

Supplement 16

Suggestions and remarks on conflicting incentives. The remarks in bold very mentioned several times.

	Researcher	Home organisation	Peer networks	National coordination	Research funders
Rationale for publishing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A researcher has to choose high impact + restricted access or low impact + open access Researchers strive to highest quality, also in journals. This discrepancy in incentives is often mentioned but it is hard to verify. Researchers should have proper education on choosing open high impact quality journals and avoiding predator journals. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> An organisation encourages both customer work and high impact publication, but does not provide time for both. University does not have clear incentives for OA publishing for disciplines not having high quality OA journals. Publishing in the best, non-open journals is a precondition for academic positions. University should have bursary for OA fees. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> International peer networks are still very reluctant to OA publishing. JUFO makes it harder to be open, as individual researcher's publication activities are evaluated by it. JUFO does not correlate with openness. Creating clear discipline-specific guidelines and recommendations. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> International active work and push for openness would change the scene and remove the discrepancy in five years. Changes are possible, but they demand strong international collaboration and pressure. Collaboration with publishers needed. We are lacking clear shared intent on how to proceed. Openness should not be pivotal in metrics for research evaluation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Existing models for funding and merit stimulate publishing behind a paywall. Ministry of Education and Culture is encouraging to publish according to JUFO-classes (to get funding). Artificial quantitative metrics for funding (like JUFO) is a tricky boundary condition, and makes collaboration and OA publishing somewhat unwelcome. Quantity replaces quality. Publishing in high impact quality journal does not guarantee that the research was of high quality. There is a publication bias. Recognizing the amount of publications stimulates the avoidance of open practices, splitting research results and seeking statistically significant result with questionable research methods.
Discipline-specific differences	The competitive and innovative advantage provided by new type of journals is not properly understood.	Professional and popular journals are not appreciated.	Some disciplines still lack high quality OA journals	Professional and popular journals are not appreciated.	There is a significant conflict with impact, costs, and funder demands.
Missing alternative metrics for data and publications sharing	There is lacking understanding in self-archiving as one OA instrument.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Self-archiving should be encouraged. Universities should be prohibited for using JUFO-classes for bonuses or in hiring. 	Self-archiving should be encouraged	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pushing for recommendations for responsible evaluation of researchers nationally and internationally Defining sensible metrics for research work. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Demands for just opening data sets very quickly do not encourage the collection of big and deep high quality data sets. Merit should be given from data and societal impact. Let us develop a better system to replace JUFO. Universities should be prohibited for

**using JUFO-
classes for
bonuses or in
hiring.**