

Archive Scholar Reference Dataset

Martin Czygan

Internet Archive
San Francisco, California, USA
martin@archive.org

Bryan Newbold

Internet Archive
San Francisco, California, USA
bnewbold@archive.org

Abstract

As part of its scholarly data efforts, the Internet Archive releases a citation graph dataset (ASREF) derived from scholarly publications and additional data sources. It is composed of data gathered by the fatcat cataloging project¹, related web-scale crawls targeting primary and secondary scholarly outputs, as well as metadata from the Open Library² project, information about archived web pages found in the Wayback Machine³ and Wikipedia⁴. This first version of the graph consists of 1,323,423,672 citations. We release this dataset under a CC0 Public Domain Dedication, accessible through an archive collection⁵. All code used in the derivation process is released under an MIT license⁶.

Index terms— Citation Graph, Web Archiving

1 Introduction

The Internet Archive releases a first version of a citation graph dataset derived from a raw corpus of about 2.5B references gathered from metadata and from data obtained by PDF extraction tools such as GROBID[5]. Additionally, we consider integration with metadata from Open Library, the Wayback Machine and Wikipedia. The goal of this report is to describe briefly the current contents and the derivation of the Archive Scholar Reference Dataset (ASREF). We expect this dataset to be iterated upon, with changes both in content and processing.

Modern citation indexes can be traced back to the early computing age, when projects like the Science Citation Index (1955)[3] were first devised, living on in existing com-

mercial knowledge bases today. Open alternatives were started such as the Open Citations Corpus (OCC) in 2010 - the first version of which contained 6,325,178 individual references[6]. Other notable sources from that time include CiteSeerX[9] and CitEc[1]. The last decade has seen an increase of more openly available reference dataset and citation projects, like Microsoft Academic[8] and Initiative for Open Citations[2][7]. In 2021, according to [4] over 1B citations are publicly available, marking a tipping point for open citations.

2 Related Work

There are a few large scale citation dataset available today. COCI, the “OpenCitations Index of Crossref open DOI-to-DOI citations” was first released 2018-07-29. As of its most recent release on 2021-07-29, it contains 1,094,394,688 citations across 65,835,422 bibliographic resources.

The WikiCite⁷ project, “a Wikimedia initiative to develop open citations and linked bibliographic data to serve free knowledge” continuously adds citations to its data base and as of 2021-06-28 tracks 253,719,394 citations across 39,994,937 publications⁸.

Microsoft Academic Graph⁹ is comprised of a number of entities¹⁰ with *PaperReferences* being one relation among many others. As of 2021-06-07 the *PaperReferences* relation contains 1,832,226,781 edges across 123,923,466 bibliographic entities.

Numerous other projects have been or are concerned with various aspects of citation discovery and curation, among them Semantic Scholar, CiteSeerX or Aminer.

¹<https://fatcat.wiki>

²<https://openlibrary.org>

³<https://web.archive.org>

⁴<https://wikipedia.org>

⁵<https://archive.org/details/fatcat-asref-todo>

⁶<https://gitlab.com/internetarchive/cgraph>

⁷<https://meta.wikimedia.org/wiki/WikiCite>

⁸<http://wikicite.org/statistics.html>

⁹A recent copy has been preserved at <https://archive.org/details/mag-2021-06-07>

¹⁰<https://docs.microsoft.com/en-us/academic-services/graph/reference-data-schema>

Dataset	Count
COCI (C)	1,094,394,688
ASREF-DOI (A)	1,303,424,212
$C \cap A$	
$C \cup A$	
$C \setminus A$	
$A \setminus C$	

Table 1: Comparison between COCI and ASREF-DOI, a subset of ASREF with DOI.

As mentioned in [4], the number of openly available citations is not expected to shrink in the future.

3 Citation Dataset

We release the first version of the Archive Scholar Reference (ASREF) dataset in an format used internally for storage and to serve queries (and which we call *biblioref* or *bref* for short). The dataset includes metadata from fatcat and the Open Library Project, links to archived pages in the Wayback Machine as well as inbound links from the English Wikipedia.

The format contains source and target (fatcat release and work) identifiers, a few attributes from the metadata (such as year or release stage) as well as information about the match provenance (like match status or reason). For ease of use, we include DOI as well, if available.

The dataset currently contains 1,323,423,672 citations across 76,327,662 entities (55,123,635 unique source and 60,244,206 unique target work identifiers). The majority of matches - 1,250,523,321 - are established through identifier based matching (DOI, PMIC, PMCID, ARXIV, ISBN). 72,900,351 citations are established through fuzzy matching.

The majority of DOI based matches between ASREF and COCI overlap, as can be seen in 1.

TODO: how matches are established and a short note on overlap with COCI DOI.

4 System Design

The constraints for the systems design are informed by the volume and the variety of the data. The capability to run the graph whole derivation on a single machine (commodity hardware) was a minor goal as well. In total, the raw inputs amount to a few TB of textual content, mostly new-line delimited JSON. More importantly, while the number of data fields is low, certain schemas are very partial with hundreds of different combinations of available field values

Fields	Percentage
CN · RN · P · T · U · V · Y	14%
DOI	14%
CN · CRN · IS · P · T · U · V · Y	5%
CN · CRN · DOI · U · V · Y	4%
PMID · U	4%
CN · CRN · DOI · T · V · Y	4%
CN · CRN · Y	4%
CN · CRN · DOI · V · Y	4%

Table 2: Top 8 combinations of available fields in raw reference data accounting for about 53% of the total data (CN = container name, CRN = contrib raw name, P = pages, T = title, U = unstructured, V = volume, IS = issue, Y = year, DOI = doi, PMID = pmid). Unstructured fields may contain any value. Identifiers emphasized.

found in the raw reference data. This is most likely caused by aggregators passing on reference data coming from hundreds of sources, each of which not necessarily agreeing on a common granularity for citation data and from artifacts of machine learning based structured data extraction tools.

Each combination of fields may require a slightly different processing path. For example, references with an Arxiv identifier can be processed differently from references with only a title. Over 50% of the raw reference data comes from a set of eight field manifestations, as listed in Table 2.

Overall, a map-reduce style approach is followed, which allows for some uniformity in the overall processing. We extract (key, document) tuples (as TSV) from the raw JSON data and sort by key. Then we group documents with the same key into groups and apply a function on each group in order to generate our target schema (currently named biblioref, or bref for short) or perform addition operations (such as deduplication).

The key derivation can be exact (like an identifier like DOI, PMID, etc) or based on a normalization procedure, like a slugified title string. For identifier based matches we can generate the target biblioref schema directly. For fuzzy matching candidates, we pass possible match pairs through a verification procedure, which is implemented for release entity schema pairs. The current verification procedure is a domain dependent rule based verification, able to identify different versions of a publication, preprint-published pairs or other kind of similar documents by calculating similarity metrics across title and authors. The fuzzy matching approach is applied on all reference documents, which only have a title, but no identifier.

With a few schema conversions, fuzzy matching can be applied to Wikipedia articles and Open Library (edition) records as well. The aspect of precision and recall are rep-

resented by the two stages: we are generous in the match candidate generation phase in order to improve recall, but we are strict during verification, in order to control precision.

5 Future Work

As other dataset in this field we expect this dataset to be iterated upon.

- The fatcat catalog updates its metadata continuously¹¹ and web crawls are conducted regularly. Current processing pipelines cover raw reference snapshot creation and derivation the graph structure, which allows to rerun processing based on updated data as it becomes available.
- Metadata extraction from PDFs depends on supervised machine learning models, which in turn depends training sets. With additional crawls and metadata available we hope to improve models used for metadata extraction, improving yield and reducing data extraction artifacts in the process.
- As of this version, a number of raw reference docs remain unmatched, which means that neither exact nor fuzzy matching can detect a link to a known entity. On the one hand, this can hint at missing metadata. However, parts of the data will contain a reference to a catalogued entity, but in a specific, dense and harder to recover form. This also include improvements to fuzzy matching code.

6 Acknowledgements

This work is partially supported by a grant from the *Andrew W. Mellon Foundation*. We like to thanks various teams at the Internet Archive for providing necessary infrastructure, and also data processing expertise. We are also indebted to various open source software tools and their maintainers as well as open scholarly data projects - without those this work would be much harder or not possible at all.

7 Appendix A

A note on data quality: While we implement various data quality measures, real-world data, especially coming from many different sources will contain errors and bugs. Among other measures, we keep track of match reasons, especially for fuzzy matching to be able to zoom in on systematic errors a bit more easily (see Table 3).

¹¹A changelog can currently be followed here: <https://fatcat.wiki/changelog>

Count	Provenance	Status	Reason
934932865	crossref	exact	doi
151366108	fatcat-datacite	exact	doi
65345275	fatcat-pubmed	exact	pmid
48778607	fuzzy	strong	jaccardauthors
42465250	grobid	exact	doi
29197902	fatcat-pubmed	exact	doi
19996327	fatcat-crossref	exact	doi
11996694	fuzzy	strong	slugtitleauthormatch
9157498	fuzzy	strong	tokenizedauthors
3547594	grobid	exact	arxiv
2310025	fuzzy	exact	titleauthormatch
1496515	grobid	exact	pmid
680722	crossref	strong	jaccardauthors
476331	fuzzy	strong	versioneddoi
449271	grobid	exact	isbn
230645	fatcat-crossref	strong	jaccardauthors
190578	grobid	strong	jaccardauthors
156657	crossref	exact	isbn
123681	fatcat-pubmed	strong	jaccardauthors
79328	crossref	exact	arxiv
57414	crossref	strong	tokenizedauthors
53480	fuzzy	strong	pmidpair
52453	fuzzy	strong	dataciterelatedid
47119	grobid	strong	slugtitleauthormatch
36774	fuzzy	strong	arxivversion
35311	fuzzy	strong	customieearxiv
33863	grobid	exact	pmcid
23504	crossref	strong	slugtitleauthormatch
22753	fatcat-crossref	strong	tokenizedauthors
17720	grobid	exact	titleauthormatch
14656	crossref	exact	titleauthormatch
14438	grobid	strong	tokenizedauthors
7682	fatcat-crossref	exact	arxiv
5972	fatcat-crossref	exact	isbn
5525	fatcat-pubmed	exact	arxiv
4290	fatcat-pubmed	strong	tokenizedauthors
2745	fatcat-pubmed	exact	isbn
2342	fatcat-pubmed	strong	slugtitleauthormatch
2273	fatcat-crossref	strong	slugtitleauthormatch
1960	fuzzy	exact	workid
1150	fatcat-crossref	exact	titleauthormatch
1041	fatcat-pubmed	exact	titleauthormatch
895	fuzzy	strong	figshareversion
317	fuzzy	strong	titleartifact
82	grobid	strong	titleartifact
33	crossref	strong	titleartifact
5	fuzzy	strong	custombsiundated
1	fuzzy	strong	custombsisubdoc
1	fatcat	exact	doi

Table 3: Table of match counts, reference provenance, match status and match reason. The match reason identifier encode a specific rule in the domain dependent verification process and are included for completeness - we do not include the details of each rule in this report.

References

- [1] Citations in economics. <https://citec.repec.org/>. Accessed: 2021-07-30.
- [2] Initiative for open citations. <https://i4oc.org/>. Accessed: 2021-07-30.
- [3] E. Garfield. The evolution of the science citation index. *International microbiology*, 10(1):65, 2007.
- [4] B. I. Hutchins. A tipping point for open citation data. *Quantitative Science Studies*, pages 1–5, 2021.
- [5] P. Lopez. Grobid: Combining automatic bibliographic data recognition and term extraction for scholarship publications. In *International conference on theory and practice of digital libraries*, pages 473–474. Springer, 2009.
- [6] D. Shotton. Publishing: open citations. *Nature News*, 502(7471):295, 2013.
- [7] D. Shotton. Funders should mandate open citations. *Nature*, 553(7686):129–130, 2018.
- [8] A. Sinha, Z. Shen, Y. Song, H. Ma, D. Eide, B.-J. Hsu, and K. Wang. An overview of microsoft academic service (mas) and applications. In *Proceedings of the 24th international conference on world wide web*, pages 243–246, 2015.
- [9] J. Wu, K. Kim, and C. L. Giles. Citeseerx: 20 years of service to scholarly big data. In *Proceedings of the Conference on Artificial Intelligence for Data Discovery and Reuse*, pages 1–4, 2019.