

Linked Data Literature Reviews *

David Hyland-Wood
Ephox Corporation
225 Montague Road, Level 4
West End, Queensland,
Australia
david.wood@ephox.com

ABSTRACT

TODO

TODO: See <http://dl.acm.org/ccs.cfm>

Keywords

ACM proceedings; RDF; Linked Data; literature reviews;
scholarly communication

1. INTRODUCTION

TODO: Reference RDF[1].

2. LINKED DATA BIBLIOGRAPHIC ENTRIES

TODO: See the The OpenCitations project, and look carefully at their use of the SPAR Ontologies according to the OCC metadata document. ARE THEY SUFFICIENT TO REPRESENT ALL BIBLIOGRAPHIC ELEMENTS? From BibTex:

- Cite key
- Authors
- Order of authors
- Title
- Book title
- Publisher
- Year
- Editor
- Volume
- Number

- Series
- Type
- Chapter
- Pages
- Address
- Edition
- Month
- Keywords

3. DESCRIBING LITERATURE REVIEWS

TODO: How to make a scientific statement? A data model of a scientific statement might include:

- An identifier (a URI or blank node)
- A statement (as a string?)

TODO: Define a vocabulary for describing a literature review.

- supportedBy
- contradictedBy
- questionedBy
- methodUsed (e.g. survey, fMRI)
- a status (as a controlled SKOS vocabulary, e.g. Law, Theory, Hypothesis), 0-1
- relatedToEntity (a URI to a physical (e.g. hypothalamus) or virtual entity (e.g. PURL) used in the statement.), *
- relatedToAction (a URI to an action or maybe a controlled vocabulary, e.g. measured, found, utilized)

4. SAMPLE LITERATURE REVIEWS

TODO: Provide both a "hello, world" simple example, and a more complex one.

5. SHARING AND REUSING

TODO: Share by publishing. Is there a better way to aggregate, change, allow changes/prevent forks?

*Comments or suggestions may be made to this paper via git pull request at TODO: [w3id.org PURL](https://w3id.org/PURL)

Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. Copyrights for components of this work owned by others than ACM must be honored. Abstracting with credit is permitted. To copy otherwise, or republish, to post on servers or to redistribute to lists, requires prior specific permission and/or a fee. Request permissions from permissions@acm.org.

WWW 2017 Perth, Western Australia, Australia

© 2016 ACM. ISBN 978-1-4503-2138-9...\$15.00

DOI: 10.1145/1235

6. EVALUATION BY QUERY

TODO: Maybe suggest some SPARQL queries that could be used on the data model to identify scientific statements that come under doubt (e.g. fMRI software bug - might use as example).

7. CONCLUSIONS AND FURTHER WORK

TODO

8. TODO: TEMPORARY BIBLIOGRAPHY

- RDF Concepts and Abstract Syntax
- The OpenCitations project (<http://opencitations.net>)
- OpenCitations papers at <http://rawgit.com/essepuntato/opencitations/master/paper/occ-lisc2016.html>
- Books used for examples:
 - Scientific Teaching
 - Neuroscience textbook

9. ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author would like to thank **TODO** for reviewing and providing feedback on this work. Ephox Corporation did not support this work; responsibility for errors rests with the author alone.

10. REFERENCES

- [1] R. Cyganiak, D. Wood, and M. Lanthaler. Rdf 1.1 concepts and abstract syntax. *W3C Recommendation*, 25:1–8, 2014.