

FAIR blog-to-blog citations



Published December 30, 2024

Citation

Willighagen, E. (2024, December 30). FAIR blog-to-blog citations. *Chem-bla-ics*. <https://doi.org/10.59350/er1mn-m5q69>

Keywords

Cito, Blog, Publishing

Abstract

Linkrot is real and digital preservation problematic. One reason why I have started migrating my blog to a more robust platform. That first step gave me version control. This summer my blog was accepted to Rogue Scholar. That gave me DOIs. And an idea.

Copyright

Copyright © None 2024. Distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License](#), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

[Linkrot is real](#) and [digital preservation problematic](#). One reason why I have [started migrating my blog](#) to a more robust platform. That first step gave me version control. This summer my blog was [accepted to Rogue Scholar](#). That gave me DOIs. And an idea.

Things are coming together, and while commercial publishers (SpringerNature, Elsevier, MDPI, Frontiers, etc) are focused on profit (“shareholder value”) instead of the community they serve, Open Science is providing working, real-world, inexpensive, superior FAIR solutions for scientific dissemination. Maybe European universities are not convinced yet (see [Björn’s post](#)), but it is happening.

Two things that are happening are [OpenAlex](#) and [OpenCitations](#). [CiTO adoption](#) not so much yet, but I am not giving up yet. Simply because Open Science doesn’t go away and everything can be picked up tomorrow. Each holiday I am picking up the Citation Typing Ontology and this holiday the [use of nanopublications for CiTO intent annotation](#) of April this year.

Yesterday, I played with the nanopublication templates used by NanoDash, got to the triples of it, and ended up using the web interface to create [a derived template](#) from [Tobias’ template from April](#). What makes this nanopublication template special is that it uses [the CiTO ontology](#).

The difference is that the original template used **ScholarlyWork** as type for the citing resource, while the derivative uses **CreativeWork** from the schema.org namespace, allowing things like this:

- article to software release: [example nanopub](#)
- article to blog: [example nanopub](#)
- blog to article: [example nanopub](#)
- blog to blog: [example nanopub](#)

The last three are possible because of the Rogue Scholar DOIs. Let’s continue with the fourth example, the blog to blog citation. While an URL is a unique, global identifier, the digital preservation depends on a lot of things. On the other hand, a DOI with the associated metadata is easier to preserve. For example, because it can be spread more easily than the digital object itself.

So, when [Martin Fenner](#) and [I started archiving](#) the [Depth-First blog of Rich Apodaca](#) to digitally preserve his blog, it also automatically gave the blog posts DOIs. This makes the blog more FAIR, just like it does for my blog. And being more FAIR, we can use the DOIs for other things too, like blog to blog citations with CiTO intent annotation, as nanopublications. (Technically, any Springer Nature journal can do this, but they found reasons to not do it.)

So, let’s take [this blog post](#). I have today updated this to not use **depth-first.com** URLs but, following Martin’s example, use the DOIs for those posts instead.

And when I make a nanopublication out of this, I can add the citation intent, and then it looks like [this](#):

Citations for: myaw4-dtg76

Full identifier: <https://w3id.org/np/RAmETOQXyoS5dYeP8yhJscOrAlimf1RHFnzG2GtziqlQ8>

Assigned to 1 class:

- [Nanopublication](#) ()

Status

This is the latest version.

Nanopublication

 [Citations for: myaw4-dtg76](#) cites CreativeWork 

doi:10.59350/myaw4-dtg76	is a	Creative work
doi:10.59350/myaw4-dtg76	cites as evidence	doi:10.59350/50ebs-4zq55
doi:10.59350/myaw4-dtg76	cites as evidence	doi:10.59350/5ct28-aaj63
doi:10.59350/myaw4-dtg76	cites as evidence	doi:10.59350/6beed-gk067
doi:10.59350/myaw4-dtg76	cites as evidence	doi:10.59350/esgte-mv539
doi:10.59350/myaw4-dtg76	cites as evidence	doi:10.59350/g29jj-d3m35
doi:10.59350/myaw4-dtg76	cites as evidence	doi:10.59350/j026p-17z02
doi:10.59350/myaw4-dtg76	cites as evidence	doi:10.59350/pz3p6-fv247
doi:10.59350/myaw4-dtg76	cites as evidence	doi:10.59350/xyp0f-9dt42
doi:10.59350/myaw4-dtg76	cites as recommended reading	doi:10.26434/chemrxiv-2022-01ltp

The assertion above is attributed to [Egon Willighagen](#)

This nanopublication is created by [me \(Egon Willighagen\)](#)

For some reason, the DOIs do not show up as references as they do for this post for the DOIs of the posts of Martin Paul Eve, Björn Brembs, and Martin Fenner. It does for [this post citing Depth-First](#).

So, from now on, I will use DOIs when citing other blog posts, and I hope many other blogs will start using Rogue Scholar or some other service to generate DOIs for single blog posts. I also have to figure out if I want to use DOIs to link to posts in my own blog. And hopefully, OpenCitations will soon accept citations provided by nanopublications. With or without CiTO

chem-bla-ics

intent annotations, whatever comes first. Oh, and I cannot wait to see the citations who up in [Altmetric.com](https://altmetric.com) :)

Let's see where this is going.