



Whose Content Is It Anyway? JATS Markup for PubMed Central and You

Joni Dames
Senior Solution Architect, Inera

Your Content, Your Markup

- You require certain pieces of information in your content
- The vendors you work with may have different (additional and/or conflicting) requirements
- Where is your content going? Who is accessing it? What do they need to know?

Valid JATS vs PMC-Compliant JATS

- Congratulations! You have valid JATS XML
- Now what are you going to do with it?
- Levels of validity: PMC Style Checker

PMC Style Checker

- Applies an additional level of validation to ensure your JATS XML meets PMC requirements
- Some of these requirements have changed over time
 - <pub-date> attributes
 - <issn> attributes
 - <contrib-group> attributes and nested collaborators

eXtyles JATS

- eXtyles JATS is updated to keep its JATS XML compliant with PMC requirements
- If you have a custom eXtyles build and you also submit JATS XML to PMC, let us know if PMC requests changes to your XML
- Updates made to support PMC requirements could have downstream processing implications

Export to ? XML

- Ideally, you export one JATS XML file that will be accepted by PMC and also work for your layout, database, and any other downstream processing needs
- But what if that one JATS XML file doesn't work for everyone?
- Compromise vs Transformation: which systems can accommodate change?

<pub-date> attributes then

Previously:

<pub-date pub-type="epub-ppub">

<pub-date pub-type="electronic">

<pub-date pub-type="print">

<pub-date> attributes now

Print and Electronic:

```
<pub-date publication-format="print"  
date-type="pub">
```

```
<pub-date publication-  
format="electronic" date-type="pub">
```

Electronic and Collection:

```
<pub-date publication-  
format="electronic" date-type="pub">
```

```
<pub-date publication-  
format="electronic" date-  
type="collection">
```

Whose Content Is It?

- Can your production workflow adjust to compensate for changes in the XML?
- Do you have a clear understanding of your own metadata?
- Are your editorial guidelines in sync with your metadata needs?

Whose Content Is It?

Article_Title

Authors

Affiliations

Affiliations

GroupAuthorMembers

Abstract_Head

Abstract

Keywords

Whose Content Is It Anyway?

Joni Dames¹, Jenny Seifert², for the Ineran Authorship Group

¹Inera, an Atypon Company

²Atypon-Wiley

Ineran Authorship Group: Sylvia Hunter, Jo Ripoll

Abstract

This is a presentation for XUG 2021.

Keywords: XUG, metadata, authorship

Whose Content Is It?

Article_Title

Authors

Affiliations

Affiliations

GroupAuthorMembers

Abstract_Head

Abstract

Keywords

Whose Content Is It Anyway?

Joni Dames¹, Jenny Seifert², for the Ineran Authorship Group

¹Inera, an Atypon Company

²Atypon-Wiley

Ineran Authorship Group: Sylvia Hunter, Jo Ripoll

Abstract

This is a presentation for XUG 2021.

Keywords: XUG, metadata, authorship

For Whom the Authorship Tolls

- <collab> vs <on-behalf-of>
- What is the word “for” doing in your Authors line?
- Are all the named authors prior to the group writing on behalf of that group? Is just the last author before the group writing on behalf of that group? Are none of the named authors in the Authors line writing on behalf of that group?

Whose Content Is It?

Article_Title

Authors

Affiliations

Affiliations

GroupAuthorMembers

Abstract_Head

Abstract

Keywords

Whose Content Is It Anyway?

Joni Dames¹, Jenny Seifert², the Ineran Authorship Group

¹Inera, an Atypon Company

²Atypon-Wiley

Sylvia Hunter, Jo Ripoll

Abstract

This is a presentation for XUG 2021.

Keywords: XUG, metadata, authorship

“for the Group” vs “the Group”

```
<contrib.contrib-type="author">¶
» <name>¶
» > <surname>¶
» > > Seifert¶
» > > </surname>¶
» > > <given-names>¶
» > > > Jenny¶
» > > </given-names>¶
» </name>¶
» <xref.ref-type="aff".rid="aff2">¶
» > <sup>¶
» > > 2¶
» > > </sup>¶
» </xref>¶
</contrib>¶
<on-behalf-of>¶
» Ineran.Authorship.Group¶
</on-behalf-of>¶
```

```
<contrib.contrib-type="author">¶
» <name>¶
» > <surname>¶
» > > Seifert¶
» > > </surname>¶
» > > <given-names>¶
» > > > Jenny¶
» > > </given-names>¶
» </name>¶
» <xref.ref-type="aff".rid="aff2">¶
» > <sup>¶
» > > 2¶
» > > </sup>¶
» </xref>¶
</contrib>¶
<contrib.contrib-type="author">¶
» <collab>¶
» > the.Ineran.Authorship.Group¶
» > <contrib-group.content-type="collab-list">¶
» > > <contrib.contrib-type="author">¶
» > > > <name>¶
» > > > > <surname>¶
» > > > > > Hunter¶
» > > > > > </surname>¶
» > > > > > <given-names>¶
» > > > > > > Sylvia¶
» > > > > > </given-names>¶
» > > > > </name>¶
» > > > </contrib>¶
» > > </collab>¶
» </contrib>¶
```

JATS4R

- PMC often adopts JATS4R recommendations
- Do the JATS4R recommendations work for your business requirements?
- Have there been times the JATS4R recommendations didn't work for you?

Some Updated PMC Tagging Guidelines 2020-2021

- Added tagging for Author Pronouns
- Added <role> and Author Contributions for information about tagging author contributions using the CRediT taxonomy
- Added values "preprint" and "published-article" to @related-article-type for the element <related-article>

<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/pmcdoc/tagging-guidelines/article/updates.html>

Some PMC Style Checker Updates, 2020-2021

- If the @custom-type attribute is present on an element, then the corresponding element type must be "custom"
 - Examples:
 - <xref ref-type="custom" custom-type="abc"> is NOT an error
 - <xref ref-type="fig" custom-type="abc"> is an error
- Require URL in ali:license_ref and URL ext-link in license statement match
- For element pub-id, added pmid-check to make sure PMIDs do not contain letters and do not start with a zero

<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/tools/stylechecker/>

To the DTD and Beyond

- Are there additional things you would like to check in your XML?
- Are you using Schematron or some other extra level of validation?
- Have you run into conflicting requirements? Would an extra level of validation beyond the DTD help prevent that?

Managing Multiple Requirements

- Is there sufficient messaging around updated requirements?
- How do you mitigate the impact changing requirements has on your workflow?