NISO JATS Standing Committee Recommendations in Response to Comments to on NISO Z39.96-2012 September 2013 through January 2014

February, 2014
1. Introduction

The NISO JATS Standing Committee has completed reviewing the second round of requests for changes to the Standard. This report documents the requests made for changes to ANSI/NISO Z39.96-2012 and to ANSI/NISO Z39.96-2012 Committee Draft 1.1d1 through the between September, 2013 and the end of January, 2014 and the recommendations of the Standing Committee with respect to the requests.

At least once a quarter the Standing Committee will review all requests that have been submitted to date and publish recommended responses to the requests. Once a year the Standing Committee will submit a revised Standard to NISO for approval.

The recommendations in this document:

• have not been submitted to NISO, and
• have not been approved for incorporation in the Standard.

Thus, any tools and supporting materials based on these recommendations must be considered drafts.

For the convenience of users who want to implement this draft, the Standing Committee will publish recommendations on all of the change requests to date (in this document).

Key: The following Tag Set icons appear with each suggested change to indicate to which of the Tag Sets a change will apply (Scope):

![Archiving](image)
![Article Authoring](image)
![Publishing](image)

2. Comment List

Comment 00293: Add label attribute to collab element

Submitter Comment:

Occasionally papers have multiple collaborations. A unified listing of all authors uses a symbol to show which collaboration the contributor belongs to. Currently collab does not have a label attribute and we have to use named-content with content-type = "label".

Submitter Proposed Solution:

We request that a @label attribute be added to the <collab> element.

Standing Committee Recommendation

• Collaborations of the type shown can be given an @id attribute and referenced using an <xref>, in the same manner that affiliations are referenced.
• A @symbol attribute should be added to <collab>, allowing a JATS user to record the symbol used for this cross-reference.
Comment 00328: Add elements <city>, <state>, <postal-code>

Submitter Comment:

JATS currently contains several elements for tagging physical address information including <address>, <addr-line> and <country>. We would like to suggest adding elements <city>, <state> and <postal-code>. It is of course possible to use <named-content> to tag all components of an address, however city, state and postal code appear very frequently within address information and having specific elements available in JATS could be helpful. Our JATS customization includes elements for city, state and postal-code, and this extension might be useful in standard JATS.

Example XML:

```
<aff id="aff0001"/><label><sup>a</sup></label> <institution>Faculty of Engineering, Information and Systems, University of Tsukuba</institution>, <city>Tsukuba</city>, <postal-code>305-8573</postal-code>, <country>Japan</country></aff>
<aff id="aff0002"/><label><sup>b</sup></label> <institution>Ollin Tlahoalli</institution>, <city>Oaxaca</city>, <state>Oaxaca</state>, <country>Mexico</country></aff>
```

Example DTD model:

```
<!ELEMENT city (#PCDATA)* >
<!ELEMENT state (#PCDATA)* >
<!ELEMENT postal-code (#PCDATA)* >

<!--ENTITY % address.class "addr-line | country | fax | institution | phone |
city | state | postal-code ” >

<!--ENTITY % address-line.class "city | state | postal-code | country |
fax | institution | phone “ >
```

Submitter Proposed Solution:

We propose:

1. Add element <city>, which allows #PCDATA, to hold the name of a city or town.
2. Add element <state>, which allows #PCDATA, to hold the name of a state or province.
3. Add element <postal-code>, which allows #PCDATA, to hold a postal code.
4. Modify parameter entities %address.class and #address-line.class to include elements <city>, <state> and <postal-code>
5. Modify parameter entity %conf-loc-elements to include %address.class.

Standing Committee Recommendation

1. Add <city>, <state>, and <postal-code> to the address.class and address-line.class elements. The elements should be added to all the location-recording elements such as <conf-loc> and <publisher-loc>.
2. All three elements should take the @content-type and @specific-use attributes.
3. Define in the documentation and that <state> should be used for any country subdivision such as a province, parish, or territory. Provide an index entry cross-reference to <state> from common alternatives such as Province.
Submitter Comment:
We would also like to suggest changing the model of <conf-loc> to allow address elements. This change would improve consistency between the models of <conf-loc> and <publisher-loc>.

Submitter Proposed Solution:
We propose:

1. Suggested DTD model:

   <!ENTITY % conf-loc-elements “%simple-text; | %address.class; “ >

Standing Committee Recommendation
As part of the addition of <city>, <state>, and <postal-code>, the address related elements should be regularized to use the address class elements, changing several models including <conf-loc> and <publisher-loc>.

Comment 00387: Add a release date for <open-access>

Submitter Comment:
The licensing model of “green open access” or “self-archiving” of peer-reviewed journal articles is rapidly gaining acceptance in the publishing world. This is in contrast to the “gold open access” or simply “open access”, whereby the publisher grants free access to an article immediately.
Typically, publishers granting green open access, impose an embargo period of a number of months before the article can become publicly available.

Current support for open access licensing does not include a “release date” which effects the embargo period.

In the Elsevier DTD, the release date in green open access licensing model is encoded as follows:

   <delayed-sponsored-article release-date="2014-06-01"/>

Submitter Proposed Solution:
Under the JATS DTD, we could add a [<date>] element under [<license-p>], for example:

   <license license-type="green-open-access">
      <license-p>     ...     ...     ...     ...     
         <open-access>
             <date date-type="release-date">
                <day>01</day>
                <month>06</month>
                <year>2014</year>
            </date>
         </open-access>
      </license-p>
   </license>

Standing Committee Recommendation
This request and Comment 00406 address the same issue, were resolved together, and are discussed under #00406.
Comment 00406: Open Access Metadata and Indicators & JATS 1.1

Submitter Comment:

Though I know that the NISO recommended practice guidelines for open access metadata and indicators (NISO RP-22-201x; http://www.niso.org/apps/group_public/download.php/12047/rp-22-201x_OA_indicators_draft_for_comments.pdf) is only in draft state and open for comments, I am writing to request that the committee give strong consideration to incorporating this best practice into the next official version of JATS (1.1).

Not only is it very useful information to be able to provide in the manuscript XML, but I believe it is of vital importance to publishers wishing to cooperate with the OSTP memorandum of February 2013 around increasing access to the results of federally funded scientific research (http://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/microsites/ostp/ostp_public_access_memo_2013.pdf) and therefore participate in the CHORUS project.

As is, the funding- and access-related metadata that will need to be registered with CrossRef/FundRef for participation in CHORUS is accommodated by tags that are accounted for within NLM 3.0 and JATS 1.0 (namely, <funding-group> and <permissions>). The missing piece of the puzzle, from an input XML perspective (as opposed to the tags that will need to be used to register metadata with CrossRef), is the ability to provide information around effective dating licensing and access. This final piece is accounted for in the proposed best practice outlined in NISO RP-22-201x.

Besides providing transparency into (and access to) the results of federally funded research, much of the value of CHORUS for everyone involved is that it utilizes existing systems and processes within the publishing community to achieve this end, rather than relying on building some entirely new solution at taxpayer expense. At a high level, the existing process in the world of scholarly publishing -- save for those organizations large enough to sponsor their own in-house, end-to-end solutions -- typically involves manuscript preparation/submission/authoring systems, content conversion vendors and/or third-party platform hosts. That last group (of which I am a part) is the one typically charged with depositing metadata to CrossRef on behalf of the publisher and is therefore reliant on working closely with publishers and their other solutions providers.

Shared standards like JATS provide a common framework for us all to work from, in this case working to meet our publishers' needs of participating in CHORUS, which is why I believe it is important that you consider adoption of the best practices for open access metadata and indicators outlined in NISO RP-22-201x into JATS 1.1. Not adopting this into JATS 1.1 will in many cases require manual workarounds for intermediaries working with publishers who wish to participate in CHORUS (for example, we would have to consider developing a tool whereby publishers could add licensing and access information to a piece of content, such that we could in turn include this information in the metadata deposited with CrossRef), thus representing a real hurdle for participation, especially for smaller publishers dependent on non-proprietary solutions.

Submitter Proposed Solution:

I appreciate your consideration in this matter, and ask that you feel free to contact me directly with any questions or points of clarification.

Standing Committee Recommendation (2014-01-21)

A subcommittee of Jeff Beck, Debbie Lapeyre, Mary McRae, and Evan Owens will investigate this, post comments on the draft NISO recommended practice guidelines for open access metadata
and indicators (NISO RP-22-201x), and report our conclusions back to the JATS Standing Committee by email. No action will be taken at this time.

**Comment 00408: Port the BITS Question-and-Answer model to JATS**

Submitter Proposed Solution:

Port the BITS Question-and-Answer model to the next release of JATS.

*Standing Committee Recommendation*

The Standing Committee feels that the Q&A model is untried, and should tested first in the BITS environment, where rapid change is possible and backwards compatibility is not as important as it is in JATS. Once the model has been tested and is more stable, we will recommend its inclusion in JATS.

In the meantime we will provide, in the non-normative documentation, instructions for adding this capability to any of the DTD versions of JATS.

### 3. Documentation Requests

**Comment: Error in Element <caption> Definition (normative)**

Submitter Comment:

The definition of the element <caption> refers to <table>, which has no caption. The reference should be to <table-wrap>.

Submitter Proposed Solution:

Fix the link to point to <table-wrap>.

*Standing Committee Recommendation*

1. The link in the ANSI/NISO standard definition will be modified to point to <table-wrap>. Such definitions are repeated for convenience within the non-normative Tag Library.

2. This correction needs to be part of the official list for the next voting version of ANSI /NISO Z39.96-2012.

**Comment: Small Infelicities in the Tag Libraries (non-normative)**

Submitter Comment:

In putting together the BITS Tag Library (which has diverged from the JATS documentation and no longer uses the same source), a number of fairly small errors and infelicities were discovered. Typos such as unmatched parentheses, misspelled words, and grammar mistakes were corrected when noticed in both the BITS and JATS documentation.
This left infelicities in JATS that were bigger than a typo, but still non-optimal. To mention but a few examples to give the flavor:

- Many paragraphs begin with a space.
- References to MathML 2.0 or MathML 3.0 should just refer to MathML, since the user could be using either. Most of these are already correct, but a few were not changed.
- Several Related Elements sections for address elements are missing <institution-wrap>.
- Several Remarks contain incorrect sentences that should be corrected or removed. For example, the Remarks for <date-in-citation> use <pub-date> instead of <date> in describing the publication date inside a citation.

**Submitter Proposed Solution:**

Mulberry would like permission to make these changes during the next update cycle.

**Standing Committee Recommendation**

Correct any mistakes you can find.