

Narrative for Submission to JAV Review Group

We are pleased to submit the following for review by the JAV Review Group:

- proposed terms and definitions for journal article versions (JAVs)
- a narrative that explains the background to our project and the rationale for our suggested terms and definitions
- a set of key use cases showing how our proposed terms could apply
- a full set of use cases considered by the JAV Technical Group

Background and Rationale

Our work plan is as follows:

1. Creation of use cases to identify the most common journal article life cycles.
2. Analysis of use cases to determine common life cycle stages.
3. Selection of preferred vocabulary for the most common life cycle stages.
4. Development of appropriate metadata to identify each variant version and its relationship to other versions, in particular the definitive, fully functional published version.
5. Establishment of practical systems for ensuring that the metadata is applied by authors or repository managers and publishers.

We spent some time considering abstract data models and the attributes that could apply to various versions of a journal article. (The website at http://www.niso.org/committees/Journal_versioning/JournalVer_comm.html contains a full set of minutes if you would like the blow-by-blow account.)

We decided to focus on the following key points:

1. Our brief was limited in scope to *journal articles* – even so, we have recognized the possible and important, if not frequent, relationships between journal articles and other scholarly document types (such as working papers, conference papers, book chapters, wikis, blogs, etc.). Rather than creating a full set of semantics and proposed metadata disambiguating these document types, we focused on the minimum necessary to show *relationship* between an instance of these document types and one or more journal articles. Of course, some of these other document types will be similar enough to journal articles to be able to use the same (or similar) semantics; others will not.
2. In most cases we believe relationship needs to be codified through the retrospective act of including an unambiguous reference or link within the metadata of a “previous” version to the version of record. Although this act creates a high and potentially onerous standard of performance for some, enabling it through standard metadata and semantics and its promulgation as a best practice is crucial for establishing the relationships that the use cases suggest are necessary.

3. We decided to concentrate on a reasonably high-level set of semantics – let’s say the phylum rather than the species. We believe that these high-level terms give sufficient distinction for 80% of article versions – and distinction where it most matters to the reader and secondarily to the author or the publisher.
4. Each term identifies a significant value-added “state change” in the progress of a journal article from origination to publication. Three of the versions (Author’s Original; Proof; Updated Version of Record) may have a number of iterative stages. We have not attempted to identify these stages, although datestamps, version numbers and metadata records may be use to differentiate them. Two of the versions (Accepted Manuscript; Version of Record) represent fixed stages. An Author’s Original that is accepted for publication becomes an Accepted Manuscript at the point of acceptance. A Proof that is corrected and published becomes a Version of Record.
5. See the attached figure for a graphical representation.
6. We have attached a set of use cases that show the application of our terminology (Appendix 1).

Next Steps

The Review Group should send comments by the end of March to me (cmorgan@wiley.co.uk) for onward circulation to the JAV Technical Working Group. The Technical WG will review and respond to all comments throughout the month of April. When the terms and definitions are agreed, the Technical WG will work on the metadata requirements for each term, but we should publicise the terms and definitions as soon as we have consensus.

Thank you for offering to review our recommendations.

The NISO/ALPSP JAV Technical Working Group

Beverley Acreman, Taylor & Francis
Catherine Jones, CCLRC
Peter McCracken, Serials Solutions
Cliff Morgan (Chair), John Wiley & Sons
John Ober, California Digital Library
Evan Owens, Portico
T. Scott Plutchak, University of Alabama at Birmingham
Bernie Rous, ACM
Claire Saxby, Oxford University Press
Andrew Wray, The Institute of Physics