

Overview of STEM Science as PROCESS, METHOD, MATERIAL, and DATA Named Entities

Jennifer D'Souza

TIB Leibniz Information Centre for Science and Technology,
Hannover, Germany
jennifer.dsouza@tib.eu

Abstract

We are faced with an unprecedented production in scholarly publications worldwide. Stakeholders in the digital libraries posit that the document-based publishing paradigm has reached the limits of adequacy. Instead, structured, machine-interpretable, fine-grained scholarly knowledge publishing as Knowledge Graphs (KG) is strongly advocated. In this work, we develop and analyze a large-scale structured dataset of STEM articles across 10 different disciplines, viz. *Agriculture, Astronomy, Biology, Chemistry, Computer Science, Earth Science, Engineering, Material Science, Mathematics, and Medicine*. Our analysis is defined over a large-scale corpus comprising 60K abstracts structured as four scientific entities PROCESS, METHOD, MATERIAL, and DATA. Thus our study presents, for the first-time, an analysis of a large-scale multidisciplinary corpus under the construct of four named entity labels that are specifically defined and selected to be domain-independent as opposed to domain-specific. The work is then inadvertently a feasibility test of characterizing multidisciplinary science with domain-independent concepts. Further, to summarize the distinct facets of scientific knowledge per concept per discipline, a set of word cloud visualizations are offered. The STEM-NER-60k corpus, created in this work, comprises over 1M extracted entities from 60k STEM articles obtained from a major publishing platform and is publicly released <https://github.com/jd-coderepos/stem-ner-60k>.

2014), DBpedia Spotlight (Mendes et al., 2011), NELL (Mitchell et al., 2018), and FRED (Gangemi et al., 2017), to name a few. In contrast, scholarly literature remains relatively understudied for its intelligible machine interpretability. Consequently, fine-grained scholarly knowledge remains largely inaccessible for machine reading. In terms of data standards, particularly the FAIR guiding principles for scientific data creation (Wilkinson et al., 2016), this implies a wider unexplored scope for obtaining scientific resources that are findable, accessible, interpretable, and reusable.

There are a multitude of recent emerging large-scale initiatives to build specialised Scholarly Knowledge Graphs (SKGs) capable of serving specific user needs. Consider Google Scholar, Web of Science (Birkle et al., 2020), Microsoft Academic Graph (Wang et al., 2020), Open Research Knowledge Graph (Auer, 2018a; Auer et al., 2020), Semantic Scholar (Fricke, 2018), etc. *These initiatives already create a practical systems need for automated graph encoding methods (e.g., to associate IRIs as URIs or URLs with graph nodes for their RDFization—a W3C labeled graph standard).*

We position this paper within the broader aim of supporting the machine reading of scientific terms multidisciplinary as dereferencable Web resources. Specifically, in this work, we release a large-scale, multidisciplinary, structured dataset of scientific named entities called STEM-NER-60k comprising over a 1M extracted entities from 60k articles across the 10 most prolific STEM disciplines on Elsevier, viz. *Agriculture (agr)*, *Astronomy (ast)*, *Biology (bio)*, *Chemistry (chem)*, *Computer Science (cs)*, *Earth Science (es)*, *Engineering (eng)*, *Materials Science (ms)*, and *Mathematics (mat)*. The NER extraction objective was based on the STEM-ECR corpus in our prior work (Brack et al., 2020; D'Souza et al., 2020) which consisted of 110 abstracts from open access publications with each of aforementioned 10 domains equally

1 Introduction

In the quest for knowledge (Schubert, 2006), significant progress has been made toward the automated understanding of the meaning of text in the commonsense domain. Some state-of-the-art systems that power commonsense machine interpretability or readability are Babelify (Moro et al.,

represented with 11 abstracts per domain. Each abstract was structured in terms of the scientific entities, the entities were classified within a four-class formalism (viz. PROCESS, METHOD, MATERIAL, and DATA) and were resolved to Wikipedia and Wiktionary respectively. The 4-class formalism had the following objective: *to be restricted within the single broad domain of Science, while still bridging terms multidisciplinarily*, thus, in a sense, validating the terms themselves and automatic systems developed for their semantic adaptability. To this end, while our prior gold-standard STEM-ECR corpus (D’Souza et al., 2020) initiated the development of semantically-adaptable systems, the silver-standard STEM-NER-60k corpus of this work (<https://github.com/jd-coderepos/stem-ner-60k>) fosters the development of not just semantically-adaptable, but also scalable solutions.

2 Background

Scholarly domain NER is not entirely new: the flagship Semantic Evaluation (SemEval) series has so far seen five related tasks organized (Kim et al., 2010; Moro and Navigli, 2015; Augenstein et al., 2017a; Gábor et al., 2018a; D’Souza et al., 2021)—however, *none of this work has been done so far in the broad multidisciplinary setting of Science*. Extending our prior work on this theme (Brack et al., 2020; D’Souza et al., 2020), we explore scholarly NER on a large-scale, silver-standard corpus of structured STEM articles which has *a wide-ranging application scope in the emerging field of the creation and discovery of SKGs that strive toward representing knowledge from scholarly articles in machine-interpretable form*. The characteristics of our corpus are unique and noteworthy. 1) The linguistic phenomenon of interdisciplinary word-sense switching is pervasive. E.g., consider the term “the Cloud” which in *cs* takes on the meaning of a technological solution for hosting software, versus in *ast* where it takes the common interpretation of the mass of water vapor we see in the sky. 2) There is a seemingly evident shift of the sense interpretation of terms to take on our corpus domain-specific scientific word senses as opposed to their common sense interpretations which may be more widely known. E.g., “power” in *mat* refers to exponentiation, which, otherwise in a common sense, takes on a human social interpretation. Thus, our work on multidisci-

plinary NER with semantically bridging concepts w.r.t both our prior gold-standard STEM-ECR corpus (<https://data.uni-hannover.de/dataset/stem-ecr-v1-0>) and the STEM-NER-60k corpus, discussed in this paper, facilitates designing novel solutions attempting multidisciplinary NER within a generic four-class formalism capable of bridging semantic concepts multidisciplinarily.

The paper is structured in two main parts. First, related work in terms of existing class formalisms for annotating scientific entities is discussed. Second, insights to the STEM-NER-60k corpus released in this work (<https://github.com/jd-coderepos/stem-ner-60k>) are given.

3 Related Work: Scientific Named Entity Recognition (NER) Formalisms

The structuring of unstructured articles as an NER task has been taken up at a wide-scale in three scientific disciplines: Computer Science (CS), Biomedicine (Bio), and Chemistry (Chem).

In this section, we discuss the different NER conceptual formalisms defined in the three domains.

3.1 Computer Science NER (CS NER)

CS NER corpora can be compared along five dimensions: (1) domain, (2) annotation coverage, (3) semantic concepts, (4) size, and (5) annotation method. Most of the corpora consist of relatively short documents. The shortest is the CL-Titles corpus (2021) with only paper titles. The longer ones have sentences from full-text articles, viz. ScienceIE (2017b), NLP-TDMS (2019), SciREX (2020), and ORKG-TDM (2021). We see that the corpora have had from one (D’Souza et al., 2021) to at-most seven NER concepts (QasemiZadeh and Schumann, 2016). Each corpora’ concepts purposefully informs an overarching knowledge extraction objective. E.g., the concepts *focus*, *technique*, and *domain* in the FTD corpus (2011) helped examine the influence between research communities; ACL-RD-TEC (2016) made possible a broader trends analysis with seven concepts. Eventually, corpora began to shed light on a novel scientific community research direction toward representing the entities as knowledge graphs (Auer, 2018b) with hierarchical relation annotations such as synonymy (2017b) or semantic relations such ‘*Method Used-for a Task*’ (2018); otherwise, concepts were combined within full-fledged semantic constructs

as LEADERBOARDS with between three to four concepts (Hou et al., 2019; Jain et al., 2020; Mondal et al., 2021; Kabongo et al., 2021), viz. *rp*, *dataset*, *meth*, *metric*, and *score*; or were in extraction objectives with solely contributions-focused entities of a paper (Färber et al., 2021; D’Souza and Auer, 2021).

3.2 Biomedical NER (BioNER)

BioNER predates CS NER. It was one of the earliest domains taken up for text mining of fine-grained entities from scholarly publications to enhance search engine performance in health applications. It aims to recognize concepts in bioscience and medicine. E.g., protein, gene, disease, drug, tissue, body part and location of activity such as cell or organism. The most frequently used corpora are GENETAG (full-text articles annotated with protein/gene entities) (Tanabe et al., 2005), JNLPBA (~2400 abstracts annotated with DNA, RNA, protein, cell type and cell line concepts) (Collier and Kim, 2004), GENIA (~200 Medline abstracts annotated with 36 different concepts from the Genia ontology and several levels of linguistic/semantic features) (Kim et al., 2003), NCBI disease corpus (793 abstracts annotated with diseases in the MeSH taxonomy) (Doğan et al., 2014), CRAFT (the second largest corpus with 97 full text papers annotated with over 4000 corpus) (Bada et al., 2012) linking to the NCBI Taxonomy, the Protein, Gene, Cell, Sequence ontologies etc. Finally, the MedMentions corpus (Mohan and Li, 2018) as the largest dataset with ~4000 abstracts with ~34,724 concepts from the UMLS ontology. By leveraging ontologies such as the Gene Ontology (Ashburner et al., 2000), UMLS (Bodenreider, 2004), MESH, or the NCBI Taxonomy (Schoch et al., 2020), for the semantic concepts, these corpora build on years of careful knowledge representation work and are semantically consistent with a wide variety of other efforts that exploit these community resources. This differs from CS NER which is evolving toward standardized concepts.

Structured knowledge as knowledge bases (KB) were early seen as necessary in organizing biomedical scientific findings. Biomedical NER was applied to build such KBs. E.g., protein-protein (PPI) interaction databases as MINT (Chatr-Aryamontri et al., 2007) and IntAct (Kerrien et al., 2007) or the more detailed KBs as pathway (Bader et al., 2006) or Gene Ontology Annotation (Camon et al.,

2004). Community challenges help curate these KBs via text mining at a large-scale. E.g., BioCreative for PPI (Krallinger et al., 2008, 2011), protein-mutation associations (Krallinger et al., 2009), and gene-disease relations (Krallinger et al., 2010); or BioNLP (Kim et al., 2011) for complex n-ary bio events. CS NER is also been addressed in equivalent series such as SemEval (2017b; 2018b; 2021) which is promising to foster rapid task progress.

3.3 Chemistry NER (ChemNER)

BioNER in part fosters Chemistry NER. Text mining for drug and chemical compound entities (Herrero-Zazo et al., 2013; Krallinger et al., 2015) are indispensable to mining chemical disease relations (Li et al., 2016), and drug and chemical-protein interactions (Krallinger et al., 2017, 2021). Obtaining this structured knowledge has implications in precision medicine, drug discovery as well as basic biomedical research. Corpora for ChemNER are Corbett et al.’s dataset (42 full-text papers with ~7000 chemical entities), ChemDNER (10,000 PubMed abstracts with 84,355 chemical entities) (2015), and NLM-Chem (150 full-text papers with 38,342 chemical entities normalized to 2,064 MeSH identifiers) (Islamaj et al., 2021).

The high-level identification of entities in text is a staple of most modern NLP pipelines over commonsense knowledge. This, in the context of the scientific entities formalisms presented above is pertinent to scholarly knowledge as well. While being structurally domain-wise related, our work has a unique objective: *to extract entities across STEM Science which follow a generic four-entity conceptual formalism*. Thus apart from having an impact in the emerging field of the discovery of science graphs, the STEM-NER-60k corpus can have specific applications in higher-level NLP tasks including information extraction (Shah et al., 2003), factuality ascertainment of statements in knowledge base population (Adel, 2018), and question answering over linked data (Unger et al., 2014).

4 Our STEM-NER-60k Corpus

We now describe our corpus: 1) definitions of the four scientific concepts (2020), viz. PROCESS, METHOD, MATERIAL, and DATA, are given; 2) the process by which the silver-standard STEM-NER-60k corpus is created is explained; and 3) corpus insights are offered specifically in terms of the multidisciplinary entities annotated under the formal-

ism of four concepts bridging the 10 domains.

4.1 Concept Definitions

Following an iterative process of concept refinement (D’Souza et al., 2020) via a process that involved expert adjudication of which scientific concepts were multidisciplinary semantically meaningful, the following four concepts were agreed upon to be relevant for entities across STEM, specifically across the following 10 domains, viz. *agri*, *ast*, *bio*, *chem*, *cs*, *es*, *eng*, *ms*, and *math*.

- **PROCESS.** Natural phenomenon, or independent/dependent activities. E.g., growing (*bio*), cured (*ms*), flooding (*es*).
- **METHOD.** A commonly used procedure that acts on entities. E.g., powder X-ray (*chem*), the PRAM analysis (*cs*), magnetoencephalography (*med*).
- **MATERIAL.** A physical or digital entity used for scientific experiments. E.g., soil (*agri*), the moon (*ast*), the set (*math*).
- **DATA.** The data themselves, or quantitative or qualitative characteristics of entities. E.g., rotational energy (*eng*), tensile strength (*ms*), vascular risk (*med*).

4.2 Corpus Creation

The silver-standard STEM-NER-60k corpus was created as follows. Roughly 60,000 articles in text format and restricted only to the articles with the CC-BY redistributable license on Elsevier were first downloaded <https://tinyurl.com/60k-raw-dataset>. Next, our aim was to obtain the four-concept entity annotations for the Abstracts in this corpus of publications. We leveraged our prior-developed state-of-the-art NER system for this purpose (Brack et al., 2020). The Brack et al. system was based on Beltagy et al.’s SciBERT which in turn for the specific NER configuration makes use of the original BERT NER (Devlin et al., 2018; Ma and Hovy, 2016) prediction architecture. The Brack et al. system, however, was pretrained on a smaller gold-standard STEM corpus (2020) expert-annotated with the four generic scientific entities described in subsection 4.1. Applying this system on the Abstracts on the newly downloaded 60k articles produced the silver-standard STEM-NER-60k corpus of this work. The resulting silver-standard corpus statistics are shown in Table 1.

	articles	process	method	material	data
<i>agr</i>	4,944	20,532	3,252	62,043	33,608
<i>ast</i>	15,003	31,104	10,423	55,753	97,011
<i>bio</i>	9,038	54,029	6,777	100,454	43,418
<i>chem</i>	5,232	18,185	6,044	48,779	30,596
<i>cs</i>	5,389	17,014	13,650	35,554	33,575
<i>es</i>	4,363	28,432	5,129	56,571	50,211
<i>eng</i>	2,441	12,705	3,293	24,633	24,238
<i>ms</i>	2,144	10,102	2,437	23,054	16,981
<i>math</i>	1,765	8,002	1,941	11,381	15,631
<i>med</i>	15,054	89,637	19,580	148,059	134,249

Table 1: STEM-NER-60k corpus statistics comprising 59,984 articles structured in terms of PROCESS, METHOD, MATERIAL, and DATA concepts

Our corpus is publicly released (<https://github.com/jd-coderepos/stem-ner-60k>) to support related R&D endeavors and for other researchers interested in further investigating the task of scholarly NER.

4.3 Corpus Insights

Here, details of the STEM-NER-60k corpus are offered.

But first, given our large-scale multidisciplinary scientific corpus, we take the opportunity to briefly examine the difference between scientific writing and non-scientific writing, if any, with the help of entropy formulations for each of our data domains. The entropies obtained for our corpus per domain is as follows: *med* (4.58) > *chem* (4.58) > *bio* (4.56) > *ast* (4.53) > *agri* (4.5) > *ms* (4.5) > *es* (4.48) > *eng* (4.42) > *math* (4.4). Intriguingly, these numbers are close to non-scientific English (4.11 bits (Cover, 1999)). Thus, given our corpus scientific English, one can rule out any atypical English usage syntax other than domain-specific jargon vocabulary.

Next, briefly, we address *which general scientific entity annotation patterns can one anticipate in our silver-standard corpus?* 1) Entity annotations can be expected as definite noun phrases whenever found. 2) Coreferring lexical units for scientific entities in the context of a single Abstract can be expected to be annotated with the same concept type. 3) Quantifiable lexical units such as numbers (e.g., years 1999, measurements 4km) or even phrases (e.g., vascular risk) should be DATA. 4) Where found, the most precise text reference (i.e. including qualifiers) regarding MATERIALS used in the experiment should be annotated. E.g., the term “carbon atoms in graphene” was annotated

as a single MATERIAL entity and not separately as “carbon atoms”, “graphene”. 5) The precedence of annotation of the scientific concepts in the original corpus in case of any confusion in classifying the four classes of scientific entities was resolved as follows: METHOD > PROCESS > DATA > MATERIAL, where the concept appearing earlier in the list was selected as the preferred class.

4.3.1 STEM scientific terms as PROCESS

Verbs (e.g., measured), verb phrases (e.g., integrating results), or noun phrases (e.g., an assessment, future changes, this transport process, the transfer) can be expected to be scientific entity candidates for PROCESS. Generally, it can be one of two things: an occurrence natural to the state/properties of the entity or an action performed by the investigators. In the latter case, however, it is better aptly expected as a METHOD entity when the action is a named instance.

Some examples are offered for scientific entities as PROCESS candidates. 1) In the sentence, “The transfer of a laboratory process into a manufacturing facility is one of the most critical steps required for the large scale production of cell-based therapy products”, the terms “The transfer”, “a laboratory process”, and “the large scale production” all are of type PROCESS. 2) In “The transterminator ion flow in the Venusian ionosphere is observed at solar minimum for the first time.”, the terms “The transterminator ion flow” and “solar minimum” PROCESS entities. The verb “observed”, however, is not considered a PROCESS since it doesn’t act upon another object. 3) On the other hand, in “It is suggested that this ion flow contributes to maintaining the night-side ionosphere.”, the terms “this ion flow” and “maintaining” are both considered valid PROCESS candidates. Finally, 4) in the sentence “Cellular morphology, pluripotency gene expression and differentiation into the three germ layers have been used compare the outcomes of manual and automated processes” the terms “pluripotency gene expression”, “differentiation”, “compare”, and “manual and automated processes” are each annotated as PROCESS.

4.3.2 STEM scientific terms as METHOD

Phrases which can be expected to be annotated as a METHOD entity are those which contain the following trigger words: simulation, method, algorithm, scheme, technique, system, function, derivative, proportion, strategy, solver, experiment, test,

computation, program. As an example, consider the sentence “Here finite-element modelling has demonstrated that once one silica nanoparticle debonds then its nearest neighbours are shielded from the applied stress field, and hence may not debond.” In this sentence, the term “finite-element modelling” is annotated as a METHOD.

4.3.3 STEM scientific terms as MATERIAL

This concept is expounded merely with the following three examples. 1) In “Based on the results of the LUCAS topsoil survey we performed an assessment of plant available P status of European croplands.” the term “European croplands” should be MATERIAL. 2) In “The transfer of a laboratory process into a manufacturing facility is one of the most critical steps required for the large scale production of cell-based therapy products.” there are two MATERIAL terms, viz. “a manufacturing facility” and “cell-based therapy products”. Finally, 3) in the sentence “Cellular morphology, pluripotency gene expression and differentiation into the three germ layers have been used to compare the outcomes of manual and automated processes.” the phrase “the three germ layers” is a MATERIAL.

4.3.4 STEM scientific terms as DATA

Phrases satisfying the patterns in the following examples can be expected to be DATA. 1) In “Based on the results of the LUCAS topsoil survey we performed an assessment of plant available P status of European croplands.”, the phrases “the results” and “plant available P status” are considered as DATA in the original annotation scheme. 2) In “Our analysis shows a status of a baseline period of the years 2009 and 2012, while a repeated LUCAS topsoil survey can be a useful tool to monitor future changes of nutrient levels, including P in soils of the EU.” the phrases: “a status of a baseline period”, “nutrient levels”, and “P” are DATA items. 3) Further, in “Observations near the terminator of the energies of ions of ionospheric origin showed asymmetry between the noon and midnight sectors, which indicated an antisunward ion flow with a velocity of $(2.5 \pm 1.5) \text{ kms}^{-1}$.” the terms “asymmetry between the noon and midnight sectors”, “a velocity”, and “ $(2.5 \pm 1.5) \text{ kms}^{-1}$ ” are DATA. Finally, 4) in “We established a P fertilizer need map based on integrating results from the two systems.” the phrase “a P fertilizer need map” is DATA which should override the selection of “a P fertilizer” as MATERIAL by the concept precedence stated earlier.

Next, in Figures 1 to 10, word clouds of the top 100 entities for the 10 STEM disciplines is shown.

5 Applications

In this section, we offer some directions for practical applications developed based on STEM-ECR NER. With this we hope to offer inspiration for similar or related usages of the STEM-NER-60k corpus developed in this work.

5.1 STEM Entities Recommendation Service in the Open Research Knowledge Graph

The STEM-ECR annotation project (<https://data.uni-hannover.de/dataset/stem-ecr-v1-0>) was initiated to support the population of structured scientific concepts in the Open Research Knowledge Graph (ORKG). Figure 11 demonstrates the integration of our prior developed machine learning model of STEM entities (Brack et al., 2020) in the ORKG frontend. The model takes as input the Abstract of a new incoming publication and structures the Abstract per the four concepts. The user can then flexibly select and deselect annotations based on their prediction confidences or the user preference to automatically structure the contribution data of the work.

5.2 Knowledge Graph Construction for Fine-Grained Structured Search

Knowledge Graphs (KG) play a crucial role in many modern applications (<https://developers.google.com/knowledge-graph>) as solutions to the information access and search problem. There have been several initiatives in the NLP (Ammar et al., 2018; Luan et al., 2018; D’Souza and Auer, 2021; D’Souza et al., 2021), and the Semantic Web (Auer et al., 2018; Jaradeh et al., 2019), communities suggesting an increasing trend toward adoption of KGs for scientific articles. The automatic construction of KGs from text is a challenging problem, more so owing to the multidisciplinary nature of Science at large. While machines can better handle the volume of scientific literature, they need supervisory signals to determine which elements of the text have value. The STEM-NER-60k corpus can be leveraged to construct knowledge graphs underlying fine-grained search over publications. Figure 12 demonstrates an example KG that was manually annotated with




relations between the entities. In the figure, the entity nodes are color-coded by their concept type: orange corresponds to PROCESS, purple for METHOD, green corresponds to MATERIAL, and blue for DATA.



6 Conclusion and Future Work Directions

In this paper, we have systematically introduced a large-scale multidisciplinary STEM corpus spanning 10 disciplines with structured abstracts in terms of generic PROCESS, METHOD, MATERIAL, and DATA entities. The corpus called STEM-NER-60k is publicly released for facilitating future research <https://github.com/jd-coderepos/stem-ner-60k>. Based on the applications presented in section 5, we envision two main future research directions: 1) extending the set of generic concepts beyond the four proposed in this work. E.g., our prior work (Brack et al., 2020) proposed concepts such as TASK, OBJECTIVE, and RESULT. And, 2) for automatic KG construction multidisciplinarily, annotating semantic relations between the entities.

References

- Heike Adel. 2018. *Deep learning methods for knowledge base population*. Ph.D. thesis, lmu.
- Waleed Ammar, Dirk Groeneveld, Chandra Bhagavathula, Iz Beltagy, Miles Crawford, Doug Downey, Jason Dunkelberger, Ahmed Elgohary, Sergey Feldman, Vu Ha, et al. 2018. Construction of the literature graph in semantic scholar. In *NAACL-HLT* (3).
- Michael Ashburner, Catherine A Ball, Judith A Blake, David Botstein, Heather Butler, J Michael Cherry, Allan P Davis, Kara Dolinski, Selina S Dwight, Janan T Eppig, et al. 2000. Gene ontology: tool for the unification of biology. *Nature genetics*, 25(1):25–29.
- Sören Auer, Viktor Kovtun, Manuel Prinz, Anna Kasprzik, Markus Stocker, and Maria Esther Vidal. 2018. Towards a knowledge graph for science. In *Proceedings of the 8th International Conference on Web Intelligence, Mining and Semantics*, pages 1–6.
- Sören Auer, Allard Oelen, Muhammad Haris, Markus Stocker, Jennifer D’Souza, Kheir Eddine Farfar, Lars Vogt, Manuel Prinz, Vitalis Wiens, and Mohamad Yaser Jaradeh. 2020. Improving access to scientific literature with knowledge graphs. *Bibliothek Forschung und Praxis*, 44(3):516–529.





- Isabelle Augenstein, Mrinal Das, Sebastian Riedel, Lakshmi Vikraman, and Andrew McCallum. 2017a. Semeval 2017 task 10: ScienceIE - extracting keyphrases and relations from scientific publications. In *SemEval@ACL*.
- Isabelle Augenstein, Mrinal Das, Sebastian Riedel, Lakshmi Vikraman, and Andrew McCallum. 2017b. [SemEval 2017 task 10: ScienceIE - extracting keyphrases and relations from scientific publications](#). In *Proceedings of the 11th International Workshop on Semantic Evaluation (SemEval-2017)*, pages 546–555, Vancouver, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Michael Bada, Miriam Eckert, Donald Evans, Kristin Garcia, Krista Shipley, Dmitry Sitnikov, William A Baumgartner, K Bretonnel Cohen, Karin Verspoor, Judith A Blake, et al. 2012. Concept annotation in the craft corpus. *BMC bioinformatics*, 13(1):1–20.
- Gary D Bader, Michael P Cary, and Chris Sander. 2006. Pathguide: a pathway resource list. *Nucleic acids research*, 34(suppl_1):D504–D506.
- Iz Beltagy, Kyle Lo, and Arman Cohan. 2019. Scibert: A pretrained language model for scientific text. In *EMNLP-IJCNLP*, pages 3606–3611.
- Caroline Birkle, David A Pendlebury, Joshua Schnell, and Jonathan Adams. 2020. Web of science as a data source for research on scientific and scholarly activity. *Quantitative Science Studies*, 1(1):363–376.
- Olivier Bodenreider. 2004. The unified medical language system (umls): integrating biomedical terminology. *Nucleic Acids Research*, 32(Database issue):D267.
- Arthur Brack, Jennifer D’Souza, Anett Hoppe, Sören Auer, and Ralph Ewerth. 2020. Domain-independent extraction of scientific concepts from research articles. In *European Conference on Information Retrieval*, pages 251–266. Springer.
- Evelyn Camon, Michele Magrane, Daniel Barrell, Vivian Lee, Emily Dimmer, John Maslen, David Binns, Nicola Harte, Rodrigo Lopez, and Rolf Apweiler. 2004. The gene ontology annotation (goa) database: sharing knowledge in uniprot with gene ontology. *Nucleic Acids Research*, 32(Database issue):D262.
- Andrew Chatr-Aryamontri, Arnaud Ceol, Luisa Montecchi Palazzi, Giuliano Nardelli, Maria Victoria Schneider, Luisa Castagnoli, and Gianni Cesareni. 2007. Mint: the molecular interaction database. *Nucleic acids research*, 35(suppl_1):D572–D574.
- J Chen, AJ Kinloch, S Sprenger, and AC Taylor. 2013. The mechanical properties and toughening mechanisms of an epoxy polymer modified with polysiloxane-based core-shell particles. *Polymer*, 54(16):4276–4289.
- Nigel Collier and Jin-Dong Kim. 2004. [Introduction to the bio-entity recognition task at JNLPBA](#). In *Proceedings of the International Joint Workshop*




Figure 11: STEM Entities-based Abstract Annotator Recommendation Service for PROCESS, METHOD, MATERIAL, and DATA entities in the Add-paper wizard of the next-generation Open Research Knowledge Graph (ORKG) digital library front-end service.




Figure 12: Structured Knowledge Graph (KG) representation of a Material Science domain publication Abstract (Chen et al., 2013) as PROCESS, METHOD, MATERIAL, and DATA typed entities. For KGs in the remaining 9 STEM domains we consider, see Appendix A.

on Natural Language Processing in Biomedicine and its Applications (NLPBA/BioNLP), pages 73–78,

Geneva, Switzerland. COLING.

Peter Corbett, Colin Batchelor, and Simone Teufel. 2007. Annotation of chemical named entities. In *Biological, translational, and clinical language processing*, pages 57–64.

Alissa Cotton, Kumar Patchigolla, and John E Oakey. 2014. Minor and trace element emissions from post-combustion co2 capture from coal: Experimental and equilibrium calculations. *Fuel*, 117:391–407.

Thomas M Cover. 1999. *Elements of information theory*. John Wiley & Sons.

Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. 2018. Bert: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. *CoRR*, abs/1810.04805.

Rezarta Islamaj Doğan, Robert Leaman, and Zhiyong Lu. 2014. Ncbi disease corpus: a resource for disease name recognition and concept normalization. *Journal of biomedical informatics*, 47:1–10.

- Danny Dolev, Matthias Függer, Markus Posch, Ulrich Schmid, Andreas Steininger, and Christoph Lenzen. 2014. Rigorously modeling self-stabilizing fault-tolerant circuits: An ultra-robust clocking scheme for systems-on-chip. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 80(4):860–900.
- Jennifer D’Souza and Soeren Auer. 2021. Pattern-based acquisition of scientific entities from scholarly article titles. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2109.00199*.
- Jennifer D’Souza, Anett Hoppe, Arthur Brack, Mohmad Yaser Jaradeh, Sören Auer, and Ralph Ewerth. 2020. [The STEM-ECR dataset: Grounding scientific entity references in STEM scholarly content to authoritative encyclopedic and lexicographic sources](#). In *Proceedings of the 12th Language Resources and Evaluation Conference*, pages 2192–2203, Marseille, France. European Language Resources Association.
- Jennifer D’Souza and Sören Auer. 2021. Sentence, phrase, and triple annotations to build a knowledge graph of natural language processing contributions—a trial dataset. *Journal of Data and Information Science*, 6(3):6–34.
- Jennifer D’Souza, Sören Auer, and Ted Pedersen. 2021. Semeval-2021 task 11: Nlpcontributiongraph-structuring scholarly nlp contributions for a research knowledge graph. In *Proceedings of the 15th International Workshop on Semantic Evaluation (SemEval-2021)*, pages 364–376.
- Jennifer D’Souza, Anett Hoppe, Arthur Brack, Mohmad Yaser Jaradeh, Sören Auer, and Ralph Ewerth. 2020. The stem-ecr dataset: Grounding scientific entity references in stem scholarly content to authoritative encyclopedic and lexicographic sources. In *Proceedings of The 12th Language Resources and Evaluation Conference*, pages 2192–2203.
- Michael Färber, Alexander Albers, and Felix Schüber. 2021. Identifying used methods and datasets in scientific publications. In *Proceedings of the Workshop on Scientific Document Understanding: co-located with 35th AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence (AAAI 2021) ; Remote, February 9, 2021*. Ed.: A. P. B. Veyseh, volume 2831 of *CEUR Workshop Proceedings*. CEUR Workshop Proceedings (CEUR-WS).
- Suzanne Fricke. 2018. Semantic scholar. *Journal of the Medical Library Association: JMLA*, 106(1):145.
- Kata Gábor, Davide Buscaldi, Anne-Kathrin Schumann, Behrang QasemiZadeh, Haifa Zargayouna, and Thierry Charnois. 2018a. Semeval-2018 task 7: Semantic relation extraction and classification in scientific papers. In *SemEval*, pages 679–688.
- Kata Gábor, Davide Buscaldi, Anne-Kathrin Schumann, Behrang QasemiZadeh, Haifa Zargayouna, and Thierry Charnois. 2018b. [SemEval-2018 task 7: Semantic relation extraction and classification in scientific papers](#). In *Proceedings of The 12th International Workshop on Semantic Evaluation*, pages 679–688, New Orleans, Louisiana. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Aldo Gangemi, Valentina Presutti, Diego Reforgiato Recupero, Andrea Giovanni Nuzzolese, Francesco Draicchio, and Misael Mongiovi. 2017. Semantic Web Machine Reading with FRED. *Semantic Web*, 8(6):873–893.
- Sonal Gupta and Christopher Manning. 2011. [Analyzing the dynamics of research by extracting key aspects of scientific papers](#). In *Proceedings of 5th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing*, pages 1–9, Chiang Mai, Thailand. Asian Federation of Natural Language Processing.
- Olivier Hauton. 2012. Integrality of the chern character in small codimension. *Advances in Mathematics*, 231(2):855–878.
- María Herrero-Zazo, Isabel Segura-Bedmar, Paloma Martínez, and Thierry Declerck. 2013. The ddi corpus: An annotated corpus with pharmacological substances and drug–drug interactions. *Journal of biomedical informatics*, 46(5):914–920.
- Yufang Hou, Charles Jochim, Martin Gleize, Francesca Bonin, and Debasis Ganguly. 2019. [Identification of tasks, datasets, evaluation metrics, and numeric scores for scientific leaderboards construction](#). In *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 5203–5213, Florence, Italy. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Rezarta Islamaj, Robert Leaman, Sun Kim, Dongseop Kwon, Chih-Hsuan Wei, Donald C Comeau, Yifan Peng, David Cissel, Cathleen Coss, Carol Fisher, et al. 2021. Nlm-chem, a new resource for chemical entity recognition in pubmed full text literature. *Scientific Data*, 8(1):1–12.
- Sarthak Jain, Madeleine van Zuylen, Hannaneh Hajishirzi, and Iz Beltagy. 2020. [SciREX: A challenge dataset for document-level information extraction](#). In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 7506–7516, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Mohamad Yaser Jaradeh, Allard Oelen, Kheir Ed-dine Farfar, Manuel Prinz, Jennifer D’Souza, Gábor Kismihók, Markus Stocker, and Sören Auer. 2019. [Open research knowledge graph: Next generation infrastructure for semantic scholarly knowledge](#). In *Proceedings of the 10th International Conference on Knowledge Capture, K-CAP ’19*, page 243–246, New York, NY, USA. Association for Computing Machinery.
- Salomon Kabongo, Jennifer D’Souza, and Sören Auer. 2021. Automated mining of leaderboards for empirical ai research. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2109.13089*.

- B Kakimpa, DM Hargreaves, and JS Owen. 2012. An investigation of plate-type windborne debris flight using coupled cfd-rbd models. part ii: Free and constrained flight. *Journal of wind engineering and industrial aerodynamics*, 111:104–116.
- Samuel Kerrien, Yasmin Alam-Faruque, Bruno Aranda, Iain Bancarz, Alan Bridge, Cathy Derow, Emily Dimmer, Marc Feuermann, Anja Friedrichsen, Rachael Huntley, et al. 2007. Intact—open source resource for molecular interaction data. *Nucleic acids research*, 35(suppl_1):D561–D565.
- J-D Kim, Tomoko Ohta, Yuka Tateisi, and Jun’ichi Tsujii. 2003. Genia corpus—a semantically annotated corpus for bio-textmining. *Bioinformatics*, 19(suppl_1):i180–i182.
- Jin-Dong Kim, Tomoko Ohta, Sampo Pyysalo, Yoshinobu Kano, and Jun’ichi Tsujii. 2011. Extracting bio-molecular events from literature—the bionlp’09 shared task. *Computational Intelligence*, 27(4):513–540.
- Su Nam Kim, Olena Medelyan, Min-Yen Kan, and Timothy Baldwin. 2010. Semeval-2010 task 5: Automatic keyphrase extraction from scientific articles. In *Proceedings of the 5th International Workshop on Semantic Evaluation*, pages 21–26.
- Mika Kivimäki, Martin J Shipley, Charlotte L Allan, Claire E Sexton, Markus Jokela, Marianna Virtanen, Henning Tiemeier, Klaus P Ebmeier, and Archana Singh-Manoux. 2012. Vascular risk status as a predictor of later-life depressive symptoms: a cohort study. *Biological psychiatry*, 72(4):324–330.
- Martin Krallinger, Jose MG Izarzugaza, Carlos Rodriguez-Penagos, and Alfonso Valencia. 2009. Extraction of human kinase mutations from literature, databases and genotyping studies. *BMC bioinformatics*, 10(8):1–20.
- Martin Krallinger, Florian Leitner, Carlos Rodriguez-Penagos, and Alfonso Valencia. 2008. Overview of the protein-protein interaction annotation extraction task of biocreative ii. *Genome biology*, 9(2):1–19.
- Martin Krallinger, Florian Leitner, and Alfonso Valencia. 2010. Analysis of biological processes and diseases using text mining approaches. *Bioinformatics Methods in Clinical Research*, pages 341–382.
- Martin Krallinger, Antonio Miranda, Farrokh Mehryary, Jouni Luoma, Sampo Pyysalo, and Alfonso Valencia. 2021. Drugprot shared task (biocreative vii track 1-2021) text mining drug-protein/gene interactions (drugprot) shared task.
- Martin Krallinger, Obdulia Rabal, Saber Ahmad Akhondi, Martín Pérez Pérez, Jesus Santamaría, Gael Pérez Rodríguez, Georgios Tsatsaronis, Ander Intxaurre, José Antonio Baso López, Umesh K. Nandal, Erin M. van Buel, Anjana Chandrasekhar, Marleen Rodenburg, Astrid Lægreid, Marius A. Doornenbal, Julen Oyarzábal, Anália Lourenço, and Alfonso Valencia. 2017. Overview of the biocreative vi chemical-protein interaction track.
- Martin Krallinger, Obdulia Rabal, Florian Leitner, Miguel Vazquez, David Salgado, Zhiyong Lu, Robert Leaman, Yanan Lu, Donghong Ji, Daniel M Lowe, et al. 2015. The chemdner corpus of chemicals and drugs and its annotation principles. *Journal of cheminformatics*, 7(1):1–17.
- Martin Krallinger, Miguel Vazquez, Florian Leitner, David Salgado, Andrew Chatr-Aryamontri, Andrew Winter, Livia Perfetto, Leonardo Briganti, Luana Licata, Marta Iannuccelli, et al. 2011. The protein-protein interaction tasks of biocreative iii: classification/ranking of articles and linking bio-ontology concepts to full text. *BMC bioinformatics*, 12(8):1–31.
- N Krupp, E Roussos, P Kollmann, C Parancas, DG Mitchell, SM Krimigis, A Rymmer, GH Jones, CS Arridge, TP Armstrong, et al. 2012. The cassini enceladus encounters 2005–2010 in the view of energetic electron measurements. *Icarus*, 218(1):433–447.
- Jiao Li, Yueping Sun, Robin J Johnson, Daniela Sciaky, Chih-Hsuan Wei, Robert Leaman, Allan Peter Davis, Carolyn J Mattingly, Thomas C Wieggers, and Zhiyong Lu. 2016. Biocreative v cdr task corpus: a resource for chemical disease relation extraction. *Database*, 2016.
- Yi Luan, Luheng He, Mari Ostendorf, and Hannaneh Hajishirzi. 2018. Multi-task identification of entities, relations, and coreference for scientific knowledge graph construction. In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 3219–3232.
- Xuezhe Ma and Eduard H. Hovy. 2016. End-to-end sequence labeling via bi-directional lstm-cnns-crf. *CoRR*, abs/1603.01354.
- Sarah L Martin, Sacha J Mooney, Matthew J Dickinson, and Helen M West. 2012. Soil structural responses to alterations in soil microbiota induced by the dilution method and mycorrhizal fungal inoculation. *Pedobiologia*, 55(5):271–281.
- Pablo N Mendes, Max Jakob, Andrés García-Silva, and Christian Bizer. 2011. Dbpedia spotlight: shedding light on the web of documents. In *Proceedings of the 7th international conference on semantic systems*, pages 1–8. ACM.
- Tom Mitchell, William Cohen, Estevam Hruschka, Partha Talukdar, Bishan Yang, Justin Betteridge, Andrew Carlson, Bhanava Dalvi, Matt Gardner, Bryan Kisiel, et al. 2018. Never-ending learning. *Communications of the ACM*, 61(5):103–115.
- Sunil Mohan and Donghui Li. 2018. Medmentions: A large biomedical corpus annotated with umls concepts. In *Automated Knowledge Base Construction (AKBC)*.

Ishtani Mondal, Yufang Hou, and Charles Jochim. 2021. [End-to-end construction of NLP knowledge graph](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL-IJCNLP 2021*, pages 1885–1895. Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Andrea Moro, Francesco Cecconi, and Roberto Navigli. 2014. Multilingual Word Sense Disambiguation and Entity Linking for Everybody. In *ISWC*, pages 25–28, Riva del Garda, Italy.

Andrea Moro and Roberto Navigli. 2015. Semeval-2015 task 13: Multilingual all-words sense disambiguation and entity linking. In *Proceedings of the 9th international workshop on semantic evaluation (SemEval 2015)*, pages 288–297.

Behrang QasemiZadeh and Anne-Kathrin Schumann. 2016. The acl rd-tec 2.0: A language resource for evaluating term extraction and entity recognition methods. In *Proceedings of the Tenth International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC’16)*, pages 1862–1868.

Conrad L Schoch, Stacy Ciufu, Mikhail Domrachev, Carol L Hotton, Sivakumar Kannan, Rogneda Khovanskaya, Detlef Leipe, Richard Mcveigh, Kathleen O’Neill, Barbara Robbertse, Shobha Sharma, Vladimir Soussov, John P Sullivan, Lu Sun, Seán Turner, and Ilene Karsch-Mizrachi. 2020. [NCBI Taxonomy: a comprehensive update on curation, resources and tools](#). *Database*, 2020. Baaa062.

Lenhart Schubert. 2006. Turing’s dream and the knowledge challenge. In *Proceedings of the national conference on artificial intelligence*, volume 21, page 1534. Menlo Park, CA; Cambridge, MA; London: AAAI Press; MIT Press; 1999.

Parantu K Shah, Carolina Perez-Iratxeta, Peer Bork, and Miguel A Andrade. 2003. Information extraction from full text scientific articles: where are the keywords? *BMC bioinformatics*, 4(1):20.

Filipa AC Soares, Amit Chandra, Robert J Thomas, Roger A Pedersen, Ludovic Vallier, and David J Williams. 2014. Investigating the feasibility of scale up and automation of human induced pluripotent stem cells cultured in aggregates in feeder free conditions. *Journal of biotechnology*, 173:53–58.

Lorraine Tanabe, Natalie Xie, Lynne H Thom, Wayne Matten, and W John Wilbur. 2005. Genetag: a tagged corpus for gene/protein named entity recognition. *BMC bioinformatics*, 6(1):1–7.

Christina Unger, Corina Forascu, Vanessa Lopez, Axel-Cyrille Ngonga Ngomo, Elena Cabrio, Philipp Cimini, and Sebastian Walter. 2014. Question answering over linked data (qald-4).

Kuansan Wang, Zhihong Shen, Chiyuan Huang, Chieh-Han Wu, Yuxiao Dong, and Anshul Kanakia. 2020. Microsoft academic graph: When experts are not enough. *Quantitative Science Studies*, 1(1):396–413.

Mark D Wilkinson, Michel Dumontier, IJsbrand Jan Aalbersberg, Gabrielle Appleton, Myles Axton, Arie Baak, Niklas Blomberg, Jan-Willem Boiten, Luiz Bonino da Silva Santos, Philip E Bourne, et al. 2016. The fair guiding principles for scientific data management and stewardship. *Scientific data*, 3(1):1–9.

A Appendix

Supplementary to the Knowledge Graph in the Material Science domain presented in [subsection 5.2](#), in Figures 13 to 20, we demonstrate nine examples of knowledge graphs for the respective nine remaining STEM domains we consider. In all graphs, nodes are color-coded by their concept type: orange corresponds to PROCESS, purple for METHOD, green corresponds to MATERIAL, and blue for DATA.




Figure 13: Structured KG representation of a Biology domain publication Abstract (Soares et al., 2014) as PROCESS, METHOD, MATERIAL, and DATA entities.




Figure 14: Structured KG representation of a Mathematics domain publication Abstract (Haution, 2012) as PROCESS, METHOD, MATERIAL, and DATA entities.






Figure 18: Structured KG representation of a Computer Science domain publication Abstract (Dolev et al., 2014) as PROCESS, METHOD, MATERIAL, and DATA typed entities.

Figure 19: Structured KG representation of an Engineering domain publication Abstract (Kakimpa et al., 2012) as PROCESS, METHOD, MATERIAL, and DATA typed entities.

Figure 20: Structured KG representation of a Medical domain publication Abstract (Kivimäki et al., 2012) as PROCESS, METHOD, MATERIAL, and DATA typed entities.