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 output with the highest score in the dataset was Mendeleev and Twitter, both with more than 400 total mentions. There were 32 of 62 outputs in the top 5% of all articles ranked by attention.

The services most used to mention the outputs in the dataset were Mendeleev and Twitter, among other services that Altmetric tracks (including Pinterest media mentions). 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 (1 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 Mendeleev).

The average price of individual paywalled outputs was US $29.75. Highest prices were for Taylor & Francis (US $24.00) and Oxford University Press (US $36.00).

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

Only 9 of 62 outputs were fully open access. There were 33 paywalled and 20 non-paywalled outputs.