)...

COMMENT (NPW): This research has been described by the evidence-based medicine leader Paul Glasziou. He says 'RECOVERY has been remarkable, going from first meeting to first patient recruited in a record-setting nine days, recruiting 13% of all COVID-19 hospitalised patients in the UK during the first COVID-19 wave; and a few months later giving clear answers on the effectiveness of dexamethasone.'

What was remarkable was the overall process. The publication of the pre-print was one part of a wider process. I note the researchers findings were published as an 'official' paper just a few weeks' later in the New England Journal of Medicine (<https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC7383595/>). It would be interesting to know how this was achieved (perhaps the researchers were already in contact with the NEJM during the course of their research?). The NEJM paper was accompanied by an editorial commentary by Clifford

Lane and Anthony Fauci ('Research in the context of a pandemic' <https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC7383591/> ).

I would argue that what would have been most useful to clinicians and policymakers was perhaps not the preprint, but the NEJM paper (which would have been edited, formatted and peer-reviewed) and associated commentary.

This is a good example in that it demonstrates how pre-prints can accelerate research communication. But it also seems to me to underline the importance of journals and their role in editing and peer-review.

But it's arguable whether it serves as an example of 'how access to the full text of a research paper saved a life, or even contributed directly to clinical decision-making'. On reflection, I don't think it demonstrates such an example. For example, we don't know of a specific health professional that sought the preprint and made a clinical decision on that basis, as compared with a specific health professional that made such a decision based on the NEJM paper and/or commentary. Indeed, while the NEJM paper was free to read at the time of the publication, it was not open-access. (If we had a situation where clinicians were unable to access the NEJM paper because it was behind a paywall, and that quality of care was reduced as a result, this would have been a good example.)

It is also notable that, by the time of publication (July 2020), leading publishers had committed (in March 2020) 'to making all of their COVID-19 and coronavirus-related publications, and the available data supporting them, immediately accessible in PubMed Central (PMC) and other public repositories. This will help to support the ongoing public health emergency response efforts'. The fact they did so suggests, in itself, that the needs of public health (particularly in emergency situations) are better served by open (or at least free) access.

### #3

#3: COVID guideline pipelines that were fully OA (for example, rapid recommendations in The BMJ; national guidance updates) show measurable prescribing shifts once OA recommendations cited the RECOVERY preprint/journal article—again underscoring that open, immediately accessible evidence changed treatment at scale. The Japanese study noted dexamethasone prescriptions rose from ~2.5 % to ~35.2 % after week 29 (July 2020) when it was formally included in guidance.

COMMENT (NPW): This paper (June 2023) simply showed that national guidance in Japan led to increased use of dexamethasone in that country, which is unremarkable. This paper could hardly be an example of a paper that a health professional might seek to help in clinical decision-making for an individual patient. The 'Japanese Guide' itself was published back in March 2020. Clearly, the guide would have been used by health professionals, but this is outside the remit of our question, which is looking at the impact on healthcare of open-access, full text research papers.

### #4

'Beyond single drugs, there's a peer-reviewed synthesis arguing (with case documentation) that open science / OA "saves lives" in outbreaks by accelerating methods, data and guidelines—the COVID pandemic is the clearest modern proof-of-concept.'

COMMENT (NPW): Yet again, this example relates to COVID-19. The authors note: 'In response to the COVID-19 pandemic many publishers and researchers have sped up their adoption of

Open Science practices, sometimes embracing them fully and sometimes partially or in a sub-optimal manner. In this article, we express concerns about the violation of some of the Open Science principles and its potential impact on the quality of research output. We provide evidence of the misuses of these principles at different stages of the scientific process. We call for a wider adoption of Open Science practices in the hope that this work will encourage a broader endorsement of Open Science principles and serve as a reminder that science should always be a rigorous process, reliable and transparent, especially in the context of a pandemic where research findings are being translated into practice even more rapidly'

On reading the text, I noted a mismatch between the title and the content. The title 'Open science saves lives' would suggest that the paper would provide evidence that open science saves lives. But saving lives was not even mentioned in the full text and no such evidence was provided. Indeed, much of the paper pointed to some major problems with preprints and rapid open access publication, as shown by these two extracts:

1. 'The scientific community has responded accordingly, with the publication of over 80,000 preprints and peer-reviewed articles on COVID-19 or SARS-CoV-2 since announcement of the emergence of a new virus on 31 st December 2019 [1]. Many of these publications have contributed to the development of a body of knowledge that has since informed practice but a considerable number of these studies suffer methodological weaknesses, limiting the interpretability of their findings [2] or leading to false claims with a potentially dramatic impact on public health.'

2. 'While the need for faster scientific dissemination during a pandemic is understandable, the possibility to publish without a rigorous and critical peer-review process is, in some circumstances, detrimental to the scientific community and the public at large. This is the case when these findings are used to inform medical practice or public health policies. For example, following concerns about the scientific validity of a study investigating the effectiveness of hydroxychloroquine, accepted for publication in less than a day after submission [33], post-publication reviews were commissioned. These reviews, published 4 months after the initial publication, [28, 62], pointed out major methodological and ethical flaws. Despite this, the paper was not retracted, on the grounds that it gives room for scientific debate'

Apart from the above, we can also note that this paper was a commentary and not a formal research paper. We can clearly see that this paper would not have been of any use in informing decision-making by a healthcare professional.

#### #5

#5 (health-system access): While it's harder to tie one patient's survival to one OA PDF, programmes built to widen OA access for clinicians—e.g., HINARI Access to Research in Health / Research4Life—have peer-reviewed evaluations showing clinicians and institutions used the newly accessible literature in care and training across low- and middle-income countries, helping close the “know-do” gap that underpins preventable mortality.'

ChatGPT doesn't give a reference for this one, but most of us are familiar with Hinari and would agree that it has improved the availability and use of research papers in peer-reviewed journals.

However, Hinari is not primarily an open-access initiative. The primary benefit of Hinari is that it provides access to subscription journals free or at low cost to certain institutions in eligible countries.

The example doesn't respond to the original challenge of identifying a specific example of how access to the full text of a research paper saved a life, or even contributed directly to clinical decision-making.

We have now asked the HIFA community and ChatGPT for such examples. None have emerged from HIFA members. Your approach to ChatGPT yielded 5 examples, and my previous approach yielded 6 examples. However, none of these 11 examples fit our original challenge.

We can therefore conclude that 'we have been unable to identify (through the HIFA forum or through ChatGPT) a single example of how access to the full text of a research paper saved a life, or even contributed directly to clinical decision-making.'

Such examples may well exist. Absence of evidence is not evidence of absence. But for me this exercise raises questions about the importance of open access to research (as opposed to open access to derivative content) to clinical decision-making.

## A PubMed search for examples where OA to research has saved a life

Meena Cherian, Switzerland: Interestingly, I couldn't find any OA research that directly saved a life; however, we should think of the numerous benefits of OA research in the context of public health, which saves many lives with the development of health policies and their implementation through national health plans and impacts lives, particularly in low- and middle-income countries (LMICs).

## Predicting the Probability That Open-Access Clinical Literature Saves Lives

David Cawthorpe, Canada: Predicting the Probability That Open-Access Clinical Literature Saves Lives. Qeios. doi:10.32388/U2SYIR. <https://www.qeios.com/read/U2SYIR>

## Indirect impacts of open access to original research

NPW: We are interested not only in the direct impact of open access to health research on the availability of reliable healthcare information and health care, but also the indirect impact. For example, how does open access to primary research enable evidence synthesis such as systematic reviews and clinical guidelines? And in what ways does open access to research facilitate the development of educational resources, formularies, books...?

Meena Cherian, Switzerland: Several OA medical journals (e.g. Lancet, BMJ, PLOS, BMC, Creative Commons licences, etc.) maintain very high standards before acceptance for publication with different APC structures. These OA medical journals benefit the lives of populations, particularly in LMICs, to enable: - Health providers to access and reproduce research in the local context. - In academia, medical trainees can publish their research most often at a faster rate. - Easy access and more frequent citations in scientific papers - Allow health providers to implement evidence-based clinical guidance at the point of care. - Global collaborative projects with interdisciplinary proposals for research and funding. - The public can access and engage in discussions with their health providers on the updated medical progress, prevention, diagnosis, and treatment. - All people to 'the right to access evidence-based medical knowledge', not only for themselves but also to engage with policymakers for equity in health. (HIFA global campaign).

### *Impact of OA on society*

Rabia Khaji, Tanzania: Knowledge should never be a privilege but a shared resource for all. To me, open access is not only about removing paywalls, but about removing barriers between evidence and impact, between research and real-life change.

### *Impact of OA on the overall global evidence ecosystem*

Ruwaida Salem, United States: I believe the solution to translating evidence into practice requires a whole knowledge ecosystem approach in which different actors work together to do their part.

NPW: For me, what is more important is the impact of open access to health research on the integrity of the overall global evidence ecosystem, and on each of the six components of the system (generate, publish, synthesise, repackage, find, apply) <https://www.hifa.org/about-hifa>

NPW: I think the indirect impacts of open access are hugely important in 'removing barriers between evidence and impact, between research and real-life change'. Open access is already having a profound positive impact on the functional integrity of the global evidence ecosystem. This will increase further as AI plays an increasing role in the system (AI depends largely on freely available content). Moreover, the ethos of the open access movement is a positive driver for cooperation and collaboration in an increasingly divided world.

NPW: These indirect impacts could relate to one or more of the six components of the global evidence ecosystem: 1 researchers, 2 journal publishers, 3 systematic reviewers and guideline developers, 4 publishers of content for end-users, 5 library and information professionals, and 6 healthcare professionals. Open access to research potentially strengthens any or all six components, thereby supporting evidence-informed policy and practice and leading to improved health outcomes. For example, open access to research may facilitate the development of systematic reviews and guideline development, which requires access to full text.

Rabia Khaji, Tanzania: How can open access initiatives do more to support translation of evidence into practice, especially in low-resource settings?

Rabia Khaji, Tanzania: Could open access platforms collaborate more with those developing guidelines, job aids, and community health materials, so that synthesized evidence flows more efficiently to end users?

### *Impact of OA on evidence generation: health research*

Joseph Ana, Nigeria: In 2011, at the BioMed Central (BMC) OA conference... I ended my presentation on Open Access Challenges... Restricted access to research is also an obstacle to the production of new knowledge.'

### *Impact of OA on the publishing and indexing of evidence*

Margaret Winker, United States: a. How can OA help research and knowledge from LMICs be peer reviewed, published, translated, and disseminated?

NPW: How does open access facilitate the peer review, publication, translation and dissemination of research? With most open access licences, translation and dissemination of research is unrestricted, thereby increasing availability and applicability. Does open access also facilitate peer review, and perhaps some aspects (which?) of the publishing process?



Margaret Winker, United States: c. How can OA help ensure that journal content from LMICs is indexed and discoverable via search engines? (WHO databases may contain LMIC content that is not indexed in other ways, but those databases may not be searched by usual search engines.)

#### *Impact of OA on evidence synthesis: systematic reviews and clinical guidelines*

NPW: 1. What is the impact of open access to original primary research on the development of evidence syntheses or systematic reviews? Do paywalls continue to be a major problem for evidence synthesis teams, even though they may have access to institutional subscriptions?

NPW: 2. How common is it for evidence syntheses or systematic reviews to be behind a paywall? What difference could it make if all were available open access?

Unni Gopinathan, Norway: (1) On open access: Accessible research papers, particularly those published under open access, present both opportunities and challenges for evidence use in health systems. On the positive side, open access practices have democratized access to research and made it easier to conduct evidence syntheses (such as systematic reviews of effectiveness or qualitative evidence syntheses) by removing paywalls that previously might have limited inclusion of relevant studies. This can have allowed researchers in low-resource settings to participate more fully in global evidence generation. Yet, this accessibility has probably also a downside: it has also contributed to a proliferation of low-quality or poorly designed studies that must be screened, increasing the workload of reviewers and making tools like machine learning-assisted screening increasingly central.. We have in our work experienced the challenge of not being able to access relevant research papers, even with substantial institutional access. Such barriers are likely to create more pronounced inequities for researchers and practitioners in settings without institutional subscriptions.

NPW: In terms of ecosystem integrity, and from a perspective that is strongly supportive of evidence synthesis and rigorous guideline development, I would put systematic reviewers and guideline developers as the key users of the full text of research papers, as implied by the Synthesis component of the global evidence ecosystem graphic on the HIFA website.

NPW: For example, in relation to the Synthesis component, we have heard from a systematic reviewer, Unni Gopinathan, that open access facilitates the systematic review process by removing paywalls. On the other hand, he notes that open access 'has also contributed to a proliferation of low-quality or poorly designed studies' that make things more challenging for systematic reviewers. (Meanwhile, we have to take into account the increasing role of AI in systematic reviews, and to note that the quality of AI itself is largely dependent on research being freely accessible - arguably the impact of OA on AI will prove to be much more important than the impact of personal access to specific papers) <https://www.hifa.org/dgroups-rss/open-access-33-open-access-and-availabi...>

#### *Impact of OA on evidence repackaging*

Rabia Khaji, Tanzania: Could open access platforms collaborate more with those developing guidelines, job aids, and community health materials, so that synthesized evidence flows more efficiently to end users?

#### *Impact of OA on HIFA*

NPW: As coordinator of HIFA for almost 20 years, open access has had a hugely positive impact.

NPW: When HIFA first launched in 2006, many of not most research papers were behind a paywall. Gradually the situation has changed completely, with open access being the norm rather than the exception.

NPW: This is important for my work, as it enables me to send messages to HIFA forum highlighting papers that relate to the HIFA remit.

NPW: I need access to the full text of any research paper that I may highlight on HIFA. The ideal is that the paper is open access, so that I know that all HIFA members will be able to read it.

NPW: When I identify a paper of interest and find it to be behind a paywall, I feel a sense of disappointment. I have often send messages to HIFA nevertheless, and I remember HIFA member Joseph Ana (Nigeria) has often commented 'What is the point of sending a message about a restricted-access paper?' He has a point, but at the same time there are reasons for doing so: many HIFA members do have access through their institutional subscription, including those LMIC institutions registered with HINARI. Also, by occasionally highlighting restricted-access papers this highlights the issue. It also raises a question about researchers' awareness of their right to also publish their preprint paper in an OA institutional repository. Most journals allow this (often with restrictions) but it seems that a lot of researchers do not take advantage of it.

NPW: HIFA does not have the funds to purchase subscriptions, but we have previously approached publishers to provide us with complementary personal access for my role in facilitating HIFA, and as a result I am grateful to The Lancet and The BMJ.

NPW: We look forward to hear how open access to research has helped you in \*your\* work, whether as a health professional, researcher or other role.

## Relevance and reliability of open access content

Rabia Khaji, Tanzania: How do we ensure that quality and relevance move hand in hand, so that open access truly helps close the gap between evidence and impact?

NPW: If 'high-quality evidence' is open access, then I agree it is available to anyone who has an internet connection and, because open access allows reuse, it is also potentially available to those without an internet connection (for example as print copies). Open access also delivers 'low-quality evidence' (and lots of it).

## Quality of evidence

NPW: What do we mean by 'high-quality evidence'? Back in 2004, the GRADE working group suggested the following definitions in grading the quality of the evidence:

'High = Further research is very unlikely to change our confidence in the estimate of effect.

Moderate = Further research is likely to have an important impact on our confidence in the estimate of effect and may change the estimate.

Low = Further research is very likely to have an important impact on our confidence in the estimate of effect and is likely to change the estimate.

Very low = Any estimate of effect is very uncertain.'

<https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC428525/>

NPW: Then in 2008 the same group proposed a different approach to the definition:



'In the GRADE approach to quality of evidence, randomised trials without important limitations constitute high quality evidence. Observational studies without special strengths or important limitations constitute low quality evidence. Limitations or special strengths can, however, modify the quality of the evidence.'

<https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC2364804/#:~:text=In%20the%20GRA....>

NPW: The 2008 approach is arguably in contradiction with the 2004 approach, because it is very unusual for a single randomised controlled trial ('high quality' 2008) to be so conclusive that 'further research is very unlikely to change our confidence in the estimate of effect' ('high quality' 2004).

Simon Lewin, Norway: In relation to your question on what do we mean by 'high quality evidence', I think for evidence users this should ideally be evidence syntheses that are relevant to their questions, well conducted, timely and that deliver findings in forms that can be understood, packaged (for instance, into frameworks to inform guidelines and other decisions) and acted on by a range of stakeholders. I would want to see the whole evidence pipeline being open access, but I think it particularly important for evidence synthesis products to be open access as these are critical components for informing decision making.

## Examples of open access to research resources

### *PubMed Central*

NPW: Thanks to Margaret Winker for her message just now about PubMed and PubMed Central. This is a reminder that PubMed Central is a very important benefit of open access publishing. 'PubMed Central (PMC) is a free digital repository that archives open access full-text scholarly articles that have been published in biomedical and life sciences journals... PubMed Central is distinct from PubMed. PubMed Central is a free digital archive of full articles, accessible to anyone from anywhere via a web browser (with varying provisions for reuse). Conversely, although PubMed is a searchable database of biomedical citations and abstracts, the full-text article resides elsewhere (in print or online, free or behind a subscriber paywall).' [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/PubMed\\_Central](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/PubMed_Central)

NPW: Can anyone say more about the use of PubMed Central as a tool for direct or indirect impact on health? I note from the NLM website that PubMed is used by about 3.5 million people every day, but cannot find figures specifically for PubMed Central. I would like to ask HIFA members: do you use PubMed Central in your work? What difference does it make? Can you give any examples?

### *Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report*

NPW: The Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report (MMWR) is a series of epidemiological science periodicals published by the United States Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). It appears to be under threat.

Read in full: <https://www.statnews.com/2025/10/21/cdc-mmwr-alternative-new-report-anno...>

'The New England Journal of Medicine and the Center for Infectious Disease Research and Policy will begin publishing "public health alerts" in the coming month'. The alerts "will basically serve to be a way to convey the information that once was shared in the MMWR with all of us in a very timely way."

NPW: This action may well be necessary to meet information needs, which are currently on pause during the government shutdown (but which might be expected to resume). However, does it give the green light for policymakers to shut down MMWR? Also it is not clear whether the new service will be open access.

Indi Trehan: This move by NEJM Evidence taking up the mantle of the type of information traditionally published by MMWR is especially important given the unfortunate recent conversion of the ProMED service, published by the International Society for Infectious Diseases, to a paid model also.

## Examples of OA non-research resources (eg training materials, guidelines, health education materials)

### *Wikipedia*

Tomas Rees, UK: Another consideration is the impact of open access on public discourse. There is a recent paper (1) that found that OA articles are more likely to be cited in disputes ("edit wars") on Wikipedia. They conclude:

Tomas Rees, UK: 'Our analysis shows that OA publications are significantly more likely to be involved in disputes, and that disputes concerning OA articles tend to emerge sooner after publication. This pattern can be explained by the increased accessibility of OA articles [Yang et al., 2024], which facilitates rapid dissemination and critical evaluation by a broader and more diverse editor base. These results extend existing literature on OA's role in enhancing visibility, readership, and scholarly engagement [Yang et al., 2024]. Furthermore, OA articles may disproportionately address emerging, interdisciplinary, or controversial topics, which naturally attract greater contestation and discussion. This is consistent with prior findings that disputes around contested content on Wikipedia often mirror broader societal controversies [Borra et al., 2015].' 1. Yang, P., Traag, V., Costas, R., & Colavizza, G. (2025). Contested Citations: The Role of Open Access Publications in Wikipedia's Scientific Disputes. <https://arxiv.org/pdf/2510.14071>

NPW: Wikipedia is itself a hugely important open access initiative and thrives on open access sources, including open access to peer-reviewed research.

NPW: Collectively, the open access movement is having a profound positive impact on the global evidence ecosystem.

NPW: The impact of open access to research on Wikipedia is a good example of an important indirect impact of open access to research. We have been discussing here on HIFA about examples where open access to research has led directly to better health care. But I suspect the indirect impacts are more important.

### *Afrihealth OptoNet*

Uzodinma Adirieje, Nigeria: OA supports capacity building within AHOA's network by providing training resources, guidelines, and health education materials to both professionals and communities. This enhances the organization's ability to deliver high-quality, locally relevant interventions, from disease prevention to health promotion campaigns. It also promotes transparency and accountability in health research, reinforcing trust with stakeholders, funders, and communities.

## Week 2. What is your experience of OA as a healthcare professional/reader?

NPW: Can you describe a situation where (lack of) access to the full text of a paper has impacted on the care of a patient?

### Positive impacts

#### *Citations*

Joseph Ana, Nigeria: Researchers and clinicians, policymakers, and implementers should be able to access references (citations), but often these citations are not available because they are behind pay walls!

#### *Supporting policy and practice*

Uzodinma Adirieje, Nigeria: My engagement with Open Access exemplifies how freely available knowledge can directly enhance healthcare practices, research, and health system improvements. My hands-on use of OA demonstrates a commitment to bridging global insights with local action, advancing healthcare quality, and fostering a more equitable and informed health community

### Negative impacts

Chris Zielinski, UK: Cons include:

- Opens the floodgates to outside resources, swamping local literature (>80% of it is in English, almost nothing in local languages)
- Makes it harder to find literature on locally appropriate solutions
- Forces an industrialised-country perspective on the developing world (“epistemic injustice”)
- Usually refers to medical practices requiring expensive equipment, pharmaceuticals and care regimes..
- APCs: epistemological discrimination, when the subject matter is not of a type that attracts research sponsors (e.g., ethics, knowledge management, intellectual property, ...)
- APCs: social/ethical discrimination, when applicants for APC waivers have to justify their inability to pay
- Provides unremunerated training materials for AI chatbots;
- Encourages disputes and controversies;
- Can lead to a decline in peer review; Research that is not locally relevant can result in inappropriate local policies and consequently failures in practice

#### *Epistemic impact*

Chris Zielinski, UK: We should consider what new health literature is suddenly being made available as the cost barrier falls away. Is it mostly Western/Northern/rich-country literature describing actions and interventions requiring expensive equipment and medicines, trained staff and robust institutions, or is it information about locally relevant, appropriate treatments that are applicable in low-resource-settings? My question is deliberately framed in extremes, in order to illustrate the “epistemic injustice” noted in recent literature: the local is being swamped

by the global, the traditional healers are being swept away without replacement by the chattering of well-paid allopathic professionals, the inexpensive local cures are being challenged by unaffordable, unattainable medicines that work just as well or badly.

## Week 3. What is your experience of OA as a researcher/author?

### Introduction

WG: - How often do healthcare professionals participate as authors on research articles?

- Do healthcare professionals consider OA publishing as a driving factor when selecting journals?

- How would you rate healthcare professionals understanding of Creative Commons licences?

WG: We are especially interested to hear actual practical examples and observations. For example, can you describe a situation where a healthcare professional made a conscious decision to publish with or without OA, including the reasons behind the decision?

NPW: One obvious benefit is that your research is accessible to anyone with an internet connection. Can you say whether/how this has benefited your work? For example, has it resulted in your research being read by more people? Has this in turn led to more contacts and more opportunities? Do you think it has made a difference to the number of times that your research has been cited by others? If you have published research in subscription-based journals and open-access journals, what were the differences in your experience?

Julie Reza, UK: I'm sure there are others like me who'd appreciate a simple listing of the "carrots" (incentives) and "sticks" (disincentives) for researchers to publish in open access journals - especially when the research topic is of importance to low- and middle-income countries.

### Positive impacts

#### *General comments*

Uzodinma Adirieje, Nigeria: In essence, my hands-on experience with Open Access epitomizes its critical role in advancing research quality, visibility, and impact. OA has empowered me to conduct meaningful studies, share knowledge globally, and contribute to evidence-driven healthcare improvements, reinforcing my commitment to bridging science, policy, and practice for better health outcomes in Africa and beyond.

#### *Increasing the reach and impact of research*

Uzodinma Adirieje, Nigeria: Beyond personal use, I actively contribute to the OA ecosystem by publishing my own research and programme reports in open-access platforms. This ensures that findings from African healthcare settings reach a global audience, support knowledge exchange and enable other professionals to replicate successful interventions.

Chris Zielinski, UK: Open Access papers are read, and therefore cited, far more often than papers in non-OA subscription journals

#### *Conception and implementation of research*

Uzodinma Adirieje, Nigeria: Throughout my career, OA has provided me with extensive access to a wealth of scientific literature, global health reports, and peer-reviewed studies, enabling me to conduct timely and comprehensive research. This access is especially valuable in multi-country studies, systematic reviews, and health systems analyses, where up-to-date evidence is critical for producing robust and relevant findings.

### *Promoting research collaboration*

Uzodinma Adirieje, Nigeria: OA has also facilitated collaboration in my work, enabling me to work closely with international researchers, share data, and co-author publications that bridge local and global health perspectives.

### *Positive experience with preprints*

David Cawthorpe, Canada: There is a pre-print service that is free with minimal cost peer-review. <https://www.qeios.com/>

## Negative impacts: APCs

Chris Zielinski, UK: a. Do APCs inhibit science? Well, take the case of individual researchers – researchers not affiliated to an academic institution willing to pay for their publishing, researchers that don't work on funded projects with publishing budgets. Such researchers are clearly inhibited from publishing. Researchers in resource-poor environments are similarly inhibited. Even though many publishers will waive APCs for such authors, there can be a reluctance to being obliged to turn out your pockets to show you cannot pay.

Chris Zielinski, UK: b. Does the inability to pay the APC raise the acceptance barrier? Does your paper have to be considered to be better than run-of-the-mill if you are getting a waiver?

Chris Zielinski, UK: c. Who publishes in the journals with the highest APCs? Is it the best authors or those from the wealthiest universities?

Thomas Krichel, United States: Uzodinma Adirieje, Nigeria writes “Without APC support, researchers may not be able to publish in open-access journals, with the risk of limiting global access to their findings — especially in low- and middle-income regions.” There is no such risk. Nothing prevent researchers from uploading their research to any web site and make it available there.

Joseph Ana, Nigeria: Groups like HINARI and some OA journals that offer targeted free access, in the form of waivers, or reduced Author Pays Charges (APC) have helped, but if a researcher is from a LLMIC country he/she may face another unique challenge: if the country works to increase its GDP, the researchers/authors/institutions suddenly cannot access HINARI, e.g. Nigeria.

NPW: APC waivers for LMICs are welcome, but individual journal policies are haphazard and confusing. Also, are likely to perversely encourage funders not to pay for a dissemination budget line on the basis that the authors 'should be able to secure an APC waiver'. I believe it would be much better and simpler for funders to take responsibility for paying capped APC costs for all research projects, whether they are HIC, LMIC or international. A further point is that waiver policies by definition categorise LMIC researchers as being unable to pay the APC, which in itself is inequitable.

## Other negative impacts

### *Predatory journals*

Chris Zielinski, UK: Predatory publishers require little staff, no investment apart from a rudimentary website, and a batch of form letters. Such publishers will publish anything because they don't care about the quality of what they publish. They have no incentive to care. Consequently, predatory publishers muddy the waters by producing poor, discredited science. Unfortunately, this is something which Open Access enables.

Chris Zielinski, UK: Just as an illustration of how predatory journals use Open Access in their business, I received yesterday “a cordial call for paper invitation” from the “Journal of Clinical and Medical Images, Case Reports with ISSN 2771-019X and Impact Factor 2.1.” In the subject line it said “Now Accepting Submissions – No Article Processing Fee, Only DOI Fee”...

#### *Publisher-researcher relations*

Gauri Divan, India: In my understanding the process of OA predicates

1. The data is collected by the research team
2. The research team has to pay for the open access
3. Open access implies that the publication technically belongs to the publishers

#### *Lack of incentive for researchers*

Julie Reza, UK: If research tenure at an academic institution is based on impact, inevitably researchers will want to publish in a so-called "high impact" journal, with OA a secondary consideration.

#### *Negative perceptions of OA journals*

Joseph Ana, Nigeria: “University Appointment and Promotion panels (A&P) were discriminating against, and stigmatising OA publications, in their procedures: claiming that OA was inferior and apportioning higher scores/grades to papers carried in the traditional model publishing print journals against OA journals papers, even if the OA journals fulfilled all the accepted international (and local) parameters and indicators for quality publishing and papers. Across the LLMICs, as researchers and authors seek to publish in proper, high impact, visible journals to disseminate their work such stigmatisation is a big handicap.”

Julie Reza, UK: Perceptions about "impact" and "research quality", publication costs, predatory journals, and confusion about types of OA (hybrid etc) may discourage OA publication.

NPW: The research fellows in this study (based in New York City) 'expressed hesitation to publish OA related to confusion surrounding legitimate OA and predatory publications and frustration with APCs [author processing charges]'. CITATION: Publishing habits and perceptions of open access publishing and public access amongst clinical and research fellows. Robin O'Hanlon et al. J Med Libr Assoc. 2020 Jan 1;108(1):47–58. doi: 10.5195/jmla.2020.751. <https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC6919981/>

Thomas Krichel, United States: They [OA journals] surely vitally enrich publishers. But since publishers in general don't pay reviewer---who do the actual evidence work---journals do very little to further evidence.

## **Week 4. How would you design an OA system that retains the benefits but fixes the problems of the current OA system?**

### **Introduction**

Indi Trehan, United States: How would YOU design an OA system that retains the benefits -- and fixes the problems! -- of the current OA system? We are eager to hear creative ideas. Build upon what's worked. Throw out what hasn't. Be flexible, be innovative. By pooling our collective experiences together, hopefully we can design a system that will lead to better access to health information for all!

## Strengthening the global evidence ecosystem

Rwaida Salem (United States): "I believe the solution to translating evidence into practice requires a whole knowledge ecosystem approach in which different actors work together to do their part."

NPW: Yes, indeed this is the rationale behind HIFA's existence: first, that the majority of the world's population does not have access to relevant, reliable healthcare information, and this is a major contributor to avoidable death and suffering; second, that meeting people's information needs depends on the integrity of the global evidence ecosystem. HIFA was established to address three intrinsic weaknesses in the ecosystem: poor communication among the stakeholders; poor understanding of information needs and how to meet them; and poor advocacy associated with lack of political and financial commitment to universal access to reliable healthcare information. We have made some progress through our forums, projects and advocacy programme, but there is much more yet to be achieved. You can read more about our approach here: <https://www.hifa.org/about-hifa>

NPW: An ideal OA system is not one that necessarily benefits researchers, nor even readers. It is one that strengthens the global evidence ecosystem as a whole.

NPW: An ideal OA system serves to build a world where every person has access to the reliable, relevant healthcare information they need to protect their own health and the health of others. The translation of evidence into policy and practice is paramount. OA is an enabler of knowledge translation. But it has limitations.

NPW: I would urge us to look at the OA system not in isolation but as an integral part of the wider global evidence ecosystem. [www.hifa.org/about-hifa](http://www.hifa.org/about-hifa) The purpose of the global evidence ecosystem, and those who work within it, is to meet the information needs of health professionals, the general public, policymakers and others.

NPW: The global evidence ecosystem can be described as having six components:

1. Generate evidence
2. Publish evidence
3. Synthesise evidence
4. Repackage evidence
5. Avail evidence
6. Apply evidence.

## Plan S

NPW: 'Plan S is an initiative for Open Access publishing that was launched in September 2018. The plan is supported by cOAlition S, an international consortium of research funding and performing organisations. Plan S requires that, from 2021, scientific publications that result from research funded by public grants must be published in compliant Open Access journals or platforms.' <https://www.coalition-s.org/>

NPW: Principle 4 notes:

'Where applicable, Open Access publication fees are covered by the Funders or research institutions, not by individual researchers'

and Principle 5 says:



'When Open Access publication fees are applied, they must be commensurate with the publication services delivered and the structure of such fees must be transparent to inform the market and facilitate the potential standardisation and capping of payments of fees.'

NPW: This is in complete alignment with our discussion on HIFA and the suggestion that funders should take responsibility for paying APCs, and that APCs should reflect actual costs (see below). OA journals continue to have a vital role to play.

## Plan U

Chris Zielinski, UK: Velterop advocates for the adoption of the so-called Plan U (for "Universal OA") – funders should mandate that research results must always be posted on an openly accessible preprint server before they are submitted to a journal. That way, the communication of science results would not be confused with the scientists' efforts to enhance their reputations through publication in "high-impact" journals."

## Funders should stop paying APCs

Lacey Lagrone, United States:- The needs of the patient/provider (i.e. access to information) and the publishers (i.e. financial gain) are not aligned, and this systematically and structurally inhibits the flow of evidence into practice. There are 'outcome positive partners' in the space, including, for example, pharmaceutical companies that make products which are generic, time-sensitive, affordable, and according to the highest level of evidence life-saving (e.g. TXA, alteplase). The current system is organized around enormous financial gain for publishers (some of which have a higher profit margin than any industry besides the entertainment industry), and 'every system is perfectly designed to get the results it gets'. - Given the current less than ideal options, and following the lead of a global Open Access champion (Gates' Ashley Farley), I favor publishing pre-prints and then in an APC-free journal, so as not to financially bolster a broken system.

NPW: 'So as not to financially bolster a broken system'. I would agree that the current system can be improved, but I wouldn't say the whole system is broken and that it needs to be swept aside. I would suggest to look at what are the biggest problems with OA publishing, and discuss how to address them. We are currently looking at the problem of inflated APCs, which I think is relatively straightforward to address - what other problems of the current system do we need to look at?

### *Gates Open Access Policy*

From Gates Policy: 'We are stopping support for APCs... this is a critical step in achieving more equitable open access business models moving forward' [NPW: but what will be the impact on the global evidence ecosystem? on the availability or reliable healthcare information? - below]

<https://blogs.lse.ac.uk/impactofsocialsciences/2024/04/09/is-the-bill-and-melinda-gates-foundations-new-oa-policy-the-start-of-a-shift-towards-preprints/>

From Gates Policy: 'The Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation (the second largest charitable foundation in the world) recently announced a new open access (OA) policy. They will require articles resulting from work they fund to be posted as preprints and no longer cover fees for their publication in academic journals. This shift in focus from the peer-reviewed journal article to preprints aligns with a proposal called Plan U and marks a significant policy change for a major funder. It comes at a time of much discussion about the future of academic publishing, as



journal peer review is coming under increased scrutiny and some are questioning whether it's necessary at all...

From Gates Policy: 'The academic community has been arguing about OA for almost three decades. Few dispute that articles reporting research findings should ideally be freely accessible to anyone. How exactly to achieve this, in particular how OA should be paid for, has been hotly debated...

From Gates Policy: 'In the model favoured by commercial journal publishers and, until recently, many funders and OA advocates, publication costs are covered by article processing charges (APCs) levied on the authors. But these merely shift the access barrier from readers to authors...

From Gates Policy: 'A solution to the access problem has however been staring at us in the face for years: preprints, draft versions of articles that have yet to go through the expensive and time-consuming journal peer review process...'

Indi Trehan, United States: I think another dimension would be to consider whether Gates and other funders would be willing to reconsider perhaps funding APCs for non-profit publishers such as PLOS or society journals, rather than for-profit publishers.

Uzodinma Adirieje, Nigeria: Open Access (OA) must be reframed as a strategic public good in Africa and other low- and middle-income countries (LMICs)... Sustainable funding can be achieved by reallocating subscription budgets to support institutional repositories and by establishing national and regional OA funds that subsidize publishing infrastructure rather than costly article processing charges (APCs).

#### *Potential consequences of stopping APCs*

NPW: Gates Foundation says that stopping payment of APCs would lead to 'achieving more equitable open access business models moving forward' But what will be the impact on the global evidence ecosystem? on the availability or reliable healthcare information?

NPW: Publishing of research (including editing and peer review) is one of the six critical components of the global evidence ecosystem [ <https://www.hifa.org/about-hifa> ]. If we mess with this component, we risk weakening the overall ecosystem and reducing the availability and use of reliable healthcare information. I agree that it is important to explore new models, including the potential of preprints and open peer review, and the increasing role of AI. However, in the meantime I would advocate for funders to take responsibility for \*reasonable\* APC costs as a budget line in the research proposal.

NPW: The Gates Foundation has a clear policy on APCs - they will stop paying them altogether. The question is whether this will increase or decrease the dissemination and application of research evidence, in the short- and long-term, and whether it will thereby improve or worsen health outcomes.

NPW: I am concerned about the decision by the Gates Foundation to stop funding APCs. They say that 'By discontinuing to support Open Access fees, we can work to address inequities in current publishing models and reinvest the funds elsewhere'. Instead they are mandating researchers to publish preprints. I am not convinced by their arguments and I believe that it would be a retrograde step for funders to stop paying APCs. APCs represent a tiny fraction of the total costs of research, and the journal publishing process is an indispensable part of knowledge translation. I suggest that such action by Gates and others will lead to fragmentation of research outputs, out-of-pocket costs to researchers, weakening of the overall global

evidence ecosystem, reduced effectiveness of knowledge translation and adverse health outcomes.

NPW: We should not accidentally throw away something important just to get rid of something we don't like.

NPW: By excluding support for researchers to publish in OA journals, funders are weakening the global evidence ecosystem and reducing the availability and use of reliable healthcare information. They are doing the opposite of their own mission statements.

### *Open letter to Gates Foundation*

Uzodinma Adirieje, Nigeria: Dear Neil and Bill Gates Foundation, When a research project funder like Bill Gates Foundation decides to stop paying Article Processing Charges (APCs), it can significantly affect the visibility, accessibility, utilization, and impact of funded research. Without APC support, researchers may not be able to publish in open-access journals, with the risk of limiting global access to their findings — especially in low- and middle-income regions. This decision can also create inequities between well-funded and under-resourced researchers, reducing collaboration, impeding knowledge management, and slowing scientific progress. Furthermore, it undermines the funder's commitment to knowledge dissemination, transparency, and public benefit, as valuable research outcomes risk being locked behind paywalls, restricting their contribution to innovation and evidence-based policymaking; and ultimately impeding progress the 2030 SDGs, and Africa Agenda 2063.

### **Funders should cap APCs**

Rabia Khaji, Tanzania: Promote transparent APC capping and collective negotiations between funders and publishers to prevent cost escalation.

NPW: I would encourage funders to take direct responsibility to support dissemination of their own funded research projects, with capped APC budget lines as recommended by Plan S (which the Gates Foundation is, ironically, one of the first signatories).

NPW: Since the 1990s, when open access was really taking off, I have always assumed that the funders of research would take responsibility for author processing charges. It is in the interests of research funders that the research is published and disseminated, in a format that is most trustworthy and useful for readers. This added value has traditionally been provided by the editorial and peer review processes of academic journals. APCs typically represent a very small percentage of the total costs of research.

NPW: How can we design a better system? I would suggest an evolution in the current system rather than a revolution, retaining the benefits and fixing the problems. It seems to me that the biggest problem is unaffordable APCs. I look forward to hear about other problems that need to be addressed.

NPW: I value highly the contribution of journals in the global evidence ecosystem. They represent component 2 - Publish evidence - one of the six pillars of the ecosystem. They serve to make a preliminary assessment of the quality and reliability of a research manuscript; to copy-edit and proofread the paper through its stages; to manage the peer-review process; and finally to format and deliver the final definitive paper in a way that best meets the needs of readers.

NPW: I would engage rather than exclude journal publishers. Not to do so is to throw away something important just to get rid of something we don't like (unaffordable APCs).

NPW: For me, a better system would be one that is similar to what we already have, but where funders accept the responsibility for paying APCs as (a very small) part of the research budget. We would look at different approaches to ensure that the cost of APCs reflects the actual cost of article processing. The simplest way to do this would be to assess these costs and cap the APC budget line accordingly. The cap would be decided (and made public) by the funder, and would take into account, for example, the cost of the overall research proposal.

NPW: There are lots of other ways in which the publication of health research can evolve, including adoption of artificial intelligence (which should further reduce APCs).

NPW: For me, it would be simple - and more flexible - for funders to cap APCs. In the above example, the budget line for APC might be \$2,000 rather than \$7,000 (depending on the funder's stated APC policy). Even for a million-dollar project this would represent only 0.2% of the total cost of the research. 0.2% to procure editorial expertise, peer review and open access of a final definitive publication.

NPW: Why have [Gates] come to this decision? I have spoken to some who are in favour of the policy, and a key argument is that some OA publishers have been profiteering from the APC system. I agree. In my view, the obvious way forward is not to exclude publishers entirely, but to call them out and negotiate. It would seem feasible for funders and publishers to agree \*reasonable\* APC costs, taking into account both the size of the research budget and the amount of work required by the publisher. If necessary, funders could cap the APC budget line in research proposals, or they could instead have a broader 'dissemination' budget line which would give authors choice on where and how to spend on the dissemination of their research.

NPW: A few of us have proposed that funders should take responsibility for APCs. One option is to build on the system we already have, and focus on addressing the most unpopular aspect of OA - high APCs. In such a system, journals would continue to play a strong role, delivering quality definitive content for end-users. Funders would pay APCs, but these would be capped (what other measures could be used to keep APCs reasonable?). Preprints would continue to have a role, especially for rapid communications among researchers in fast-moving fields. AI would be harnessed with a view to improving quality while reducing publishing costs (and thereby reducing APCs).

NPW: There have been mentions of other approaches. For example, an increased focus on preprints (as proposed by Plan U) and subsequent publication in APC-free OA journals. How would this work in practice? What are the drivers and barriers?

Indi Trehan, United States: My personal opinion is indeed that APCs should be covered by funders, but it is very challenging for us as researchers to plan an accurate line-item in grants for APC fees. We can't accurately predict years ahead of time how much APCs will be (as prices are always going up), whether we will even publish something open access, how many papers will come out of a study, etc. Another challenge is that grant funding has an end-date whereas publications often continue for months to years after the end of the funding so money may not be available.

NPW: For me, it seems relatively straightforward to estimate an APC. Yes, it is impossible to predict exactly what the costs will be at the end of the project (which may be years ahead) as

this will depend on many factors. As we have discussed, funders can have clear policies on APCs.

## We should shift the emphasis to preprints

NPW: What is a preprint? 'In academic publishing, a preprint is a version of a scholarly or scientific paper that precedes formal peer review and publication in a peer-reviewed scholarly or scientific journal.' Wikipedia

Quoting from Gates OA policy: ' [Preprints are] also journal agnostic which means the research can be evaluated in its own merit and not the journal in which it's published' [NPW: a key function of journals is to evaluate papers on their own merit]'

Quoting from Gates OA policy: '[Preprints] allows for the research community to quickly respond and address any issues [NPW: if we have a precipitation of preprints, will this help the research community to 'respond quickly'?]'

Quoting from Gates OA policy: 'Which will thus make it more trustworthy' [NPW: will we trust preprints more than journal articles?]

NPW: I'm in favour of pre-prints but I believe they have a limited role. They are good for rapid sharing of results among researchers, where a field is moving rapidly. But they are not very useful in general for the majority of end-users of health evidence.

NPW: I understand that some publishers have set up their own pre-print repositories, which presumably allow open peer-review with a view to being accepted in one of the publisher's journals. How does this work?

NPW: Pros: The main pro is rapid dissemination of results without the delay of journal peer review. This may be important for fields that are rapidly developing, and is perhaps especially useful to promote efficient exchange among researchers. The usefulness for end-users of research is less clear.

### *Problems of preprints*

NPW: It is unclear whether and how frontline healthcare providers and patients use pre-prints to inform their health decisions. And, if they do, whether the benefits outweigh the risks. If I were a frontline healthcare provider, I would almost never use pre-prints. I would rely primarily on the work of others to synthesise and repackage evidence. I look forward to comments on this.

Suranjana Banik, India: From a healthcare standpoint, it is vital that preprints are interpreted responsibly. For clinicians, especially those in evidence-based fields, preprints can offer early insights but should never be the sole basis for clinical decision-making.

NPW: Cons: Pre-prints are less reliable than journal papers that have undergone peer review. They are more likely to contain errors or methodological flaws. The authors' interpretation of the findings is more likely to be biased. Pre-prints that have sensational findings are likely to add to dangerous misinformation. For example, pre-prints contributed to misinformation about the effectiveness of hydroxychloroquine to treat COVID-19.

NPW: Over time, proponents of pre-prints appear to be embracing not only specialist researchers, but frontline healthcare providers, the general public, policymakers and even the media in a much wider target audience. This ramps up the risks of pre-prints.

NPW: One article I read on this topic (although from a PubMed journal I had not heard of before) concluded: 'While preprints offer many benefits, the misuse of AI technologies like ChatGPT only adds to the great risks associated with their use. Therefore, it is critical that all parties involved in medical research take a more cautious and responsible approach to the use of preprints.'

## Other considerations

### *Transaction agreements between academic institutions and publishers*

Indi Trehan, United States: The cost of these university packages continues to increase and much has been written about how difficult it is for university library budgets to keep supporting these, which is especially ironic since it is often the same university researchers that are producing the content that goes into those journals, research that is often publicly funded itself. A vicious circle that has led to some high-profile disagreements between universities and publishers. It is not clear how these conflicts will play out, but one approach here has been for the university to set up agreements with certain publishers for the university to pay for their researchers' open-access fees instead of, or in addition to, paying for the subscription costs to the journals.

### *Diamond OA journals*

NPW: 'APC-free journals'. Open-access journals that are able to deliver quality editorial and peer review without APCs are commendable. I invite HIFA members to describe examples of such journals. I understand that many of these are small enterprises, perhaps funded by their academic institution. I think all the major OA journals - those with the highest impact funders - rely on APCs?

NPW: I would question whether APC-free is better than APC-affordable, particularly for the larger journals.

Quoted from: When "Free" Isn't Fair: The Hidden Costs of Diamond OA. The "no-fee" model often conceals significant costs. Editorial labor, copyediting, typesetting, hosting, preservation — none of these are free. When no revenue is collected from subscriptions or APCs, someone must absorb the expense. Often, that "someone" is a small editorial team working unpaid, a university department stretching its limited budget, or a scholarly society relying on volunteer time... In 2024, the Dutch research council NWO launched grants of up to €50,000 to support journals flipping to diamond OA, recognizing that transitions are costly and require financial planning. Similar initiatives, such as NSF-funded programs at MIT, provide crucial short-term support for the transition phase. However, most of these grants last only a few years, leaving journals facing significant uncertainty once the initial funding ends.

<https://scholarlykitchen.sspnet.org/2025/10/15/diamond-dreams-unequal-realities-the-promise-and-pitfalls-of-no-apc-open-access/>

NPW: It's interesting to see that Diamond OA advocates are now saying that diamond OA should be supported in core research funding. Which brings us back to where we were a few weeks ago: research funders should take responsibility for funding research communication [whether this is through APCs or through financial support for Diamond OA journals]

### *Governance*

Uzodinma Adirieje, Nigeria: Community Governance. Managed by an international consortium of researchers, practitioners, and policymakers to ensure accountability, transparency, and adaptability.

### *Co-development*

Virginia Barbour, Australia: I would start from the premise that it's essential that systems are designed collectively and in cooperation regionally and globally. There are many good examples of OA systems already being designed but in the development of new systems it is essential that they are underpinned by community rather than commercial principles. These principles will include equity, especially financial and transparency of processes.

### *Bibliodiversity*

Virginia Barbour, Australia: A further important principle is that of bibliodiversity - that is support for a multitude of publishing models.

### *A global OA fund*

Uzodinma Adirieje, Nigeria: a "global OA Fund: Supported by governments, philanthropic foundations, and international health organizations, covering APCs for researchers without institutional backing".

Uzodinma Adirieje, Nigeria: It is my considered opinion that the Global Open Access Fund (GOAF) would serve as a dedicated international mechanism to promote equitable access to scientific publishing by removing financial barriers for researchers lacking institutional or grant support. Supported collaboratively by governments, philanthropic foundations, multilateral agencies, and global health organizations, the Fund would pool resources into a transparent, centrally managed platform. Eligible researchers — especially from low- and middle-income countries — could apply for coverage of Article Processing Charges (APCs) required by open-access journals.

### *Alternatives to 'publish or perish'*

Margaret Winker, United States: One approach would be to reward research transparency, including full data access, and deemphasize the number of publications, journal impact factor, and citations as a measure of research importance. Some countries are starting down that path, but many more are needed to change the research culture. If they do not, and LMIC journals don't have tools to meet these new challenges, both they and the research culture they help support, which is so important to contextualize medicine and other fields for local populations around the world, will suffer.

## **ChatGPT's recommendation for an OA model**

NPW: I asked ChatGPT for help to describe a model open access system. I did prompt it with my own personal biases (as I have already expressed)...

This is what it replied:

Talking Points: A Practical Approach to Funding Open Access in Health Research

1. Funders should pay APCs — but wisely.

\*The cost of publishing open access is tiny compared to the overall cost of health research — often less than 1%.

\*Yet, publication is where research becomes impact. It's how evidence reaches practitioners, policymakers, and the public.

\*That's why APCs should be a standard budget line in research proposals, covered by funders up to a sensible cap.

\*This ensures predictability, fairness, and visibility of funded work.

## 2. Capping APCs keeps the system fair and sustainable.

\*Funders can limit reimbursement to a maximum (say, USD 1,500–2,000) and require publishers to justify their costs.

\*This helps prevent excessive pricing while sustaining the genuine services journals provide — coordination of peer review, professional editing, and indexing.

\*If publishers want to charge more, they can, but funders and authors are free to choose better-value options.

\*Competition then drives efficiency, not prestige inflation.

## 3. We still need journals — and peer review.

\*Preprints are wonderful for speed and transparency, but they aren't enough for healthcare.

\*Clinicians and health managers need reliable, edited, peer-reviewed evidence that's easy to read and ready to apply.

\*Preprints can complement journals, but they shouldn't replace them. In healthcare, reliability and clarity save lives.

## 4. Refusing to pay APCs altogether risks backfiring.

\*Some funders, like the Gates Foundation, have stopped paying APCs in protest at high costs.

\*That frustration is understandable — but abandoning APCs entirely risks pushing authors toward obscure or lower-quality outlets.

\*It's like throwing the baby out with the bathwater. The real solution is to make APCs affordable, transparent, and equitable.

## 5. A pragmatic “funders-pay-with-conditions” model could work.

Here's a simple, balanced formula:

\*Funders pay APCs up to a reasonable cap.

\*Publishers must disclose their costs and services.

\*LMIC and unfunded authors get automatic waivers.

\*Only journals meeting recognised quality standards (COPE, DOAJ) qualify.

\*Funders reserve part of the OA budget for repositories, Diamond journals, and translation into local languages.

\*This model is practical, equitable, and supports both global access and quality assurance.

## 6. The bottom line.

\*Open access is essential — but it must also be fair, affordable, and trustworthy.

\*We need the input of journals, but we need to avoid them overcharging for their input.

\*By working together — funders, publishers, and researchers — we can open not just access, but impact.

## Week 5. Open discussion and next steps.

### General reflections

NPW: Our discussion suggests that everyone appreciates the main benefit of open access publishing: that it is free to access for anyone with an internet connection. Researchers appreciate it for the increased visibility that it gives to their work.

NPW: Free access is described as the main benefit and article processing charges are the main barrier.

### What do publishers think?

NPW: Second, is there potential for global health journals (eg GHSP, The Lancet, The Lancet Global Health, BMJ Global Health, WHO Bulletin) to collaborate and build solidarity, particularly in this era of financial cuts to global health by the US and UK governments? We have representatives of all these journals on HIFA and we would welcome their inputs. This is also an area that WAME (World Association of Medical Editors) might be able to support. HIFA Steering Group member Chris Zielinski is currently President of WAME and may like to comment.

#### *Case study: GHSP*

Ruwaida Salem, United States: I can offer my perspective, as the Managing Editor of a diamond OA journal, Global Health: Science and Practice (GHSP), on what an OA journal might be able to contribute in this ecosystem... Support from donors, philanthropies, or others for community-owned diamond OA journals is critical for sustaining high-quality publications that focus on sharing thoughtful and useful knowledge that readers, in turn, are more likely to put into use...

### Maintaining quality, ICTs and AI

Margaret Winker, United States: - In many countries, academicians -- and even students in some countries -- are required to publish research to maintain their positions or to graduate. They may not have the resources or time to conduct sufficient research for promotion or graduation, so an industry selling fake papers and authorships on accepted manuscripts has evolved, aka "paper mills."

Margaret Winker, United States: - AI has made generating fake papers or components of research much faster and cheaper.

Margaret Winker, United States: - Many journals are receiving many more manuscript submissions to screen and potentially peer review, taxing editorial resources.

Margaret Winker, United States: b. How can journals in LMICs and other journals with few resources have access to tools to screen manuscripts for potential scientific misconduct and other issues, including plagiarism, image manipulation, papermills, and AI-generated content that authors have not identified as such? Such tools are available to many journals with large publishers, but these publishers don't work for, or with, many LMIC journals for a number of reasons, and journals in LMICs often cannot afford to pay for the tools.

Lacey Lagrone, United States - Just like the development of the internet, the introduction of genAI holds huge promise, and huge risk, and its use will likely bend towards profit-generation for industries except where persons whose incentives are aligned with the patient choose to



take an active role in defining how/where/when genAI is used in the evidence to practice continuum. In other words, it will be new tech, in an old way (the old way being inequity).

## Open data

Simon Lewin, Norway: Ensuring that research evidence is available open access was an important point of discussion within the Evidence Synthesis Infrastructure Collaborative (ESIC) deliberations and part of the ESIC roadmap is looking at how to provide 'open reusable data' that can be incorporated into workflows for decision support products such as systematic reviews and evidence briefs for policymaking...

## Language

Najeeb Al-Shorbai, Jordan: The assumption is that ALL can speak and write in English. This is a wrong assumption. Not all health science scientists in LMICs master English as native speakers...

NPW: HIFA has argued that the abstracts (at the very least) of all health research papers should be available in the language of the country/ies where they are most likely to be applied. [https://www.thelancet.com/journals/langlo/article/PIIS2214-109X\(18\)30384-X/fulltext](https://www.thelancet.com/journals/langlo/article/PIIS2214-109X(18)30384-X/fulltext)

## Impact of COVID-19

Margaret Winker, United States: This study would be useful to review: "The impact of COVID-19 on the debate on open science: a qualitative analysis of published materials from the period of the pandemic" <https://www.nature.com/articles/s41599-024-03804-w> The article is Open Access. The section "Clear 'line of sight' to the benefits of OS" is particularly relevant to our discussion. [This includes the following statement 'the success in responding to the COVID-19 pandemic has depended fundamentally on open science']

## Unanswered (or partially answered) questions (#105)

NPW: I have extracted all the questions from our edited compilation document: <https://www.hifa.org/sites/default/files/articles/Compilation-OA-short-e...>

I have provisionally classified these under subheadings. Some of the questions have been partly answered, while others have yet to receive comments.

If you can help with any of these, please email: [hifa@hifaforums.org](mailto:hifa@hifaforums.org)

### 1. WHAT IS THE IMPACT OF OPEN ACCESS (OA) ON HEALTH CARE?

1.1 What is the impact of open access to health research on health care?

1.2 Who needs access to original research and why?

1.3 Do health professionals need access to the full text of research to deliver quality health care?

1.4 If all pharma-funded research were open access, would this help drive improvements in patient care?

### 2. WHAT IS YOUR EXPERIENCE OF OA AS A HEALTHCARE PROFESSIONAL/READER?

2.1 How important is open access publishing for healthcare professionals?

2.2 What are the perceived benefits and barriers of open access publishing for healthcare professionals, as readers and users of scientific content?

2.3 What is the impact of \*not\* publishing open access on healthcare professionals, especially for those who \*do not\* have access via an institutional subscription?

2.4 Can you describe a situation where a healthcare professional made a conscious decision to publish with or without OA, including the reasons behind the decision?

2.5 To your knowledge, has open access to research ever saved a life?

2.6 Can anyone say more about the use of PubMed Central as a tool for direct or indirect impact on health? I note from the NLM website that PubMed is used by about 3.5 million people every day, but cannot find figures specifically for PubMed Central. I would like to ask HIFA members: do you use PubMed Central in your work? What difference does it make? Can you give any examples?

### 3. WHAT IS YOUR EXPERIENCE OF OA AS A RESEARCHER/AUTHOR?

### 4. HOW WOULD YOU DESIGN AN OA SYSTEM THAT RETAINS THE BENEFITS BUT FIXES THE PROBLEMS OF THE CURRENT OA SYSTEM?

### 5. OPEN ACCESS AND THE GLOBAL EVIDENCE ECOSYSTEM

5.1 What is the impact of open access to research on the global evidence ecosystem?

5.2 How can open access to research facilitate the six different components of the global evidence ecosystem? how does open access to primary research enable evidence synthesis such as systematic reviews and clinical guidelines? And in what ways does open access to research facilitate the development of educational resources, formularies, books...?

5.3 How can OA help research and knowledge from LMICs be peer reviewed, published, translated, and disseminated?

5.4 How does open access facilitate the peer review, publication, translation and dissemination of research? With most open access licences, translation and dissemination of research is unrestricted, thereby increasing availability and applicability. Does open access also facilitate peer review, and perhaps some aspects (which?) of the publishing process?

5.5 How can OA help ensure that journal content from LMICs is indexed and discoverable via search engines? (WHO databases may contain LMIC content that is not indexed in other ways, but those databases may not be searched by usual search engines.)

5.6 How can open access initiatives do more to support translation of evidence into practice, especially in low-resource settings?

5.7 Could open access platforms collaborate more with those developing guidelines, job aids, and community health materials, so that synthesized evidence flows more efficiently to end users?

### 6. PREPRINTS

6.1 What is your experience with pre-prints?

### 7. Article Processing Charges (APCs)

7.1 Some OA journals do not charge APCs. How do they do this?

7.2 Do all the major OA journals rely on APCs?

7.3 What are your views on APC waivers?

7.4 Should funders take responsibility for paying APCs?

### 8. Artificial intelligence

In what ways will AI change things? Will it reduce costs of processing articles (and thereby potentially lower APCs)?