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Interested in the role of "alternative" article-level metrics (Priem et al 2011; Priego 2012; Adle et al 2013; Alperin 2014) as tools for discovering uptake of Open Access and other publication patterns amongst digital humanists and online attention to publications in the Digital Humanities, we used the Altmetric Explorer to search and collect published outputs with "digital humanities" in their title and metadata. We obtained a dataset that after manual refining contained 62 outputs with unique identifiers.

The dataset included mention counts for 12 major types of online mentions. Later we used Google Scholar to identify citation counts for each output. The dataset ranks outputs by quality and quantity of online mentions (the Altmetric score).

The 3 most-mentioned papers were not paywalled (but not strictly Open Access in all cases**). The paper with the highest number of mentions was a grey literature output deposited on SSRN. There were no outputs published in Fully-Open Access Journals (CC-BY).

The most open license for a published article (not preprint) in the dataset was CC-BY-NC-ND (11 article).

Though the 3 most-tweeted publications were non-paywalled, the dataset as a group did not show consistent correlations between access type and online attention (including Twitter and Mendeley).

The services most used to mention the outputs in the dataset were Mendeley and Twitter, both with more than 400 total mentions. There were mentions in 6 other services that Altmetric tracks (including Pinterest and media mentions).

The output with the highest score in the dataset was in the top 5% of all articles ranked by attention.

The services most used to mention the outputs in the dataset were Mendeley and Twitter, both with more than 400 total mentions. There were mentions in 6 other services that Altmetric tracks (including Pinterest and media mentions).

32 of 62 outputs had a main author or PI based in the USA.

The output with the highest score in the dataset was in the top 5% of all articles ranked by attention.

The services most used to mention the outputs in the dataset were Mendeley and Twitter, both with more than 400 total mentions. There were mentions in 6 other services that Altmetric tracks (including Pinterest and media mentions).

The average price of individual paywalled outputs was US $25.84. Highest prices were for Taylor & Francis (US $44.00) and Oxford University Press (US $83.68).

We suggest prioritizing services like the Altmetric Explorer as an efficient method to obtain bibliographic datasets with unique digitally outputs being mentioned online in the subjects covered by these services. Our dataset reflects that outputs with "digital humanities" in their metadata were not published by fully-funded Open Access journals. The role of those and other Open Access repositories was found to be relatively significant, but the licensing of the outputs available through them was not always immediately clearly displayed. Our working definition of "Open Access" requires outputs to be open for human and machine access through CC-BY or at least CC-BY-SA. The absence of clear licensing information at output level is perceived to be problematic, as it is a lack of any outputs clearly and visibly licensed with CC-BY. The fact that the most-mentioned outputs in the dataset were available without a paywall might signal towards the potential of Open Access for greater public impact. "Free Access" outputs in paywalled journals did not reflect these mentions nor citations than their paywalled or non-paywalled counterparts.

The dataset reflects a predictable pattern: significant, but the lack of any outputs clearly and visibly licensed with CC-BY had a paywall might signal towards the potential of Open Access for greater public impact. "Free Access" outputs in paywalled journals did not reflect these mentions nor citations than their paywalled or non-paywalled counterparts.

The 3 most-mentioned papers were not paywalled (but not strictly Open Access in all cases**). The paper with the highest number of mentions was a grey literature output deposited on SSRN. There were no outputs published in Fully-Open Access Journals (CC-BY).

The most open license for a published article (not preprint) in the dataset was CC-BY-NC-ND (11 article).

Though the 3 most-tweeted publications were non-paywalled, the dataset as a group did not show consistent correlations between access type and online attention (including Twitter and Mendeley).

The services most used to mention the outputs in the dataset were Mendeley and Twitter, both with more than 400 total mentions. There were mentions in 6 other services that Altmetric tracks (including Pinterest and media mentions).

The output with the highest score in the dataset was in the top 5% of all articles ranked by attention.

The services most used to mention the outputs in the dataset were Mendeley and Twitter, both with more than 400 total mentions. There were mentions in 6 other services that Altmetric tracks (including Pinterest and media mentions).

The average price of individual paywalled outputs was US $25.84. Highest prices were for Taylor & Francis (US $44.00) and Oxford University Press (US $83.68).

503 Readers on Mendeley
439 Tweeters on Twitter
18 Facebook Walls in the dataset

400 most-mentioned outputs in the dataset.

According to data obtained with the Altmetric Explorer (available at the Altmetric.ca) on April 23, 2014, "non-paywalled" refers to full version output in the dataset available via open access repositories and posting presented at the Digital Humanities 2014 conference, 10 July 2014, Amphipôle Building, UNIL, Lausanne, Switzerland. For source data and more information go to: [http://doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.1394404](http://doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.1394404).
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