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Abstract

I outline the involvement of the Los Alamos e-print archive (arXiv) within the Open Archives Initiative (OAI) and describe the implementation of the data provider side of the OAI protocol v1.0. I highlight the ways in which we map the existing structure of arXiv onto elements of the protocol. ¹

1 Introduction

1.1 Background

The Los Alamos e-print archive, now called arXiv [1] and formerly known as ‘xxx’, was started by Paul Ginsparg in August 1991. It allows unrefereed author self-archiving of research papers and no-fee retrieval by users worldwide. Initially arXiv was limited to high-energy theoretical physics, operated over email only, and served ≈200 users. The number of users grew to over 1000 in a few months and has grown to over 70,000 now. The scope of archive has expanded and new facilities have been added steadily since 1991 [2]. The following is a list of some of the more significant developments:

Aug 1991 Physics e-print archive started: hep-th archive with email interface.

1992 ftp interface added. hep-ph and hep-lat added locally; alg-geom, astro-ph and cond-mat added remotely.

Dec 1993 Web interface added.

Nov 1994 Data at some remote archives (using the same software) moved to main site, the remote sites become mirrors.

Jun 1995 Automatic PostScript generation from \TeX{} source.

Apr 1996 PDF generation added.

Jun 1996 Web upload facility added.

from 1996 Worldwide mirror network grows.

from 1999 arXiv involved in the OAI.

¹Expanded version of talk presented at Open Archives Initiative Open Meeting in Washington, DC, USA on 23rd January 2001.
1.2 The present

arXiv is the dominant means of information dissemination within certain areas of physics, notably high-energy physics, and has growing significance in many others [3]. It has rendered the paper distribution of pre-prints obsolete. The following is a list of some key statistics:

- Covers physics, mathematics, computer science, and non-linear systems.
- Serves over 70,000 users in over 100 countries.
- Estimated 13 million downloads in 2000.
- Over 30,000 new submissions in 2000, over 150,000 e-prints total (approximately linear growth in submission rate, $\approx 3500$ extra each year).
- $>99\%$ of submissions entirely automated.
- Submission via web (68%), email (27%) and ftp (5%).
- Some journals now accept and arXiv identifiers instead of requiring direct submission (e.g. APS: Phys. Rev. D, Elsevier: Phys. Lett. B).
- Los Alamos site funded by DOE\(^2\) and NSF; mirror sites funded locally.

1.3 arXiv software

The software running arXiv comprises of the order of 30,000 lines of Perl running under Linux with numerous other programs ($\TeX$, ghostscript, tar, gnuzip,...). The Perl code has evolved through many incremental changes on a system that has run continuously for 9.5 years, punctuated only by moves to newer hardware and a few short outages. We are currently putting significant effort into tidying and rewriting the code in a modular fashion but, unfortunately, we do not have the resources to engage in a complete off-line rewrite.

The growth of the arXiv far beyond early expectations means that some aspects will need to be changed. For example, the metadata is currently stored in plain files and will probably be moved to an XML database. This would allow more uniform parsing and character encoding, and provide better extraction facilities for services such as the OAI data provider interface. Also, the 3-digit serial number built into our identifiers limits each archive to 999 submissions per month (000 is not used). In November 2000, the astro-ph archive had 583 submissions. This limitation makes it impossible to combine the current array of physics archives into one archive with an extended subject-class structure as exists for other subject areas on arXiv. All changes must be implemented without disrupting the operation of the main site or the mirror sites.

1.4 Involvement of arXiv in the OAI

The Open Archives Initiative (OAI) developed from a meeting held in Santa Fe in 1999 which was initiated by Paul Ginsparg (arXiv, Los Alamos National Lab.), Rick Luce (Los Alamos National Lab.) and Herbert Van de Sompel (University of Ghent, Los Alamos National Lab.). arXiv has continued to be actively involved in both management of the initiative and technical development of the protocol.\(^2\) arXiv has direct DOE grant funding and also support from the ‘Library Without Walls’ project (LWW/STB-RL) within Los Alamos National Lab.
The protocol that resulted from the Santa Fe meeting [4] was a subset of the Dienst protocol [5] developed at Cornell University. While the syntax has changed significantly, the philosophy remains similar and our implementation has developed from that written to comply with the Santa Fe Convention and announced on 15th February 2000.

The initial focus of the OAI was author self-archived scholarly literature — e-prints, as they are often known. While the scope of the OAI has expanded considerably, the e-print community has led the protocol development. An example of this lead is the eprints.xsd schema (appendix 2 in the protocol specification [7]) which defines an e-print community specific description section for the response to the Identify verb.

2 OAI protocol v1.0 implementation

In the remainder of this paper I describe the arXiv implementation of the data provider side of the OAI protocol v1.0 [7]. I discuss issues associated with some of the concepts used in the protocol and then comment on each of the verbs.

2.1 Identifiers

Internally, the arXiv software uses identifiers of the form arch-ive/0101027 to refer to the latest version of an e-print, where arch-ive is the archive name (e.g. hep-th or math, and 0101027 is built up from last two digits of the year YY, the month number MM, and a serial number NNN. Some archives have compulsory subject-classes and the primary subject class is indicated by a two letter code appended to the archive name giving a complete identifier of the form arch-ive.SC/0101027, where SC is the subject-class. The subject-class is not necessary in order to locate the e-print but the form of the identifier including the subject-class is considered the canonical form.

There are multiple versions of some e-prints and the identifier just described is considered to refer to the latest version. A suffix vN is used to denote a specific version, where N is the version number (starting at 1). The details of the internal identifiers are likely to change to circumvent the limitations mentioned earlier. The existing identifiers must, however, continue to work because they have been widely used as references.

The OAI protocol specifies that identifiers must follow the URI [8] syntax. Our implementation exposes only the metadata of the latest version of each e-print and we follow the rules of the oai-identifier type shown in appendix 2 of the OAI protocol specification [7]. We prepend to our internal identifier the scheme name (oai), a colon separator (:), our repository name (arXiv), and another colon (:). The resulting identifiers have the form oai:arXiv:arch-ive[.SC]/0101027. The following are example internal identifiers and the corresponding OAI identifiers:

- hep-th/9901001 oai:arXiv:hep-th/9901001
- quant-ph/9912010 oai:arXiv:quant-ph/9912010
- math.SG/0001001 oai:arXiv:math.SG/0001001
- cs.SE/0101002 oai:arXiv:cs.SE/0101002

2.2 Datestamps

Until now, the significant dates in arXiv records have been the dates of submission of different revisions (as recorded in the Date lines of the metadata, and in the daily log file) and the dates of cross-listings (as recorded in the daily log file). We have had no need to record by-hand modifications to the metadata or
the date of addition or modification of a journal-reference (which is the only metadata element an author is allowed to change without generating a new revision).

In the context of the OAI, we need a datestamp that reflects any change in the metadata so that any change in the metadata will cause the metadata to be re-harvested. We store the metadata for each e-print in a separate file, so the easiest way to provide the required datestamp is to use the file modification date extracted from the file modification time.

It is straightforward to extract such a datestamp for a single record. However, the requirement for a search by datestamp as used in the ListIdentifiers and ListRecords requests requires that we compile indexes of datestamps. Further, the need to support incremental harvesting without missing any changes means we need to rebuild (or at least update) these indexes at whichever is the larger of the update interval (e.g., 1 day for by-hand modifications, 1 day for submissions, etc.) or the datestamp resolution (1 day). If a longer interval were used then it would be necessary to create datestamps tied to the rebuild times to avoid a service provider that harvested more frequently (e.g., daily) missing updates.

Within the existing protocol there is still the possibility for problems dependent upon the time of day the harvesting occurs in relation to any updates. The simplest solution is for harvesters to overlap successive harvests by 1 day so that any updates occurring on the day of the previous harvest are sure to be included, even if they occurred after the previous harvest. Double-harvesting a few records should not cause any problems.

2.3 Sets

The OAI protocol characterizes sets as “an optional construct for grouping items in a repository for the purpose of selective harvesting of records”, and they may be arranged in zero or more hierarchies. arXiv has a two- or three-level (depending on subject area) grouping hierarchy based on the subject of the e-print. The three levels are:

**group** There are four groups: physics, math, cs, nlin

**archive** The physics group has many archives (e.g., hep-th, astro-ph, cond-mat and even physics). Group and archive may be identified for the three other groups.

**subject-class** Some archives have subject-classes and individual e-prints may belong to one or more subject-class. However, we make a distinction between the primary subject-class and any others (which are treated in the same way as cross-lists to other archives).

It is possible to cross-list e-prints to archives other than the primary archive, or other subject-classes within the same or other archives. The purpose of cross-lists is to avoid the need to submit a single e-print to multiple archives. For example, if an e-print in the astro-ph archive is cross-listed to the hep-ph archive, then ‘readers’ of hep-ph will see the astro-ph e-print in the announcement email and the daily-listings on the web. The cross-listed astro-ph e-print will also be included in searches of the hep-ph archive.

We feel that it is desirable to reflect the existing arXiv organization, including the idea of cross-lists, in the OAI set structure. We currently declare four sets which correspond to the four groups listed above. If an e-print in one group is cross-listed to another group, or an archive within another group, then it will appear in the sets for both groups. If there were a need for it then we could also expose the subject-class layer in the set structure (skipping the archive layer which is an historical artifact). This was demonstrated in a prototype implementation.
Data from arXiv has previously been harvested in a manner that would now be achieved with sets. Data from the computer science archive (now the cs set) was harvested by the NCSTRL [9] project using a version of the Dienst protocol [5].

It is worth noting that data providers do not have to implement sets. Also, even when harvesting from data providers that implement sets, service providers do not have to use the sets (i.e. they never specify a set).

2.4 Deleted records

arXiv does not allow e-prints to be removed once submitted. We do permit authors to submit a withdrawal notice as a new revision which means that anyone looking for that e-print will see that the author wishes for it to be considered withdrawn. However, earlier revisions remain available. From the perspective of our OAI implementation, we export metadata for the withdrawal notice in the same was as for any other e-print.

There are a very small number (9 at present) of e-prints that have been removed because they were inappropriate or were duplicate copies. We have chosen to use the OAI status="deleted" attribute for these papers. This is currently implemented using a lookup table.

2.5 Metadata formats

We disseminate metadata for e-prints in the following formats:

- oai_dc Dublin Core encoded in XML.
- oai_rfc1807 RFC1807 encoded in XML.
- arXiv Test-bed for new internal XML metadata format.
- arXivOld XML encoded version of current internal metadata format.

Details of the oai_dc and oai_rfc1807 formats are given by the schemas in appendix 1 of the protocol specification [7].

Many mappings are obvious, e.g. Title → Dublin Core ‘title’, and Abstract → Dublin Core ‘description’. Other elements in Dublin Core and RFC1807 have to be extracted from less specific fields in the current arXiv metadata. One example is the language of the e-print. Most e-prints on arXiv are in English but some are in other languages (with an English abstract). The language is usually reflected by a comment such as ‘in French’ in the our ‘Comments’ field. We look for such declarations and export the information in the ‘language’ field of RFC1807 metadata.

We currently store author names and affiliations commingled in a rather free format which is quite difficult to untangle in general. We attempt to extract the surnames, forenames or initials, surname prefixes (e.g. de, von), surname suffixes (e.g. III) and affiliations. For example, arXiv metadata might say:

Authors: Fred A Bloggs, Mark Smith II (Univ A), T Sawyer (Univ B)

where, following convention, we assume Fred A Bloggs has affiliation Univ A and we must recognize II as a suffix rather than the surname of Mark Smith. Involvement in the OAI has highlighted the need for arXiv to collect better metadata.
2.6 Document verb

This verb is not part of the OAI protocol specification and the HTTP return is an error (400 Malformed request). However, an HTML page is also returned and this provides some notes about the current status of our implementation and some links to example requests for other verbs. The request is:

http://arXiv.org/oai1?verb=Document,

where http://arXiv.org/oai1 is the BASE-URL of the arXiv OAI implementation, and verb=Document is the keyword argument specifying the verb.

2.7 Identify verb

Implementation of the Identify verb is simply a matter of generating an appropriately formatted XML record containing information from various configuration variables. The request and response are shown in figure 1. arXiv returns two description containers:

- oai-identifier Declares our use of the OAI identifier scheme defined by oai-identifier.xsd, and gives a sample identifier oai:arXiv:quant-ph/9901001.
- eprints As we are part of the e-prints community, we include a description container that follows the eprints.xsd schema (appendix 2 of the protocol specification [7]).

2.8 ListSets verb

This is very straightforward to implement. The groups, the top level of our subject-classification structure, already have long and short names in the existing arXiv code. These names are taken from configuration variables and written out as XML. The request and response are shown in figure 2.

As we have a small number of sets there has been no need to implement the partial response and acceptance of a resumptionToken. Any request which supplies a resumptionToken will result in a 400 error.

2.9 ListMetadataFormats verb

The metadata formats that can be disseminated by the arXiv OAI interface are stored in configuration variables (along with pointers to the routines that convert from our native format). Implementation of this verb is simply a matter of writing out this information in the correct format. The request and response are shown in figure 3.

As we have a small number of metadata formats there has been no need to implement the partial response and acceptance of a resumptionToken. Any request which supplies a resumptionToken will result in a 400 error.
Figure 1: Example Identify request and response
Figure 2: Example ListSets request and response.
Request: http://arXiv.org/oai1?verb=ListMetadataFormats
Response:

<?xml version="1.0" encoding="UTF-8"?>
<ListMetadataFormats
    xmlns="http://www.openarchives.org/OAI/1.0/OAI_ListMetadataFormats"
    xmlns:xsi="http://www.w3.org/2000/10/XMLSchema-instance"
    xsi:schemaLocation="http://www.openarchives.org/OAI/1.0/OAI_ListMetadataFormats
"http://www.openarchives.org/OAI/1.0/OAI_ListMetadataFormats.xsd">
    <responseDate>2001-01-25T16:30:23-07:00</responseDate>
    <requestURL>http://arXiv.org/oai1?verb=ListMetadataFormats</requestURL>
    <metadataFormat>
        <metadataPrefix>arXivOld</metadataPrefix>
        <schema>http://arXiv.org/OAI/arXivOld.xsd</schema>
        <metadataNamespace>http://arXiv.org/OAI/</metadataNamespace>
    </metadataFormat>
    <metadataFormat>
        <metadataPrefix>arXiv</metadataPrefix>
        <schema>http://arXiv.org/OAI/arXiv.xsd</schema>
        <metadataNamespace>http://arXiv.org/OAI/</metadataNamespace>
    </metadataFormat>
    <metadataFormat>
        <metadataPrefix>oai_rfc1807</metadataPrefix>
        <schema>http://www.openarchives.org/OAI/rfc1807.xsd</schema>
        <metadataNamespace>
            http://info.internet.isi.edu:80/in-notes/rfc/files/rfc1807.txt
        </metadataNamespace>
    </metadataFormat>
    <metadataFormat>
        <metadataPrefix>oai_dc</metadataPrefix>
        <schema>http://www.openarchives.org/OAI/dc.xsd</schema>
        <metadataNamespace>http://purl.org/dc/elements/1.1/</metadataNamespace>
    </metadataFormat>
</ListMetadataFormats>

Figure 3: Example ListMetadataFormats request and response.
2.10 GetRecord verb

The majority of the effort involved in implementing the GetRecord verb is in performing the metadata format conversion and mapping from our internal format to the format requested. This has been discussed above. Once the request has been parsed, there are four possible outcomes:

1. Item does not exist → no <record> container returned.
2. Item is ‘deleted’ → <record status="deleted"> container with <header> block returned.
3. Item exists but can not be disseminated in the requested metadata format → <record> container with <header> but no <metadata> block returned.
4. Item exists and can be disseminated in the requested metadata format → <record> container with <header> and <metadata> blocks returned.

As metadata for all items in arXiv can be disseminated in all four metadata formats supported, case 3 applies only if an unsupported metadata format is requested. Figure 4 shows an example GetRecord request and response.

We have chosen not to implement the <about> container at this time because we do not have rights information for individual metadata records and consider that the overall statement supplied in the Identify response is adequate.

2.11 ListIdentifiers verb

This verb is essentially a search by datestamp, the optional from and until parameters specifying the datestamp range, and the optional set parameter limiting the archives searched. We do not want to return all >150,000 identifiers in one response and so implement partial responses and supply a resumptionToken as necessary. Our index of updates is time ordered so we choose to return identifiers in datestamp order and build the resumptionToken from a concatenation of the new from parameter, the until parameter and the set. This means that the resumptionToken does not expire at any particular time although the response will change if the index of updates changes. An example ListIdentifiers request and response is shown in figure 5.

2.12 ListRecords verb

This verb is essentially a combination of the ListIdentifiers and GetRecord verbs. We implement the search by datestamp and set using the same code as for ListIdentifiers. Then, for each identifier found, we use the same code the implements the GetRecord verb to write XML metadata records in the format requested. An example request and response is shown in figure 6.

2.13 Flow Control

The main arXiv site, http://arXiv.org/, is heavily used and has various automated scripts to prevent badly written and non-conforming (i.e. not obeying /robots.txt) robots from loading the server to the point where there is denial-of-service to other users. arXiv is particularly vulnerable because of the fact that most papers are stored as TEX source and processed to produce PostScript or PDF on demand (with a large cache). Flow control is thus essential to avoid legitimate OAI service providers getting blocked.
Figure 4: Example GetRecord request and response.
Flow control is implemented with a combination of HTTP 503 Retry-After replies and, for the list requests, the use of partial responses and the resumptionToken. A harvester that abides by the delay specified in the Retry-After reply will not get blocked. The strategy is simple: the OAI code keeps track of the time of the last request from each site and enforces a minimum before answering further requests. If a request comes sooner than is permitted, a Retry-After reply is issued where the delay returned is the time that the harvester must wait before a request will be answered. To avoid loading the server with searches by date, there is a longer delay for ListIdentifiers and ListRecords requests than for other requests. A harvester that knew the delay could pre-emptively wait between requests. With the current protocol there is no way to communicate this delay so the usual situation will be that every fulfilled request is followed by a request answered by a Retry-After reply indicating the time the harvester must wait.

Before the addition of flow control we had repeated problems with OAI developers getting blocked by arXiv’s robot detection scripts. This is no longer a problem and the arc [10] harvester has managed to harvest metadata for all arXiv records several times without running foul of the robot detection scripts.

One could also implement load-balancing over a number of servers using the HTTP 302 response permitted by the OAI protocol. This has not been implemented for arXiv as we currently run only one server at the main site.

2.14 Implementation cost

The current implementation has evolved from the Open Archives Dienst Subset [5] implementation so it is hard to estimate the time it would take to write the interface from scratch using the OAI v1.0 protocol specification. The arXiv implementation is complicated significantly by internal inconsistencies in the archive structure. The list below indicates some of the major efforts:

‘Santa Fe convention’, OAI Dienst Subset, December 1999 ≈2-3 weeks effort which included time to understand Dienst, writing utility routines such as an XML writing library (now available in standard libraries), coding a search by date, and coding conversion of our metadata to RFC1807.
Figure 6: Example ListRecords request and response.
OAI v0.2, October 2000  \(\approx 2\) days which included writing \(\LaTeX \rightarrow\) UTF-8 conversion code for the special characters which are currently mostly \(\LaTeX\) encoded in our metadata. Also included rewriting parsing code for simplified syntax.

OAI v1.0, January 2001  Many small changes during protocol development, most of which involved simplifications in the code!

The majority of the effort necessary to create a new implementation is likely to be in routines to implement metadata format conversion; a search to find records by datestamp; and perhaps flow control through partial responses and Retry-After returns.

3 The future

I hope that the OAI protocol will be widely adopted as a means of exposing metadata by the scholarly publishing community and by others. The utility of this is contingent upon the development services using this metadata. One can imagine resource discovery tools that index all OAI compliant repositories and using just the required Dublin Core [11] metadata still provide much more structured search facilities than generic Web search engines such as Google [12].

I am confident that the scholarly publishing community, especially the e-print community, will be quick to use the OAI protocol. There already exists one OAI-based cross-archive search engine (ar[10]). The e-prints community is also developing a metadata set able to encode a richer set of information than Dublin Core and to include relations between records. I hope that this will lead to community specific tools with additional functionality based on this extra information.
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