

Q & A transcript

Annual meeting & board election #CRLIVE20

#	Question	Answers
1	Ed: can you say something about how often the full public datafile was used (downloaded)?	The file is hosted on academic torrents: https://academictorrents.com/details/0c6c3fbfdc13f0169b561d29354ea8b188eb9d63 The 'technical' tab has some stats.
2	My question is about multilingual metadata support. Publishers of non-English serials are always confused whether to register metadata in English or in national language. Either choice decreases the discoverability and reference detecting. It will be a way better to register multilingual metadata for such publications.	Thanks Denis, we are just starting a group to look at multilingual metadata. it includes a couple of member of our board and staff - I'll post more about it on our blog soon "Thanks, Bryan! Can we participate in this group?" Happy to widen it! support@crossref.org

3	It'll be nice if crossref can reduce membership fees for small organisations which didn't have revenues. How to do it?	Hi - we do a few things to help and enable smaller orgs to participate - see https://www.crossref.org/fee-assistance. Does this help? The Sponsors Program is the main way to allow smaller publishers to work with Crossref. Or email member@crossref.org and we can chat through options. Thank you Ginny! I'll email to discuss possible options. Thanks - that'd be good - keen to see what more we could do
---	---	---

4	How complete and accurate would you say the “is-identical-to” field is so far? Is there an outlook for improving the quality of that relationship?	(or, relationships in general!) - asking because in the past when we were looking at book DOIs via co-access there was a bit of inconsistency there The relationships are defined by the depositor. Crossref does not detect them, in general. We detect "conflicts" for items with the same metadata, but that does not apply to any relationship. Same for co-access, no further relationship is applied by Crossref. It's an interesting idea, however, but I'm not sure how we would implement determining the accuracy of the relations. That makes sense. I guess some of the situations we noticed, particularly with Co-access, was say, one book DOI that shows two ISBNs and two other DOIs, but then if you look at one of the other DOIs it only shows one other DOI and one ISBN, that kind of thing I can understand that it is wildly complicated to ensure the quality of that data :) Do you have an example of that? I would expect that there is some indication of the relationship in the "crm-items" rather than the XML since we generally don't modify the deposited XML (except for adding DOIs to things that we've determined matched on deposited information like references) Oops, I just wrote as a new question - I do have an example, but I'd have to dig for it :D OK, so for instance - http://api.crossref.org/works/10.1353/book.56233 has is-identical-to and a DOI, but if you look up that DOI, there's no is-identical-to field at all That one's actually got 3 DOIs, 10.7591/9781501713071 and 10.1353/book.56233 and 10.7591/cornell/9781501709937.001.0001 - and only the last one actually references both of the others. The first one references neither, the second one references the first one, and the last one references both of the first ones the REST-API reads the "crm-items", however, a "crm-item" change does not trigger a "this doi has been
---	---	---

	updated" event to push the DOI to the REST-API so it may not have been updated. If you look at the UNIXSD for the DOIs you'll see one has the deposited XML identical, and the other has the "crm-item" at the top with the inverse link: http://doi.crossref.org/search/doi?pid=myalter@crossref.org&format=unixsd&doi=10.7591/9781501713071 http://doi.crossref.org/search/doi?pid=myalter@crossref.org&format=unixsd&doi=10.1353/book.56233 I was most curious about the co-access situation mentioned above with the ISBN for 3 but one item only having one other in it, any chance you have an example of that? I'm sure I do, got to dig again! Most of these came out of looking to support TOME books, which are often registered through Project Muse plus one or, for some reason, two other university publishers (if you guys are looking for people for product interviews about co-access, I'm really happy to be involved) I guess the same example actually sort of works, though it's not quite as wacky as I originally described: 1. 10.7591/cornell/9781501709937.001.0001 gives you two ISBNs, "9781501709937", "9781501713071" 2. 10.1353/book.56233 and 10.7591/9781501713071 each give you one ISBN, "9781501713071" A second example, which I don't think is actually a co-access scenario (though it probably should be?) - there's a publisher DOI http://api.crossref.org/works/10.3998/mpub.9831118 and a JSTOR DOI http://api.crossref.org/works/10.2307/j.ctv3mt93h and they don't share ISBNs :/ What would you like to see here? The DOIs were deposited with the displayed ISBNs, which we matched to each other, which put them into co-access. Would showing their co-access status in the XML response the sort of thing you'd like or something else? Most ideally, regardless of which DOI you originally saw, you would retrieve the same metadata for it (including all the other DOIs it might be associated with, all the ISBNs, and consistent titles, dates, authors, etc)
--	--

	(by which I mean all the other DOIs that represent the same item) That's an interesting idea. We don't currently overwrite the xml content deposited for the DOI, so if the other isbnns were not included, we are not building it off the relationship data. Yeah, I can definitely understand that wrt the ISBNs. Like, what are you going to do, check all the other records and make sure all the ISBNs are the same? That sounds like a pretty complex operation.... At the same time, I think in order for the is-identical-to field to be meaningfully useful for us we'd at least need all DOIs to be consistently present on all records - so you don't risk hitting the wrong record and not finding out about the relationships, basically It's likely that the ISBN is actually not associated with the other publishers. They may only have the electronic version, so the print one would not apply to them. Their metadata may contain other bits that differ slightly (say it's hosted in another language, for instance). We'd have to think of a way of displaying that. That also makes sense, considering that books already have all these different versions. But then I guess it makes me wonder, is one co-access DOI technically supposed to represent a different record than another co-access DOI, in the same way that one ISBN represents a paperback and the other an ebook, etc.? I think part of this also comes back to the fact that I don't fully understand the motivation of book publishers to apply different DOIs to the same item - I assumed it was primarily a branding/ownership kind of thing, i.e "we don't want to display your DOI on our publisher page" Those relationships are all given to us by the depositing publisher, we don't determine them. As far as co-access is concerned, we say that if an ISBN matches, then the DOI is referring to the same work, but we don't make further determinations as to whether the metadata matches or is as complete for the other items. Book publishers normally do not assign a different DOI to the same work, for books, it would be rejected by us, for other works it would be marked as a conflict. Co-access is a special case of multi-resolution where more than one publisher is publishing the same work, and they each have their own DOI to that work.
--	--

		You're right about the two that don't share an ISBN, which excludes them from co-access. If either of the other two DOIs or the excluded DOI was deposited with an ISBN from the other set, and the publishers were opted into co-access group, they'd be put into co-access.
5	Is a relationship, once identified on Crossref, bi-directional? I noticed difference between <code>is_preprint_of</code> and <code>has_preprint</code>	Yes, if the referenced DOI is a Crossref DOI, it will show the relationship in the other direction as part of the "crm-item" in the UNIXSD view, for example. "Here's an example, Michael: http://api.crossref.org/works/10.26434/chemrxiv.12116175.v2/transform/application/vnd.crossref.unixsd+xml Look for: <code><rel:related_item></code> <code><rel:intra_work_relation identifier-type=""doi""</code> <code>relationship-type=""isPreprintOf"">10.1021/acsomega.0c03342</rel:intra_work_relation></code> <code></rel:related_item></code>"
6	Is Crossref still working on establishing a conference ID? There was a WG. See https://www.crossref.org/categories/conference-ids/	We are still working on identifiers for conferences - at this point we're just waiting for time to implement, it will be part of our forthcoming schema changes. DataCite will be implementing as well.
7	Thanks Jon, Issac, just wondered about the difference in numbers on Eds slides for these?	Relationships can be supplied for a number of identifiers as well as for non-Crossref DOIs, we can currently only make them recursive for Crossref DOIs, so that most likely explains it - I had noticed that discrepancy as well and intend to dig into what relationships are being supplied for what identifiers a bit more (hopefully soon!) :-) thanks

8	Regarding sustainability of the organisation: Should crossref try to register in other countries as well, in order to be more resilient to controversial jurisdictions? Currently the organisation is registered as an US organisation.	Thanks for your question. It's a good point to raise. We have thought about the possibility of registering in a different country but to date we haven't had any problems or been constrained - there's quite a strong non-profit legal framework in the US and in New York state that isn't subject to sudden changes.
9	Can I have all what Ed had talk about	We will share the slides of all the talks and the Zoom session is being recorded. We will send out links after the meeting.
10	What is the best way to provide feedback to Crossref? We regularly send in help question emails that are quickly answered. But, we are also finding we need to develop work arounds or internal rules for certain things when using Crossref APIs and services. We would love to share our experiences and feedback with Crossref.	Hi Carly, as well as emailing us at feedback@crossref.org , we now also have a community forum. This is fairly new but we would love for you to share your feedback for Crossref and other members there: https://community.crossref.org/
11	Is there any plan on development of Crossref mobile app for carrying out some of activities on the go by members?	Hi - not at the moment. Bryan will be mentioning our plans for a “member center” which will streamline activities for members and these page will be response so useable on mobiles.

12	Redirected from the Chat window, Ibrahim Adeyanju asked: "what is difference between references and open references in the participation report?"	Open References refers to the proportion of your references that are set to open distribution. That means the references you deposit in your metadata will be openly distributed through our APIs. This will typically either be 0% or 100% because reference distribution is set at the prefix level. References refers to the percentage of your DOIs for which you've included references in the submitted metadata. "If your open references are at 0% and you'd like them to be set to open distribution please let us know by emailing support@crossref.org. If your references are at 0% you can start registering them as part of your content registration process. Let us know if you need any assistance." yes, please. how do we start registering our references? There are different way to do so and they depend on how you currently register your content. Do you use the Web deposit form? OJS? Metadata Manager? XML? "Here are some general instructions: https://www.crossref.org/education/metadata-stewardship/maintaining-your-metadata/add-references/ If you use the web deposit form to register your content then you can follow these instructions to register your references: https://www.crossref.org/education/metadata-stewardship/maintaining-your-metadata/add-references/#00176 OJS: https://docs.pkp.sfu.ca/crossref-ojs-manual/en/references"
----	--	---

13	Is it any possibility to collaborate with doaj?	We already collaborate with DOAJ - they make use of Crossref metadata but there is more to do. Do you have suggestions for how we could collaborate better with DOAJ? Thanks Ed for your response. I think the same and more can be done with openaire.
14	Which are the ~20 other funding organisations that have joined as members but have not yet started registering the grant metadata, as you mentioned in your recent email?	US Department of Energy has launched our Award DOI Service and plan to start assigning DOIs for our user facilities awards very soon. Though we were already members for many years, so we wouldn't be in that ~20 new members. Good question - I don't have the list to hand but we can provide after the meeting. Thank you very much, much appreciated. Hi Harry, off the top of my head some are: Chan Zuckerberg Initiative (CZI), The Simons Foundation, Melanoma Research Alliance, Swiss National Science Foundation, Vienna Science & Technology Fund. As Carly says there are existing members like the US Department of Energy who are also working on this. I'm also going to post about this on our blog (soon!) to update. Oh great, thank you. I'm looking forward to the blog post as well.

15	I did not see UWI Press Jamaica listed as a sponsor	Hi Nadine - The University of the West Indies (UWI Press) is listed as a Sponsoring Member within the list of Sponsoring Members on our website, here: https://www.crossref.org/community/sponsors/ Does this answer you question? Hi Nadine, UWI Press is listed under the list of Sponsoring Members (rather than Sponsoring Organizations)
16	From Ed's talk: Many of the organizations listed as current partners in the research infrastructure development (understandably!) are in the scholarly communications industry. Do you see Crossref reaching out to research infrastructure organizations that are outside of scholarly communications, for example, standards organizations, clinical trials, physical facilities/equipment, networking, etc	Definitely - as you note, we are starting with organizations we are already working with and are in scholarly communications but standards and clinical trials are important. We haven't done anything in facilities/equipment - ORCID has done good work on this. The potential is huge so we do have to prioritize.

17	what is difference between references and open references in the participation report?	Thanks for the question! There are some responses above on this: Open References refers to the proportion of your references that are set to open distribution. That means the references you deposit in your metadata will be openly distributed through our APIs. This will typically either be 0% or 100% because reference distribution is set at the prefix level. References refers to the percentage of your DOIs for which you've included references in the submitted metadata. Thanks, Martyn! Beat me to it.
18	is there a way as a member I can get list of aggregator or scholar indexing organization that harvest metadata via DOI from crossref and index them in their database.	You want to know who retrieves metadata from our APIs? This is far from comprehensive, but we have some examples here https://www.crossref.org/services/metadata-retrieval/user-stories/ yes, one indexing organization(SciLit) once told us that they retrieve metadata into their database for indexing purpose. We don't track who consumes which data from our APIs. Our REST API has no access control, and the data is made freely available. Thanks that link was useful

19	Is it possible to detect number articles citations of a journal through Crossref? How?	Yes, each article has a count of citations in its metadata. You can query these using our API. You can participate with Cited-by to obtain the number of citations. "Alternatively, the journal depositor reports also can provide you with the cited-by counts for each DOI of a journal here: https://www.crossref.org/06members/51depositor.html And, here's a specific example from the journal Advances in Forestry Science: https://data.crossref.org/depositorreport?pubid=J331817 Look for the cited-by counts for each DOI on the far right." The number of citations are available to anyone, through Cited-by you can get the list of citing articles, including those that are deposited as 'closed references'. Cited-by is available to any member who deposits references in their metadata.
20	These Q+A are very useful. Might Crossref also share the Q+A text in follow up? Might also be nice to have a transcription/summary for those of us with less good English?	Second that. We'll make the Q&A available in the community forum - https://community.crossref.org/. It's a great place to get your questions answered or answer others' questions. Hope to see you there! Oh great, thank you. I'm looking forward to the blog post as well. Thanks for the information

21	Bryan (or Martyn :-)), can you also give a short update on plans for / work on Crossref Event Data? (apologies if this will come up in the talk still!)	I'm working on a blog post about this - should be up in the next week. Briefly, it's a case of shoring up the server infrastructure first, then adding in some additional monitoring and quality checks. After that, we'll be looking at the use cases we can best meet to make it as useful as possible. Thanks! Also just now hearing Bryan mention this :))
22	What is crossref doing about educating members especially those in South Korea that similarity check is not the same thing as plagiarism check. It is highly abused. Similarity Check could aid in detecting plagiarism not that it is plagiarism check itself	We do stress this in our webinars and support documentation. It's very important that editorial staff look at the reports within iThenticate to see *why* there is overlapping text. You are right that the system cannot identify definite plagiarism, only matching text. We have recently updated our Similarity Check curriculum to include more information regarding this issue. https://www.crossref.org/education/similarity-check/ithenticate-account-use/similarity-report-understand/ As Bryan mentioned, we've recently had some questions come up regarding pre-prints and Similarity Check, so we are currently working on adding more language here to clarify that as well. We also covered a section on Similarity Check on our LIVE Korea event in June: https://www.slideshare.net/CrossRef/crossref-live-korea-17-june-2020. As Kirsty & Kathleen say, it's an ongoing job to keep clarifying that the reports always need analysis rather than them being a straightforward check.
23	OJS is an excellent platform but the crossref plugin deosn't work very good.	We hope to address some of those challenges with the work we're doing together

24	On one of the slides it said Sunsetting TDM at the end of the year. Can you provide more details on that?	Hi Judy. Bryan posted a blog about this in late August: https://www.crossref.org/blog/evolving-our-support-for-text-and-data-mining/ Take a look and let us know if you have questions. You can always reach us at support@crossref.org with follow-ups. thanks Thanks Bryan
25	Copying question from chat window: From Anjum Sherasiya to All panelists and other attendees: (11:30 AM) Q: Participation report is the real time statistic of the journal with Crossref.	Yes, you can change the date range on the right Current content = anything published in 2018, 2019 and 2020,Ä©Back file = anything published before 2018,Ä©All time = everything you have registered with Crossref
26	can we get a transcription or summary transcription for those with less good English? thank you.	Hi - yes good idea - we'll get a transcript from zoom afterwards and share that out too. Thanks for the suggestion

27	This is not a question but observation, I felt their was sentiment is the candidate vote by members, From results seen, the members vote in large by your listing of names this is why those at the bottom of the two list end up not making it. So I sense some biased here which should be address for next election.	We can look into if the ballot company can present them in a random order next year per ballot. put ladies first! Not the matter of put a sex above the other, everyone should have equal right
----	--	--