SN SciGraph

Modeling publications in SN SciGraph 2012-2019

June 2019

Michele Pasin

Lead Data Architect Tech Product Owner



SPRINGER NATURE

Outline

- 1. A bit of history: how we got here
 - The SciGraph project: motivation, applications and data releases
- 2. Modeling the publications domain
 - Three phases
- 3. Conclusions

SPRINGER NATURE



Formed in **May 2015** through the **merger** of Nature Publishing Group, Palgrave Macmillan, Macmillan Education and Springer Science+Business Media



Digital Science is a **technology** company formed in 2010 that focuses on strategic investments into startup companies that support the **research lifecycle**. In 2018 it launched Dimensions, a scholarly search engine that is free to use.





SPRINGER NATURE

Springer Nature SciGraph

A Linked Open Data platform for the scholarly domain



> Collaborative effort between Springer Nature and Digital Science (mid 2016)

> Increasing discoverability of content by using linked data and semantic technologies

> Supporting internal use cases, but also contributing to an emerging web of linked scholarly data

www.springernature.com/scigraph

Motivation: integrating Springer Nature archive



Vision



Tomorrow: Knowledge Graph



We manage knowledge

SciGraph data landscape



Applications: analytics dashboards for editors, publishers etc..

oringer Nature SciGraph Analytics Dashboards Journals Institutions Countries Subject Areas	Publication Volume This section provides statistics useful to understand the type and volume of re- researche how wave and table have been outbinked over the values, which a	Publication Volume This section provides statistics useful to understand the type and volume of content linked to a publication. For example, the manage article shape here nullified over the wave, which are the most frequently use article brues and how much of this content has been inter-	
BMC Cell Biology	external databases. Article - Total number	Article - Count from 2012	
Journal ID: 12860 Note: In order to obtain the raw data for this dashboard please contact the Knowledge Graph team	8441 Articles in Total Article - Count by publication year	201 Articles Published Last 3 Years	
PUBLICATION VOLUME JOURNAL METRICS AUTHORS COUNTRIES & INSTITUTIONS FIELD OF RESEARCH RESEARCH FUNDING DATA QUALITY Section - Countries and Institutions	001 000 y		
Countries and Institutions	20 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	6000 1110 1110 1110 1110 1110 1110 1110	

Use this section to find out which are the top countries and institutions contributing to a publication.

Note: this information comes from the GRID database (https://www.grid.ac/).

Article - map view





Applications: SciGraph open data publishing

SN SciGraph Data Explorer Getti	ng Started Models - Downloads License FAQ	
You are here: Home		
Springer Natur	e SciGraph Data Explorer	
Search across one billion f	acts from the scholarly domain.	
Search for	GO	
Not sure where to start? Try searching	for an organization, e.g. the 'Francis Crick Institute', a topic, e.g. 'machine learning', or an author, e.g. 'Steven Pinker'.	
F		
	SN SciGraph Data Explorer Getting Started Models - Downloads License FAQ Search	60
SciGraph is the Springer Na		
information from across the documents, people, places	Overview 🖉 Details 🎟	
science and scholarly dom	How to use: Click on a node to preview its contents. Double click to open its homepage.	
Metadata for millions of en site, as well as for downloa	This average in the second sec	
application.	su-surgerseagy	
See https://www.springerr	extreme extreme	
	Assessment of the second with the design, study or generative at the second sec	
	atus statistica	
	- entre	
	Interstroader DNA nanylechnology sy 5-skypet	
	adjett: sincedance and bennduty (documenter)	
	subjects the neurostructures	
	Ludgecta true nanoelabridity Magnetic organizing evaluation with dra	8

http://scigraph.springernature.com

Releases

- <u>Three</u> major releases: 2017 (Feb & Nov), 2019 (Jan)
- Currently: <u>daily</u> updates for publications

Features

- Linked Data <u>Explorer</u> (dereference & search)
- Bulk downloads (1 Billion+ triples)

License

- Hybrid model
- <u>CC-BY</u> most metadata; <u>CC-BY-NC</u> abstracts and grants; <u>CC-0</u> conferences data

Modeling Publications Challenges and Solutions 11

Summary of approaches

1. [2012-14] Ontologies Mix and Match

2. [2015-17] Bespoke 'SciGraph' Ontology

3. [2018-19] Building on Schema.org

2012-2014: Ontologies Mix & Match



- Common vocabularies were used as much as possible
- **bibo** :issue, :pageStart, pageEnd, :Volume
- **dc** :identifier, :publisher, :title, :subj ect
- **prism** :copyright, :doi, :genre, :num ber, :publicationDate, :url, :volume
- foaf :name, :familiyName, :givenNa me
- skos :broader, :label, :Concept
- npg :hasProduct, :doihash, :hasCit ation, :hasContributor, :hasPublicati on, :hasDataCitation etc..
- **RDF exported** only, not used internally
- Flat publications model main objects are represented, but no hierarchy

2012-2014: Ontologies Mix & Match

PROS

Catalog

PubMed

hasLink

✓Model easy to comprehend

CrossRef

- ✓Appealing to LOD practitioners
- ✓ Data reuse straightforward (for LOD people)

CONS

hasLink

Term

Bio2RDF

hasGraph

Graph

- Model rather simplistic
- Hard to maintain / extend / query
- Loose semantics, not suited for formal reasoning
- Not solid enough for internal uptake at Springer Nature

npg :hasProduct, :doihash, :ha sCitation, :hasContributor, :has Publication, :hasDataCitation etc..

Summary of approaches

1. [2012-14] Ontologies Mix and Match

2. [2015-17] Bespoke 'SciGraph' Ontology

3.[2018-19] Building on Schema.org

2015-2017: Bespoke 'SciGraph' Ontology



- **Scigraph** unique ontology and namespace (~60 classes, ~230 properties)
- Regimented model: focus on internal coherence; no blank nodes; domain/range specs; naming conventions etc.. (see Hammond, Pasin 2015)
- Mappings to other ontologies published separately
- **Top level**: similar to CIDOC-CRM (event based modeling)
- **Publications**: compatible with BibFrame

🔿 Book editi

🔘 Journal

Monograph O

2015-2017: Publications in 'SciGraph' Ontology



2015-2017: Events in 'SciGraph' Ontology



2015-2017: Bespoke 'SciGraph' Ontology

PROS

- ✓ Model very coherent from a logical perspective
- ✓ Model easy to extend and adapt to project needs
- ✓ Supports automatic reasoning
- ✓ Well understood by ontology specialists and information scientists

CONS

:hasAffiliationEvent

hasPerson:

/eni

- Users must learn the SG ontology
- Event-based modeling generates lots of instances
- Model not appealing to (non LOD) developers

:Person

:p1



Summary of approaches

1. [2012-14] Ontologies Mix and Match

2. [2015-17] Bespoke 'SciGraph' Ontology

3. [2018-19] Building on Schema.org

2018-2019: Building on Schema.org



- Collaborative community activity from major search engines (Bing, Google, Yahoo!, and Yandex - 2011)
- Focus on structured data on the Internet and search engine optimisation (discoverability)
- **JSON-LD** is the recommended representation format

2018-2019: Building on Schema.org



- All Scigraph classes could be modelled using schema.org
- Some exceptions still require Scigraph entities
- JSON-LD used as canonical format for all data
- **Publication** model rich enough (https://bib.schema.org/)

Sample JSON-LD Markup

{

https://scigraph.springernature.com/explorer/datasets/articles/

```
"@context": "https://springernature.github.io/scigraph/jsonld/sqcontext.json",
"id": "sg:pub.10.1038/164322a0",
"type": "ScholarlyArticle",
"name": "A New Type of Fossil Man",
                                                                                                    le
"url": "http://www.nature.com/articles/164322a0",
"sameAs": [
    "https://doi.org/10.1038/164322a0",
    "https://app.dimensions.ai/details/publication/pub.1000676771"
                                                                                                   uire
1,
"isPartOf": [
    {
        "type": "PublicationIssue",
        "issueNumber": "4164"
    },
                                                                                                   at
    {
        "type": "PublicationVolume",
        "volumeNumber": "164"
    },
    {
        "id": "sg.journal.1018957",
                                                                                                   ۱k
        "type": "Periodical",
        "name": "Nature",
        "issn": ["0028-0836", "1476-4687"],
        "publisher": "Nature Publishing Group UK"
1,
"datePublished": "1949-08",
"pagination": "164322a0",
"description": "IN the cave at Swartkrans which has now yielded the jaws and skulls of the huge a
"genre": "research article",
"author": [
   s
```

2018-2019: Building on Schema.org

PROS

- ✓ Schema.org increasingly popular
- ✓ Schema.org is flexible and actively developed

sgo:Patent

:citation => publications

- ✓ Suited for JSON-LD serialisation
- ✓ SEO friendly out-of-the-box

:MonetaryGrant

CONS

- JSON-LD can have side-effects on other serialisations
- More work required for rigorous logical inference

• ?

dings

:MedicalStudy

Conclusions

#Conclusions: Usage and Data Models

* Most users have very simple needs

- * eg search for publications title+abstracts (few other metadata items are needed)
- * Hard core users (eg LOD specialists) are often more interested in the model and tech stack than actual reusing of the data
 - * => see our paper at 'Semantic Science' workshop 2016
- * Ontological hair-splitting is fun but not always to the point
 - * FRBR: how many of your users know the difference between an expression and a work?
 - * Specialist communities: a lot of interest, but no practical uptake
 * Useful to focus on concrete use cases (justifying the effort)

#Conclusions: Technology and Implementation

* Models have a big impact on data volumes

* A good data model shouldn't make it harder to process/query your data *"a data model is a <u>practical</u> theory"*

* Scalability & performance

- * Semantic graph databases are often harder to scale
- * => If you have lots of data you'll probably end up using non-RDF technologies too eg Elasticsearch

* Data Serialization

- * RDF still very unpopular with developers / data consumers
- * Good to go beyond the LOD community with new standards like JSON-LD

Thanks Email: m.pasin@digital-science.com

Project Homepage: http://www.springernature.com/scigraph