How does scholarly publishing facilitate or hinder the development of digital libraries? Include in your discussion a consideration of the economics of scholarly publishing.

“Preserving the scholarly record is more difﬁcult in a digital world than a print one, due to the rapid evolution of technology, changes in intellectual property regulations, and new business models for publishing.”

The delicate balance between the roles of scholars, publishers, and librarians that existed in the print world is now askew. By the latter 1990s, the traditional library model of journal subscriptions and book purchasing was deemed economically unsustainable

Digital documents are not ﬁxed; they are malleable, mutable, and mobile. Only one master version exists, and it can be altered, destroyed, or become unreadable, either deliberately or through benign neglect. Perfect reproductions can be made and distributed widely, however. Documents can be revised without any indication that alterations have occurred. Other material can be attached to a document, even after it is published.

Most of the costs involved in producing information are intellectual. The ﬁrst copy is expensive; subsequent reproduction and distribution are relatively inexpensive.

Describe the evolution of the "invisible college" as networked scholarly information has taken over from the solely print form.

Big science also can refer to mature ﬁelds that have formalized their research methods, established international and collaborative projects, and developed invisible colleges of researchers who know each other and exchange information on a formal and informal basis

Printed publications once dominated scholarly communication, with researchers relying on journals and books to disseminate knowledge. However, the rise of digital platforms and the internet has democratized access to information, fostering a more inclusive and collaborative invisible college. Online forums, academic social networks, and open-access repositories have become the modern-day meeting places for scholars, enabling real-time communication and the rapid exchange of ideas across disciplines and geographical boundaries. This shift has not only accelerated the pace of academic discourse but has also elevated the visibility of previously marginalized voices, ushering in a new era where the invisible college thrives in the digital landscape.

How can quality be assured in institutional repositories?  Discuss digital curation in relation to institutional repositories.  
Interest in text and data mining has ampliﬁed the tensions between using institutional repositories to provide access to current publications and creating new models of publishing,

The library community makes a strong case for institutional repositories as a means to provide open access, but with different arguments. As presented in a seminal position paper (Crow 2002), institutional repositories arose in response to two strategic issues facing universities: to reform scholarly communication by disaggregating the functions of publishing, and to provide “tangible indicators of an institution’s quality.” Each university can showcase the work of its faculty in institutional repositories, and those repositories can be interoperable, thus expanding access. Universities can assert more control over the scholarly communication system and save money. The registration, certiﬁcation, dissemination, and preservation functions of publishing can be separated. Repositories also can provide additional services such as managing reports of publications to personnel review committees and funding agencies

Although incentives differ, the interests of authors, libraries, and universities in the use of institutional repositories to self-archive publications are aligned. Still, approaches to such use began to diverge as the low participation rates of authors became apparent. Libraries, having begun to build the technology, saw additional uses for it. They could capture other valuable content in digital form, including manuscripts, reports, instructional materials, data sets, digitized materials, and university documentation, all of which they are under pressure to preserve. Repositories could therefore legitimize a wider array of scholarly communication than just peer-reviewed publications. The broader array of content serves the stated library goals, but from the perspective of self-archiving advocates, dilutes the goal of immediate access to peer reviewed publications. Larger and more diverse repositories also are a more expensive undertaking with greater requirements for preservation. As repositories expand in scope to become digital libraries, the deﬁnition of institutional repository becomes ever more vague