

平成 29 年 8 月 25 日

博士論文審査結果報告
Report on Ph.D. / Doctoral Dissertation Defense

政策研究大学院大学
教授 隅藏 康一

審査委員会を代表し、以下のとおり審査結果を報告します。

On behalf of the Doctoral Thesis Review Committee, I would like to report the result of the Ph. D. / Doctoral Dissertation Defense as follows.

学位申請者氏名 Ph.D. Candidate	ElHassan Anas ElSabry		
学籍番号 ID Number	DOC14153		
プログラム名 Program	科学技術イノベーション政策プログラム Science, Technology and Innovation Policy Program		
審査委員会 Doctoral Thesis Review Committee	主査 Main referee	隅藏 康一 SUMIKURA, Koichi	主指導教員 Main advisor
	審査委員 Referee	桑原 輝隆 KUWAHARA, Terutaka	副指導教員 Sub advisor
	審査委員 Referee	INTARAKUMNERD, Patarapong	副指導教員 Sub advisor
	審査委員 Referee	MUNRO, Alistair	博士課程委員会委員長代理 Doctoral Programs Committee Representative
	審査委員 Referee	安達 淳 ADACHI, Jun (国立情報学研究所 教授/ National Institute of Informatics)	外部審査委員 Referee from outside institutions
論文タイトル Dissertation Title	The Societal Impact of Open Access to Research		
(タイトル和訳)※ Title in Japanese	研究成果のオープン・アクセス化の社会的インパクト		
学位名 Degree Title	博士 (政策研究) / Doctor of Policy Studies		
論文提出日 Submission Date of the Draft Dissertation	平成 29(2017)年 5 月 2 日	論文審査会開催日 Date of the Degree Committee Meeting	平成 29(2017)年 6 月 1 日
論文発表会開催日 Date of the Defense	平成 29(2017)年 6 月 1 日	論文最終版提出日 Submission Date of the Final Dissertation	平成 29(2017)年 8 月 23 日
審査結果 Result	合格 Pass		
	不合格 Failure		

※タイトルが英文の場合、文部科学省に報告するため、和訳を付してください

If the title is in English, please translate in Japanese in order to report MEXT.

1. 論文要旨 Thesis overview and summary of the presentation.

Open Access to scholarly literature has been an issue under debate since the early days of the World Wide Web. For over two decades, study after study have investigated the impact of Open Access (OA) to research papers in a variety of different contexts. Those studies have predominantly focused on the impact it has on the academic community itself. For example, so many studies were published on what is called the “Open Access Citation Advantage (OACA)”. They all tried to validate (or argue against) the claim that making an article openly available online results in more citations to that article, than its toll-access counterparts. Another large portion of studies have focused on business models associated with Open Access. Yet, implications of open access in non-academic contexts (practitioners, policymakers, patients, concerned citizens, etc.) have been the subject of many discussions and indeed was the basis for much of the advocacy work and its responses from science funding agencies, but rarely so in formal published studies. In fact, several researchers have specifically pointed to the lack of research in this area.

This study is the first comprehensive attempt to understand the potential impact of open access research on society at large (beyond academia). It starts by examining the rhetoric about societal benefits within the Open Access movement (as represented by advocates, policymakers and leading researchers). It goes on with collecting and synthesizing the scarce evidence available on the issue. The study then makes its contribution on the theoretical level by introducing a typology of the various science/society interfaces where access to research papers is needed. The proposed scheme is anticipated to provide guidance for future research on the issue. In effort to add to this scarce evidence, the study also investigate more closely two specific groups of research users from outside academia. It seeks to understand factors affecting citations to open access journals in patents of US pharmaceutical companies and sheds light on the rising trend of “independent researchers” and how they might benefit from open access to scholarly literature.

Open access is an issue of growing policy interest. More and more governments and science policymaking bodies are involved in the Open Access debate. There is considerable pressure (from both sides of the debate) on policymakers to respond and take related decisions. The study aims to contribute a clearer picture of the non-academic uses of research papers and ends by recommendations to science policy makers as well as future researchers in the field.

Mr. ElHassan made a very clear presentation that lasted for about 45 minutes and subsequently the referees made several questions and comments.

2. 審査報告 Notes from the Doctoral Thesis Review Committee (including changes required to the thesis by the referees)

Summary of the comments at the Doctoral Thesis Review Committee is as follows.

- (1) The main findings should be linked with theoretical debates related to the issue of "open access," such as knowledge diffusion, open innovation or absorptive capacity.
- (2) He should explain why he picked up the examples of US pharmaceutical industry and independent researchers.
- (3) A chapter of "Conclusion" should be provided.
- (4) The econometric analysis presented in the defense should be incorporated into the revised thesis.
- (5) As a robustness check, the data analysis should be redone with the 'abstracts' not counted as open access. Both sets of the results should be presented and compared, and the arguments for and against including abstracts considered properly (including references to the literature).
- (6) As a large majority of the data points are thrown away because of difficulties in finding matching financial data for firms, some attempt to bring the missing data into the dissertation should be taken. If this is not possible, then an explanation should be provided.
- (7) The reasons why firm financial data is missing should be properly examined.

The second version of dissertation was submitted and distributed to the reviewers, with explanation of the changes attached, on July 13th, 2017. The ratings were 5, 5, 5, 4 and 3, in which the median was 5.

On (2) and (3), one of the reviewer commented, "According to the revision of Chapter 5.1, more explanation of pharmaceutical industry research was added and this modification clarifies my questions raised in the defense of June 1st. The conclusions at each chapter were also revised and they are reasonable. To sum up, there is nothing to point out for further revision, since all the comments I made at the defense are appropriately dealt with."

On (1) and (4)-(7), some of the reviewers made additional comments for improvements. He tried to respond to the comments and updated on those points in the final version of his dissertation.

3. 最終提出論文確認結果 Confirmation by the Main Referee that changes have been done to the satisfaction of the referees

Mr. ElHassan has revised his thesis to incorporate the comments of the referees and has provided an explanation of the changes. The referees are satisfied with the revisions.

4. 最終審查結果 Final recommendation

I recommend that the degree of Doctor of Policy Studies be awarded to Mr. ElHassan.