

The challenge and promise of software citation for credit, identification, discovery, and reuse

Kyle E. Niemeyer

School of Mechanical, Industrial, and Manufacturing Engineering,
Oregon State University
kyle.niemeyer@oregonstate.edu

Arfon M. Smith

GitHub Inc.
arfon@github.com

Daniel S. Katz

Computation Institute, University of Chicago &
Argonne National Laboratory
d.katz@ieee.org

1 Introduction

Modern science and engineering depend on software. We use citation to acknowledge traditional research results published in archival journals and conferences, but no such accepted standard exists to credit the considerable efforts that go into software. One method to increase the amount of software developed, shared, and credited is to treat a software release as a publication. In addition, since research results, including data, now depend on the specific software used (e.g., version), proper citation—and the associated preservation—is necessary to ensure reproducibility. **The main challenge of software citation is that we need a way to uniquely identify released/published software so that it can be cited by others who use it.** We also need a process to curate and review software.

Different communities follow widely varying practices for citing software, with guidelines ranging from citations of an associated paper or the software itself via DOI [[American Astronomical Society, 2016](#)] to no policy at all, with many ad hoc practices in between [[Howison and Bullard, 2015](#)]. Questions also remain about the role of curating/reviewing software—if software will be cited in the same manner as a publication, is quality assessment needed (e.g., peer code review)? If so, how, when, and by whom?

As a first step towards sustainable, reusable, and attributable software, efforts are underway to establish citation practices for software used in research.

2 Related Work

Multiple organizations, including the WSSSPE Software Credit [[Katz et al., 2014, 2016a,b](#)] and FORCE11 Software Citation Working Groups, are working to standardize software citation practices. Some of the observations and recommendations made here come from their efforts, which follow similar work by DataCite and the FORCE11 [Data Citation Synthesis Group \[2014\]](#) to standardize research data citation practices. Currently, services including Zenodo or [figshare](#) allow software developers to obtain DOIs for software; the

former has a streamlined process [GitHub Inc., 2014] to register DOIs for GitHub software releases. The CodeMeta project [Boettiger et al., 2016] is formalizing minimal metadata schemas in JSON and XML to connect existing software repositories, archives, and libraries (e.g., GitHub, figshare, Zenodo).

Complementary efforts to provide credit for software development in research also depend on standardized citation practices. These include the transitive credit via JSON-LD scheme [Katz and Smith, 2015] that assigns varying credit weights to contriponents—both contributors and research artifacts, including software and data—depending on their level of importance to the work. The Project CRediT (contributor role taxonomy) scheme [CASRAI, 2015] includes a “software” category for authors of a publication with roles dedicated to software development, maintenance, and/or testing. The related PaperBadger project [Mozilla Science Lab, 2015] offers digital contributor badges associated with each role, connecting publications with people via DOI and ORCID, respectively.

3 Challenges and Research Directions

Key challenges and research directions include the need to:

- identify necessary metadata associated with software for citation,
- standardize proper formats for citing software in publications,
- establish mechanisms for software to cite other software (i.e., dependencies),
- develop infrastructure to support indexing of software citations along with (or complementary to) the existing publication citation ecosystem,
- determine standard practices for peer review of software, and
- increase cultural acceptance of the concept of software as a digital product.

For software to be cited, we recommend that metadata include software name, primary authors/contributors (name and ORCID), DOI or other unique identifier, location where the software has been published/archived (DOI/URL), and software dependencies (via DOI). This information should be provided in a CITATION file, potentially in JSON or XML format (and with an appropriate metadata schema, e.g., DOAP) to replace or supplement plaintext and allow automatic processing. Citations of software in publications should minimally include software name, primary authors, and DOI or location where the software was published/archived; however, individual citation formats will vary based on the particular style of journals, conferences, or professional societies. Existing services such as Libraries.io [Nesbitt and Pompilio, 2016] and Depsy [Priem and Piwowar, 2015] automate software dependency tracking; these could be harnessed to produce citation networks. Technical solutions to these challenges exist; community acceptance is instead needed.

However, research and development efforts are needed to solve the remaining challenges. These questions include: how can we cite closed-source/commercial software—can the above information be provided, even if the the software itself is not publicly preserved? How will index services (e.g., Web of Science, Scopus, Google Scholar) fully index software, since software citations require indexing to create a citation network akin to publications to carry weight for academic credit and reputation? How can publications indicate direct use of software for research in citations, where results would not be possible without efforts of software authors—should such a citation be “weighted” higher than others? The American Astronomical Society [2016] suggests a new “Software” section below the acknowledgements; other approaches include machine-readable supplementary data [Katz and Smith, 2015].

Finally, open questions remain on whether citable software should go through peer review and, if so, how can this be implemented? Should citable software itself follow the arXiv preprint model where releases are made available for users and the community to judge, or alternatively, the software paper model where “advertising” papers undergo peer review in a relevant community?

Acknowledgments

Some work by K. E. Niemeyer was supported by NSF grant ACI-1535065. Work by D. S. Katz was supported by the National Science Foundation (NSF) while working at the Foundation; any opinion, finding, and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this material are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of the NSF.

References

- American Astronomical Society. 2016. Policy Statement on Software. <http://journals.aas.org/policy/software.html>. (Jan. 2016). Accessed: 2016-01-12.
- Carl Boettiger, Matt Jones, Arfon M Smith, Yolanda Gil, Martin Fenner, Lars Holm Nielsen, and Mark Hahnel. 2016. CodeMeta. <http://codemeta.github.io/>. (2016). Accessed: 2016-01-12.
- CASRAI. 2015. Project CRediT. <http://credit.casrai.org>. (Oct. 2015). Accessed: 2016-01-11.
- Data Citation Synthesis Group. 2014. Joint Declaration of Data Citation Principles. <https://www.force11.org/group/joint-declaration-data-citation-principles-final>. (2014). Accessed: 2015-10-28.
- GitHub Inc. 2014. Making Your Code Citable. <https://guides.github.com/activities/citable-code/>. (2014). Accessed: 2016-01-17.
- James Howison and Julia Bullard. 2015. Software in the scientific literature: Problems with seeing, finding, and using software mentioned in the biology literature. *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology* (2015). DOI:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/asi.23538> In press.
- Daniel S. Katz, Sou-Cheng T. Choi, Hilmar Lapp, Ketan Maheshwari, Frank Löffler, Matthew Turk, Marcus Hanwell, Nancy Wilkins-Diehr, James Hetherington, James Howison, Shel Swenson, Gabrielle Allen, Anne Elster, Bruce Berriman, and Colin Venters. 2014. Summary of the First Workshop on Sustainable Software for Science: Practice and Experiences (WSSSPE1). *Journal of Open Research Software* 2, 1 (2014), e6. DOI:<http://dx.doi.org/10.5334/jors.an>
- Daniel S. Katz, Sou-Cheng T. Choi, Nancy Wilkins-Diehr, Neil Chue Hong, Colin C. Venters, James Howison, Frank J. Seinstra, Matthew Jones, Karen Cranston, Thomas L. Clune, Miguel de Val-Borro, and Richard Littauer. 2016a. Report on the Second Workshop on Sustainable Software for Science: Practice and Experiences (WSSSPE2). *Journal of Open Research Software* (2016). Accepted. Available at <http://arxiv.org/abs/1507.01715>.
- Daniel S. Katz, Kyle E. Niemeyer, Sou-Cheng T. Choi, James Hetherington, Frank Löffler, Dan Gunter, Ray Idaszak, Steven R. Brandt, Mark A Miller, Sandra Gesing, Nick D. Jones, Nicholas Weber, Gabrielle Allen, Colin C. Venters, Ethan Davis, Lorraine Hwang, Ilian Todorov, Abani Patra, and Miguel de Val-Borro. 2016b. Report on the Third Workshop on Sustainable Software for Science: Practice and Experiences (WSSSPE3). (2016). In preparation.
- Daniel S. Katz and Arfon M Smith. 2015. Transitive Credit and JSON-LD. *Journal of Open Research Software* 3 (2015), e7. DOI:<http://dx.doi.org/10.5334/jors.by>
- Mozilla Science Lab. 2015. PaperBadger. <https://badges.mozillascience.org/>. (2015). Accessed: 2016-01-12.
- Andrew Nesbitt and Mauro Pompilio. 2016. Libraries.io. <https://libraries.io>. (2016). Accessed: 2016-01-17.
- Jason Priem and Heather Piwowar. 2015. Depsy. <http://depsy.org>. (2015). Accessed: 2016-01-17.