

## Comments on UNESCO Recommendation Open Science

Dear all,

I was incredibly grateful to receive a request from Lutz Möller for comments on the UNESCO Recommendation Open Science. First of all, I'd like to say that I'm very impressed. The recommendations are incredibly well crafted and address a number of concerns I have, e.g. the dangers of commercialisation of Open Science practices in a similar way that publishing has become a huge business that takes tax-payer funded research and puts it behind paywalls.

Attached you find a word document that includes my comments but to summarise, I have two major points to make:

1.) I'm a molecular biologist by training and sharing/ openness in this research area is not necessarily restricted to digital materials, which appears to be the main focus of the recommendation. I would also consider the sharing of non-digital research materials, e.g. reagents, to be an essential part of Open Science practices. To give an example, there are central facilities like Addgene (<https://www.addgene.org/>) that store research materials for biologists. It might be useful to add sharing of (non-digital) methods to a number of points (see my comments) to have a more "inclusive" definition of "Open Methodology" that does not only include Open Software and Open Hardware.

2.) I wonder whether researchers with a (non-digital) humanities background have commented on the draft. From my point of view as a biologist, the recommendations such as the use of preprints (line 679) or open access publishing make a lot of sense but I wonder whether that is also true for humanities researchers, which have different publishing practices and depend a lot more on publication of monographs.

Thanks for your incredible work on this!

Best wishes,

Verena Heise, DPhil

Research Fellow

Hanse-Wissenschaftskolleg (Institute for Advanced Study)