

# Lutz Bornmann

## List of Publications by Year in descending order

Source: <https://exaly.com/author-pdf/7569070/publications.pdf>

Version: 2024-02-01

365  
papers

15,704  
citations

23567

58  
h-index

28297

105  
g-index

374  
all docs

374  
docs citations

374  
times ranked

9388  
citing authors

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
1	Simulation of the h index use at university departments within the bibliometrics-based heuristics framework: Can the indicator be used to compare individual researchers?. Journal of Informetrics, 2022, 16, 101237.	2.9	3
2	Scores of a specific field-normalized indicator calculated with different approaches of field-categorization: Are the scores different or similar?. Journal of Informetrics, 2022, 16, 101241.	2.9	4
3	Empirical analysis of recent temporal dynamics of research fields: Annual publications in chemistry and related areas as an example. Journal of Informetrics, 2022, 16, 101253.	2.9	8
4	Research calls, competition for funding and inefficiency. Research Evaluation, 2022, 31, 289-296.	2.6	3
5	Alphabetized co-authorship in economics reconsidered. Scientometrics, 2022, 127, 2173-2193.	3.0	3
6	Reference publication year spectroscopy (RPYS) in practice: a software tutorial. Scientometrics, 2022, 127, 7253-7271.	3.0	2
7	Relevance of document types in the scoresâ€™ calculation of a specific field-normalized indicator: Are the scores strongly dependent on or nearly independent of the document type handling?. Scientometrics, 2022, 127, 4419-4438.	3.0	1
8	Which are the influential publications in the Web of Science subject categories over a long period of time? CRExplorer software used for big-data analyses in bibliometrics. Journal of Information Science, 2021, 47, 419-428.	3.3	7
9	On the disruptive power of small-teams research. Scientometrics, 2021, 126, 117-133.	3.0	6
10	Which aspects of the Open Science agenda are most relevant to scientometric research and publishing? An opinion paper. Quantitative Science Studies, 2021, 2, 438-453.	3.3	2
11	A call for governments to pause Twitter censorship: using Twitter data as social-spatial sensors of COVID-19/SARS-CoV-2 research diffusion. Scientometrics, 2021, 126, 3193-3207.	3.0	5
12	Improved clusterings and visualizations of 11,359 journals in the JCRs 2015. Scientometrics, 2021, 126, 5353-5354.	3.0	2
13	Can tweets be used to detect problems early with scientific papers? A case study of three retracted COVID-19/SARS-CoV-2 papers. Scientometrics, 2021, 126, 5181-5199.	3.0	11
14	A decade of in-text citation analysis based on natural language processing and machine learning techniques: an overview of empirical studies. Scientometrics, 2021, 126, 6551-6599.	3.0	28
15	Convergent validity of several indicators measuring disruptiveness with milestone assignments to physics papers by experts. Journal of Informetrics, 2021, 15, 101159.	2.9	19
16	Heat waves: a hot topic in climate change research. Theoretical and Applied Climatology, 2021, 146, 781-800.	2.8	58
17	Bibliometric Analysis in the Field of Quantum Technology. Quantum Reports, 2021, 3, 549-575.	1.3	9
18	Anchoring effects in the assessment of papers: The proposal for an empirical survey of citing authors. PLoS ONE, 2021, 16, e0257307.	2.5	1

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
19	Is culture related to strong science? An empirical investigation. <i>Journal of Informetrics</i> , 2021, 15, 101160.	2.9	7
20	Disruption indices and their calculation using web-of-science data: Indicators of historical developments or evolutionary dynamics?. <i>Journal of Informetrics</i> , 2021, 15, 101219.	2.9	14
21	Applied usage and performance of statistical matching in bibliometrics: The comparison of milestone and regular papers with multiple measurements of disruptiveness as an empirical example. <i>Quantitative Science Studies</i> , 2021, 2, 1246-1270.	3.3	7
22	Growth rates of modern science: a latent piecewise growth curve approach to model publication numbers from established and new literature databases. <i>Humanities and Social Sciences Communications</i> , 2021, 8, .	2.9	124
23	Mapping the impact of papers on various status groups in excellencemapping.net: a new release of the excellence mapping tool based on citation and reader scores. <i>Scientometrics</i> , 2021, 126, 9305-9331.	3.0	4
24	Investigating dissemination of scientific information on Twitter: A study of topic networks in opioid publications. <i>Quantitative Science Studies</i> , 2021, 2, 1486-1510.	3.3	6
25	How to identify the roots of broad research topics and fields? The introduction of RPYS sampling using the example of climate change research. <i>Journal of Information Science</i> , 2020, 46, 392-405.	3.3	5
26	Research diversification and its relationship with publication counts and impact: A case study based on Australian professors. <i>Journal of Information Science</i> , 2020, 46, 131-144.	3.3	6
27	Does the $h$ -index reinforce the Matthew effect in science? The introduction of agent-based simulations into scientometrics. <i>Quantitative Science Studies</i> , 2020, 1, 331-346.	3.3	8
28	Citation concept analysis (CCA): a new form of citation analysis revealing the usefulness of concepts for other researchers illustrated by exemplary case studies including classic books by Thomas S. Kuhn and Karl R. Popper. <i>Scientometrics</i> , 2020, 122, 1051-1074.	3.0	37
29	Bibliometrics-based decision tree (BBDT) for deciding whether two universities in the Leiden ranking differ substantially in their performance. <i>Scientometrics</i> , 2020, 122, 1255-1258.	3.0	3
30	Reference publication year spectroscopy (RPYS) of computer science papers from Eastern Europe. <i>Aslib Journal of Information Management</i> , 2020, 72, 305-319.	2.1	2
31	Historical roots of pain management in infants: A bibliometric analysis using reference publication year spectroscopy. <i>Paediatric and Neonatal Pain</i> , 2020, 2, 22-32.	1.7	9
32	Author name disambiguation of bibliometric data: A comparison of several unsupervised approaches. <i>Quantitative Science Studies</i> , 2020, 1, 1510-1528.	3.3	29
33	How can citation impact in bibliometrics be normalized? A new approach combining citing-side normalization and citation percentiles. <i>Quantitative Science Studies</i> , 2020, 1, 1553-1569.	3.3	4
34	Should citations be field-normalized in evaluative bibliometrics? An empirical analysis based on propensity score matching. <i>Journal of Informetrics</i> , 2020, 14, 101098.	2.9	8
35	“Interdisciplinarity” and “Synergy” in the Åuvre of Judit Bar-Ilan. <i>Scientometrics</i> , 2020, 123, 1247-1260.	3.0	1
36	An evaluation of percentile measures of citation impact, and a proposal for making them better. <i>Scientometrics</i> , 2020, 124, 1457-1478.	3.0	24

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
37	Disruptive papers published in <i>Scientometrics</i> : meaningful results by using an improved variant of the disruption index originally proposed by Wu, Wang, and Evans (2019). <i>Scientometrics</i> , 2020, 123, 1149-1155.	3.0	26
38	Are disruption index indicators convergently valid? The comparison of several indicator variants with assessments by peers. <i>Quantitative Science Studies</i> , 2020, 1, 1242-1259.	3.3	29
39	Historical roots of Judit Bar-Ilan's research: a cited-references analysis using CRExplorer. <i>Scientometrics</i> , 2020, 123, 1193-1200.	3.0	2
40	Citation concept analysis (CCA) of Robert K. Merton's book <i>Social Theory and Social Structure</i> : How often are certain concepts from the book cited in subsequent publications?. <i>Quantitative Science Studies</i> , 2020, , 1-16.	3.3	6
41	Thomas theorem in research evaluation. <i>Scientometrics</i> , 2020, 123, 553-555.	3.0	11
42	Bibliometrics-based decision trees (BBDTs) based on bibliometrics-based heuristics (BBHs): Visualized guidelines for the use of bibliometrics in research evaluation. <i>Quantitative Science Studies</i> , 2020, 1, 171-182.	3.3	7
43	Are papers addressing certain diseases perceived where these diseases are prevalent? The proposal to use Twitter data as social-spatial sensors. <i>PLoS ONE</i> , 2020, 15, e0242550.	2.5	8
44	Library and Information Science Papers Discussed on Twitter: A new Network-based Approach for Measuring Public Attention. <i>Journal of Data and Information Science</i> , 2020, 5, 5-17.	1.1	12
45	Altmetrics and societal impact measurements: Match or mismatch? A literature review. <i>Profesional De La Informacion</i> , 2020, 29, .	2.7	30
46	Studying Bibliometrics-Based Heuristics (BBHs): A New Research Program on the use of Bibliometrics in Research Evaluation. <i>Scholarly Assessment Reports</i> , 2020, 2, .	1.8	0
47	Hot and cold spots in the US research: A spatial analysis of bibliometric data on the institutional level. <i>Journal of Information Science</i> , 2019, 45, 84-91.	3.3	15
48	How well does I3 perform for impact measurement compared to other bibliometric indicators? The convergent validity of several (field-normalized) indicators. <i>Scientometrics</i> , 2019, 119, 1187-1205.	3.0	7
49	Heuristics as conceptual lens for understanding and studying the usage of bibliometrics in research evaluation. <i>Scientometrics</i> , 2019, 120, 419-459.	3.0	25
50	Normalisation of citation impact in economics. <i>Scientometrics</i> , 2019, 120, 841-884.	3.0	36
51	Do we measure novelty when we analyze unusual combinations of cited references? A validation study of bibliometric novelty indicators based on F1000Prime data. <i>Journal of Informetrics</i> , 2019, 13, 100979.	2.9	27
52	Does the normalized citation impact of universities profit from certain properties of their published documents " such as the number of authors and the impact factor of the publishing journals? A multilevel modeling approach. <i>Journal of Informetrics</i> , 2019, 13, 170-184.	2.9	10
53	What do citation counts measure? An updated review of studies on citations in scientific documents published between 2006 and 2018. <i>Scientometrics</i> , 2019, 121, 1635-1684.	3.0	107
54	Do altmetrics assess societal impact in a comparable way to case studies? An empirical test of the convergent validity of altmetrics based on data from the UK research excellence framework (REF). <i>Journal of Informetrics</i> , 2019, 13, 325-340.	2.9	73

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
55	Interdisciplinarity as diversity in citation patterns among journals: Rao-Stirling diversity, relative variety, and the Gini coefficient. <i>Journal of Informetrics</i> , 2019, 13, 255-269.	2.9	95
56	Statistical significance and effect sizes of differences among research universities at the level of nations and worldwide based on the leiden rankings. <i>Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology</i> , 2019, 70, 509-525.	2.9	9
57	Influential cited references in <i>FEMS Microbiology Letters</i>: lessons from Reference Publication Year Spectroscopy (RPYS). <i>FEMS Microbiology Letters</i> , 2019, 366, .	1.8	7
58	R package for producing beamplots as a preferred alternative to the h index when assessing single researchers (based on downloads from Web of Science). <i>Scientometrics</i> , 2019, 120, 925-927.	3.0	1
59	Disruptive papers published in <i>Scientometrics</i> . <i>Scientometrics</i> , 2019, 120, 331-336.	3.0	18
60	The integrated impact indicator revisited (I3*): a non-parametric alternative to the journal impact factor. <i>Scientometrics</i> , 2019, 119, 1669-1694.	3.0	12
61	How to measure research efficiency in higher education? Research grants vs. publication output. <i>Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management</i> , 2019, 41, 322-341.	2.3	50
62	The value and credits of n-authors publications. <i>Journal of Informetrics</i> , 2019, 13, 540-554.	2.9	11
63	How Efficiently Do Elite US Universities Produce Highly Cited Papers?. <i>Publications</i> , 2019, 7, 4.	3.8	5
64	Diversity measurement: Steps towards the measurement of interdisciplinarity?. <i>Journal of Informetrics</i> , 2019, 13, 904-905.	2.9	18
65	Does the public discuss other topics on climate change than researchers? A comparison of explorative networks based on author keywords and hashtags. <i>Journal of Informetrics</i> , 2019, 13, 695-707.	2.9	46
66	MHq indicators for zero-inflated count data – A response to the comment by Smolinsky (in press). <i>Journal of Informetrics</i> , 2019, 13, 464-465.	2.9	2
67	The graduation shift of German universities of applied sciences. <i>PLoS ONE</i> , 2019, 14, e0210160.	2.5	2
68	The Relative Influences of Government Funding and International Collaboration on Citation Impact. <i>Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology</i> , 2019, 70, 198-201.	2.9	43
69	h±: the scientist as chimpanzee or bonobo. <i>Scientometrics</i> , 2019, 118, 1163-1166.	3.0	13
70	Spatial bibliometrics on the city level. <i>Journal of Information Science</i> , 2019, 45, 416-425.	3.3	7
71	Productivity does not equal usefulness. <i>Scientometrics</i> , 2019, 118, 705-707.	3.0	19
72	Societal Impact Measurement of Research Papers. <i>Springer Handbooks</i> , 2019, , 609-632.	0.6	4

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
73	Disruption index depends on length of citation window. Profesional De La Informacion, 2019, 28, .	2.7	17
74	Allegation of scientific misconduct increases Twitter attention. Scientometrics, 2018, 115, 1097-1100.	3.0	10
75	Which differences can be expected when two universities in the Leiden Ranking are compared? Some benchmarks for institutional research evaluations. Scientometrics, 2018, 115, 1101-1105.	3.0	3
76	Identifying single influential publications in a research field: new analysis opportunities of the CRExplorer. Scientometrics, 2018, 116, 591-608.	3.0	43
77	Normalization of zero-inflated data: An empirical analysis of a new indicator family and its use with altmetrics data. Journal of Informetrics, 2018, 12, 998-1011.	2.9	30
78	Identifying landmark publications in the long run using field-normalized citation data. Journal of Documentation, 2018, 74, 278-288.	1.6	13
79	Plots for visualizing paper impact and journal impact of single researchers in a single graph. Scientometrics, 2018, 115, 385-394.	3.0	8
80	Visualizing the context of citations referencing papers published by Eugene Garfield: a new type of keyword co-occurrence analysis. Scientometrics, 2018, 114, 427-437.	3.0	89
81	Reference publication year spectroscopy (RPYS) of Eugene Garfield's publications. Scientometrics, 2018, 114, 439-448.	3.0	22
82	Core elements in the process of citing publications: Conceptual overview of the literature. Journal of Informetrics, 2018, 12, 203-216.	2.9	97
83	Discontinuities in citation relations among journals: self-organized criticality as a model of scientific revolutions and change. Scientometrics, 2018, 116, 623-644.	3.0	14
84	Algorithmically generated subject categories based on citation relations: An empirical micro study using papers on overall water splitting. Journal of Informetrics, 2018, 12, 436-447.	2.9	18
85	Which research institution performs better than average in a subject category or better than selected other institutions?. Online Information Review, 2018, 42, 222-237.	3.2	1
86	Count highly-cited papers instead of papers with h citations: use normalized citation counts and compare "like with like". Scientometrics, 2018, 115, 1119-1123.	3.0	32
87	What are the top five journals in economics? A new meta-ranking. Applied Economics, 2018, 50, 659-675.	2.2	31
88	Betweenness and diversity in journal citation networks as measures of interdisciplinarity – A tribute to Eugene Garfield. Scientometrics, 2018, 114, 567-592.	3.0	64
89	"Smart girls" versus "sleeping beauties" in the sciences: The identification of instant and delayed recognition by using the citation angle. Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology, 2018, 69, 359-367.	2.9	31
90	Reference Publication Year Spectroscopy (RPYS) with publications in the area of academic efficiency studies: what are the historical roots of this research topic?. Applied Economics, 2018, 50, 1442-1453.	2.2	20

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
91	The number of linked references of publications in Microsoft Academic in comparison with the Web of Science. <i>Scientometrics</i> , 2018, 114, 367-370.	3.0	8
92	Alternative article-level metrics. <i>EMBO Reports</i> , 2018, 19, .	4.5	14
93	Climate and the Decline and Fall of the Western Roman Empire: A Bibliometric View on an Interdisciplinary Approach to Answer a Most Classic Historical Question. <i>Climate</i> , 2018, 6, 90.	2.8	15
94	Field- and time-normalization of data with many zeros: an empirical analysis using citation and Twitter data. <i>Scientometrics</i> , 2018, 116, 997-1012.	3.0	16
95	Identifying "hot papers" and papers with "delayed recognition" in large-scale datasets by using dynamically normalized citation impact scores. <i>Scientometrics</i> , 2018, 116, 655-674.	3.0	18
96	The negative effects of citing with a national orientation in terms of recognition: National and international citations in natural-sciences papers from Germany, the Netherlands, and the UK. <i>Journal of Informetrics</i> , 2018, 12, 931-949.	2.9	14
97	Creativity in science and the link to cited references: Is the creative potential of papers reflected in their cited references?. <i>Journal of Informetrics</i> , 2018, 12, 906-930.	2.9	37
98	Measuring Individual Performance with Comprehensive Bibliometric Reports as an Alternative to <i>h</i> -Index Values. <i>Journal of Korean Medical Science</i> , 2018, 33, e138.	2.5	4
99	Highly Cited Researchers 2014 and 2015: An investigation of some of the world's most influential scientific minds on the institutional and country level. <i>Collnet Journal of Scientometrics and Information Management</i> , 2018, 12, 15-33.	0.8	0
100	Approximation of citation distributions to the Poisson distribution. <i>Collnet Journal of Scientometrics and Information Management</i> , 2018, 12, 49-53.	0.8	1
101	Field classification of publications in Dimensions: a first case study testing its reliability and validity. <i>Scientometrics</i> , 2018, 117, 637-640.	3.0	19
102	MHQ indicators for zero-inflated count data " A response to Smolinsky and Marx (2018). <i>Journal of Informetrics</i> , 2018, 12, 1012-1014.	2.9	2
103	Critical rationalism and the search for standard (field-normalized) indicators in bibliometrics. <i>Journal of Informetrics</i> , 2018, 12, 598-604.	2.9	26
104	Do altmetrics correlate with the quality of papers? A large-scale empirical study based on F1000Prime data. <i>PLoS ONE</i> , 2018, 13, e0197133.	2.5	89
105	The geography of references in elite articles: Which countries contribute to the archives of knowledge?. <i>PLoS ONE</i> , 2018, 13, e0194805.	2.5	18
106	The Second-order <i>h</i> -type Indicators for Identifying Top Units. <i>Data and Information Management</i> , 2018, 2, 49-56.	1.0	2
107	Measuring impact in research evaluations: a thorough discussion of methods for, effects of and problems with impact measurements. <i>Higher Education</i> , 2017, 73, 775-787.	4.4	57
108	An empirical look at the nature index. <i>Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology</i> , 2017, 68, 653-659.	2.9	6

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
109	Is collaboration among scientists related to the citation impact of papers because their quality increases with collaboration? An analysis based on data from F1000Prime and normalized citation scores. <i>Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology</i> , 2017, 68, 1036-1047.	2.9	39
110	Relative Citation Ratio (RCR): An empirical attempt to study a new field-normalized bibliometric indicator. <i>Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology</i> , 2017, 68, 1064-1067.	2.9	23
111	Characteristics of highly cited researchers 2015 in Germany. <i>Scientometrics</i> , 2017, 111, 543-545.	3.0	8
112	Which early works are cited most frequently in climate change research literature? A bibliometric approach based on Reference Publication Year Spectroscopy. <i>Scientometrics</i> , 2017, 110, 335-353.	3.0	38
113	Generating clustered journal maps: an automated system for hierarchical classification. <i>Scientometrics</i> , 2017, 110, 1601-1614.	3.0	36
114	Quality and impact considerations in bibliometrics: a reply to Ricker (in press). <i>Scientometrics</i> , 2017, 111, 1857-1859.	3.0	5
115	Measuring field-normalized impact of papers on specific societal groups: An altmetrics study based on Mendeley Data. <i>Research Evaluation</i> , 2017, 26, 230-241.	2.6	16
116	Applying the CSS method to bibliometric indicators used in (university) rankings. <i>Scientometrics</i> , 2017, 110, 1077-1079.	3.0	13
117	Does evaluative scientometrics lose its main focus on scientific quality by the new orientation towards societal impact?. <i>Scientometrics</i> , 2017, 110, 937-943.	3.0	48
118	Are there any frontiers of research performance? Efficiency measurement of funded research projects with the Bayesian stochastic frontier analysis for count data. <i>Journal of Informetrics</i> , 2017, 11, 613-628.	2.9	23
119	Confidence intervals for Journal Impact Factors. <i>Scientometrics</i> , 2017, 111, 1869-1871.	3.0	13
120	Fast growing research on negative emissions. <i>Environmental Research Letters</i> , 2017, 12, 035007.	5.2	114
121	How many scientific papers are mentioned in policy-related documents? An empirical investigation using Web of Science and Altmetric data. <i>Scientometrics</i> , 2017, 110, 1209-1216.	3.0	44
122	Skewness of citation impact data and covariates of citation distributions: A large-scale empirical analysis based on Web of Science data. <i>Journal of Informetrics</i> , 2017, 11, 164-175.	2.9	46
123	Expected values in percentile indicators. <i>Collnet Journal of Scientometrics and Information Management</i> , 2017, 11, 249-252.	0.8	0
124	Sequence analysis of annually normalized citation counts: an empirical analysis based on the characteristic scores and scales (CSS) method. <i>Scientometrics</i> , 2017, 113, 1665-1680.	3.0	5
125	Use of the journal impact factor as a criterion for the selection of junior researchers: A rejoinder on a comment by Peters (2017). <i>Journal of Informetrics</i> , 2017, 11, 945-947.	2.9	4
126	h-based $\mathbf{I}^3$ -type multivariate vectors: multidimensional indicators of publication and citation scores. <i>Collnet Journal of Scientometrics and Information Management</i> , 2017, 11, 153-171.	0.8	4



#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
127	Calculating the excellence shift: How efficiently do institutions produce highly cited papers?. <i>Scientometrics</i> , 2017, 112, 1859-1864.	3.0	8
128	Slow reception and under-citedness in climate change research: A case study of Charles David Keeling, discoverer of the risk of global warming. <i>Scientometrics</i> , 2017, 112, 1079-1092.	3.0	6
129	Can the journal impact factor be used as a criterion for the selection of junior researchers? A large-scale empirical study based on ResearcherID data. <i>Journal of Informetrics</i> , 2017, 11, 788-799.	2.9	52
130	The Role of Climate in the Collapse of the Maya Civilization: A Bibliometric Analysis of the Scientific Discourse. <i>Climate</i> , 2017, 5, 88.	2.8	17
131	Global Warming and Tea Production—The Bibliometric View on a Newly Emerging Research Topic. <i>Climate</i> , 2017, 5, 46.	2.8	40
132	The Journal Impact Factor Should Not Be Discarded. <i>Journal of Korean Medical Science</i> , 2017, 32, 180.	2.5	19
133	The Power-weakness Ratios (PWR) as a Journal Indicator: Testing the “Tournaments” Metaphor in Citation Impact Studies. <i>Journal of Data and Information Science</i> , 2017, 1, 6-26.	1.1	3
134	Further steps in integrating the platforms of WoS and Scopus: Historiography with HistCite, and main-path analysis. <i>Profesional De La Informacion</i> , 2017, 26, 662.	2.7	11
135	Citations: Indicators of Quality? The Impact Fallacy. <i>Frontiers in Research Metrics and Analytics</i> , 2016, 1, .	1.9	56
136	How much does the expected number of citations for a publication change if it contains the address of a specific scientific institute? A new approach for the analysis of citation data on the institutional level based on regression models. <i>Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology</i> , 2016, 67, 2274-2282.	2.9	5
137	What do altmetrics counts mean? A plea for content analyses. <i>Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology</i> , 2016, 67, 1016-1017.	2.9	11
138	New features of CitedReferencesExplorer (CRExplorer). <i>Scientometrics</i> , 2016, 109, 2049-2051.	3.0	24
139	Policy documents as sources for measuring societal impact: how often is climate change research mentioned in policy-related documents?. <i>Scientometrics</i> , 2016, 109, 1477-1495.	3.0	75
140	Is the promotion of research reflected in bibliometric data? A network analysis of highly cited papers on the Clusters of Excellence supported under the Excellence Initiative in Germany. <i>Scientometrics</i> , 2016, 107, 1041-1061.	3.0	15
141	Proposal of a minimum constraint for indicators based on means or averages. <i>Journal of Informetrics</i> , 2016, 10, 485-486.	2.9	5
142	Introducing CitedReferencesExplorer (CRExplorer): A program for reference publication year spectroscopy with cited references standardization. <i>Journal of Informetrics</i> , 2016, 10, 503-515.	2.9	86
143	Efficiency of research performance and the glass researcher. <i>Journal of Informetrics</i> , 2016, 10, 652-654.	2.9	8
144	Sampling issues in bibliometric analysis. <i>Journal of Informetrics</i> , 2016, 10, 1225-1232.	2.9	19

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
145	At what institutions did Nobel laureates do their prize-winning work? An analysis of biographical information on Nobel laureates from 1994 to 2014. <i>Scientometrics</i> , 2016, 109, 723-767.	3.0	46
146	Cited references and Medical Subject Headings (MeSH) as two different knowledge representations: clustering and mappings at the paper level. <i>Scientometrics</i> , 2016, 109, 2077-2091.	3.0	31
147	The journal Impact Factor and alternative metrics. <i>EMBO Reports</i> , 2016, 17, 1094-1097.	4.5	35
148	Change of perspective: bibliometrics from the point of view of cited references—a literature overview on approaches to the evaluation of cited references in bibliometrics. <i>Scientometrics</i> , 2016, 109, 1397-1415.	3.0	49
149	Professional and citizen bibliometrics: complementarities and ambivalences in the development and use of indicators—a state-of-the-art report. <i>Scientometrics</i> , 2016, 109, 2129-2150.	3.0	101
150	Construction of a pragmatic base line for journal classifications and maps based on aggregated journal-journal citation relations. <i>Journal of Informetrics</i> , 2016, 10, 902-918.	2.9	20
151	Citation score normalized by cited references (CSNCR): The introduction of a new citation impact indicator. <i>Journal of Informetrics</i> , 2016, 10, 875-887.	2.9	32
152	Sampling issues in bibliometric analysis: Response to discussants. <i>Journal of Informetrics</i> , 2016, 10, 1253-1257.	2.9	12
153	Highly cited papers in Library and Information Science (<scp>LIS</scp>): Authors, institutions, and network structures. <i>Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology</i> , 2016, 67, 3095-3100.	2.9	24
154	Replicability and the public/private divide. <i>Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology</i> , 2016, 67, 1777-1778.	2.9	2
155	The application of bibliometrics to research evaluation in the humanities and social sciences: An exploratory study using normalized <scp>G</scp>oogle <scp>S</scp>cholar data for the publications of a research institute. <i>Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology</i> , 2016, 67, 2778-2789.	2.9	39
156	Detecting the historical roots of tribology research: a bibliometric analysis. <i>Scientometrics</i> , 2016, 107, 305-313.	3.0	19
157	Study of citation networks in tribology research. <i>Collnet Journal of Scientometrics and Information Management</i> , 2016, 10, 71-96.	0.8	2
158	To what extent does the Leiden manifesto also apply to altmetrics? A discussion of the manifesto against the background of research into altmetrics. <i>Online Information Review</i> , 2016, 40, 529-543.	3.2	11
159	Identifying seminal works most important for research fields: Software for the Reference Publication Year Spectroscopy (RPYS). <i>Collnet Journal of Scientometrics and Information Management</i> , 2016, 10, 125-140.	0.8	3
160	Normalization of Mendeley reader impact on the reader- and paper-side: A comparison of the mean discipline normalized reader score (MDNRS) with the mean normalized reader score (MNRS) and bare reader counts. <i>Journal of Informetrics</i> , 2016, 10, 776-788.	2.9	20
161	Overlay maps based on <scp>M</scp>endeley data: The use of altmetrics for readership networks. <i>Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology</i> , 2016, 67, 3064-3072.	2.9	12
162	A new approach to the <scp>QS</scp> university ranking using the composite <scp>I</scp>-distance indicator: Uncertainty and sensitivity analyses. <i>Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology</i> , 2016, 67, 200-211.	2.9	68

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
163	The operationalization of "fields" as WoS subject categories (WC) in evaluative bibliometrics: The cases of "library and information science" and "science & technology studies". Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology, 2016, 67, 707-714.	2.9	85
164	Count regression models in informetrics. Journal of Informetrics, 2016, 10, 29-30.	2.9	2
165	Excellence networks in science: A Web-based application based on Bayesian multilevel logistic regression (BMLR) for the identification of institutions collaborating successfully. Journal of Informetrics, 2016, 10, 312-327.	2.9	11
166	Normalization of Mendeley reader counts for impact assessment. Journal of Informetrics, 2016, 10, 62-73.	2.9	42
167	How to normalize Twitter counts? A first attempt based on journals in the Twitter Index. Scientometrics, 2016, 107, 1405-1422.	3.0	39
168	Scientific Revolution in Scientometrics: The Broadening of Impact from Citation to Societal. , 2016, , 347-359.		14
169	Climate Change Research in View of Bibliometrics. PLoS ONE, 2016, 11, e0160393.	2.5	189
170	t factor: A metric for measuring impact on Twitter. Malaysian Journal of Library and Information Science, 2016, 21, 13-20.	0.4	7
171	Proposal of using scaling for calculating field-normalized citation scores. Profesional De La Informacion, 2016, 25, 11.	2.7	5
172	Recent Developments in China's U.S. Cooperation in Science. Minerva, 2015, 53, 199-214.	2.4	24
173	Nature's top 100 revisited. Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology, 2015, 66, 2166-2166.	2.9	1
174	Complex tasks and simple solutions: The use of heuristics in the evaluation of research. Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology, 2015, 66, 1738-1739.	2.9	6
175	Interrater reliability and convergent validity of F1000Prime peer review. Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology, 2015, 66, 2415-2426.	2.9	27
176	Growth rates of modern science: A bibliometric analysis based on the number of publications and cited references. Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology, 2015, 66, 2215-2222.	2.9	830
177	Which of the world's institutions employ the most highly cited researchers? An analysis of the data from highlycited.com. Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology, 2015, 66, 2146-2148.	2.9	27
178	Distribution of women and men among highly cited scientists. Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology, 2015, 66, 2715-2716.	2.9	6
179	Criteria for Nature Index questioned. Nature, 2015, 517, 21-21.	27.8	4
180	Evaluation of the highly-cited researchers™ database for a country: proposals for meaningful analyses on the example of Germany. Scientometrics, 2015, 105, 1997-2003.	3.0	9

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
181	Testing for the fairness and predictive validity of research funding decisions: A multilevel multiple imputation for missing data approach using exâ€ante and exâ€post peer evaluation data from the Austrian science fund. Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology, 2015, 66, 2321-2339.	2.9	15
182	Methods for the generation of normalized citation impact scores in bibliometrics: Which method best reflects the judgements of experts?. Journal of Informetrics, 2015, 9, 408-418.	2.9	95
183	Philosophy of science viewed through the lense of â€Referenced Publication Years Spectroscopyâ€ (RPYS). Scientometrics, 2015, 102, 1987-1996.	3.0	39
184	Usefulness of altmetrics for measuring the broader impact of research. Aslib Journal of Information Management, 2015, 67, 305-319.	2.1	46
185	Response to Stephen Holgate. EMBO Reports, 2015, 16, 262-262.	4.5	0
186	BRICS countries and scientific excellence: A bibliometric analysis of most frequently cited papers. Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology, 2015, 66, 1507-1513.	2.9	82
187	Alternative metrics in scientometrics: a meta-analysis of research into three altmetrics. Scientometrics, 2015, 103, 1123-1144.	3.0	144
188	Which people use which scientific papers? An evaluation of data from F1000 and Mendeley. Journal of Informetrics, 2015, 9, 477-487.	2.9	33
189	The interest of the scientific community in expert opinions from journal peer review procedures. Scientometrics, 2015, 102, 2187-2188.	3.0	3
190	Letter to the Editor: On the conceptualisation and theorisation of the impact caused by publications. Scientometrics, 2015, 103, 1145-1148.	3.0	4
191	Does quality and content matter for citedness? A comparison with para-textual factors and over time. Journal of Informetrics, 2015, 9, 419-429.	2.9	37
192	How well does a university perform in comparison with its peers? The use of odds, and odds ratios, for the comparison of institutional citation impact using the Leiden Rankings. Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology, 2015, 66, 2711-2713.	2.9	3
193	Ranking and mapping of universities and research-focused institutions worldwide: The third release of excellencemapping.net. Collnet Journal of Scientometrics and Information Management, 2015, 9, 65-72.	0.8	7
194	Discussion about the new Nature Index. Scientometrics, 2015, 102, 1829-1830.	3.0	7
195	On the causes of subject-specific citation rates in Web of Science. Scientometrics, 2015, 102, 1823-1827.	3.0	77
196	How have the Eastern European countries of the former Warsaw Pact developed since 1990? A bibliometric study. Scientometrics, 2015, 102, 1101-1117.	3.0	75
197	An overview of academic publishing and collaboration between China and Germany. Scientometrics, 2015, 102, 1781-1793.	3.0	16
198	Topical connections between the institutions within an organisation (institutional co-authorships,)	3.0	18

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
199	Ranking institutions within a university based on their scientific performance: A percentile-based approach. <i>Profesional De La Informacion</i> , 2015, 24, 551.	2.7	10
200	Bibliometrische Verfahren zur Bewertung von Forschungsleistung. <i>Soziale Welt</i> , 2015, 66, 161-176.	0.3	1
201	Assigning publications to multiple subject categories for bibliometric analysis. <i>Journal of Documentation</i> , 2014, 70, 52-61.	1.6	6
202	Validity of altmetrics data for measuring societal impact: A study using data from Altmetric and F1000Prime. <i>Journal of Informetrics</i> , 2014, 8, 935-950.	2.9	98
203	From P100 to P100': A new citation rank approach. <i>Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology</i> , 2014, 65, 1939-1943.	2.9	9
204	Distributions instead of single numbers: Percentiles and beam plots for the assessment of single researchers. <i>Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology</i> , 2014, 65, 206-208.	2.9	10
205	On the function of university rankings. <i>Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology</i> , 2014, 65, 428-429.	2.9	5
206	The reception of publications by scientists in the early days of modern science. <i>Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology</i> , 2014, 65, 2160-2161.	2.9	0
207	What is the effect of country-specific characteristics on the research performance of scientific institutions? Using multi-level statistical models to rank and map universities and research-focused institutions worldwide. <i>Journal of Informetrics</i> , 2014, 8, 581-593.	2.9	44
208	On the problems of dealing with bibliometric data. <i>Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology</i> , 2014, 65, 866-867.	2.9	4
209	Is there currently a scientific revolution in Scientometrics?. <i>Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology</i> , 2014, 65, 647-648.	2.9	25
210	On scientific misconduct. <i>Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology</i> , 2014, 65, 1089-1090.	2.9	0
211	Tracing the origin of a scientific legend by reference publication year spectroscopy (RPYS): the legend of the Darwin finches. <i>Scientometrics</i> , 2014, 99, 839-844.	3.0	43
212	The wisdom of citing scientists. <i>Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology</i> , 2014, 65, 1288-1292.	2.9	34
213	How to evaluate individual researchers working in the natural and life sciences meaningfully? A proposal of methods based on percentiles of citations. <i>Scientometrics</i> , 2014, 98, 487-509.	3.0	99
214	Scientometrics in a changing research landscape. <i>EMBO Reports</i> , 2014, 15, 1228-1232.	4.5	158
215	Do altmetrics point to the broader impact of research? An overview of benefits and disadvantages of altmetrics. <i>Journal of Informetrics</i> , 2014, 8, 895-903.	2.9	378
216	h-Index research in scientometrics: A summary. <i>Journal of Informetrics</i> , 2014, 8, 749-750.	2.9	24

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
217	Detecting the historical roots of research fields by reference publication year spectroscopy (<scp>RPYS</scp>). Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology, 2014, 65, 751-764.	2.9	142
218	What proportion of excellent papers makes an institution one of the best worldwide? Specifying thresholds for the interpretation of the results of the <scp>SCI</scp>mago Institutions Ranking and the Leiden Ranking. Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology, 2014, 65, 732-736.	2.9	10
219	Ranking institutions by the handicap principle. Scientometrics, 2014, 100, 603-604.	3.0	2
220	On the origins and the historical roots of the Higgs boson research from a bibliometric perspective. European Physical Journal Plus, 2014, 129, 1.	2.6	23
221	Referenced Publication Years Spectroscopy applied to iMetrics: Scientometrics, Journal of Informetrics, and a relevant subset of JASIST. Journal of Informetrics, 2014, 8, 162-174.	2.9	43
222	On the meaningful and non-meaningful use of reference sets in bibliometrics. Journal of Informetrics, 2014, 8, 273-275.	2.9	4
223	How to improve the prediction based on citation impact percentiles for years shortly after the publication date?. Journal of Informetrics, 2014, 8, 175-180.	2.9	76
224	Ranking and mapping of universities and research-focused institutions worldwide based on highly-cited papers. Online Information Review, 2014, 38, 43-58.	3.2	45
225	How are excellent (highly cited) papers defined in bibliometrics? A quantitative analysis of the literature. Research Evaluation, 2014, 23, 166-173.	2.6	66
226	The European Union, China, and the United States in the top-1% and top-10% layers of most-frequently cited publications: Competition and collaborations. Journal of Informetrics, 2014, 8, 606-617.	2.9	74
227	How should the societal impact of research be generated and measured? A proposal for a simple and practicable approach to allow interdisciplinary comparisons. Scientometrics, 2014, 98, 211-219.	3.0	51
228	The Substantive and Practical Significance of Citation Impact Differences Between Institutions: Guidelines for the Analysis of Percentiles Using Effect Sizes and Confidence Intervals. , 2014, , 259-281.		7
229	The generation of large networks from <i>Web of Science</i> data. Profesional De La Informacion, 2014, 23, 589-593.	2.7	4
230	How good is research really?. EMBO Reports, 2013, 14, 226-230.	4.5	69
231	Evaluations by Peer Review in Science. Springer Science Reviews, 2013, 1, 1-4.	1.3	9
232	Do universities or research institutions with a specific subject profile have an advantage or a disadvantage in institutional rankings?. Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology, 2013, 64, 2310-2316.	2.6	32
233	Fieldâ€normalized impact factors (<scp>IFs</scp>): A comparison of rescaling and fractionally counted <scp>IFs</scp>. Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology, 2013, 64, 2299-2309.	2.6	24
234	The use of percentiles and percentile rank classes in the analysis of bibliometric data: Opportunities and limits. Journal of Informetrics, 2013, 7, 158-165.	2.9	145

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
235	The emergence of plate tectonics and the Kuhnian model of paradigm shift: a bibliometric case study based on the Anna Karenina principle. <i>Scientometrics</i> , 2013, 94, 595-614.	3.0	23
236	How can journal impact factors be normalized across fields of science? An assessment in terms of percentile ranks and fractional counts. <i>Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology</i> , 2013, 64, 96-107.	2.6	26
237	What is societal impact of research and how can it be assessed? a literature survey. <i>Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology</i> , 2013, 64, 217-233.	2.6	399
238	Which percentile-based approach should be preferred for calculating normalized citation impact values? An empirical comparison of five approaches including a newly developed citation-rank approach (P100). <i>Journal of Informetrics</i> , 2013, 7, 933-944.	2.9	40
239	The advantage of the use of samples in evaluative bibliometric studies. <i>Journal of Informetrics</i> , 2013, 7, 89-90.	2.9	13
240	The proposal of a broadening of perspective in evaluative bibliometrics by complementing the times cited with a cited reference analysis. <i>Journal of Informetrics</i> , 2013, 7, 84-88.	2.9	39
241	A better alternative to the h index. <i>Journal of Informetrics</i> , 2013, 7, 100.	2.9	13
242	The validation of (advanced) bibliometric indicators through peer assessments: A comparative study using data from InCites and F1000. <i>Journal of Informetrics</i> , 2013, 7, 286-291.	2.9	87
243	The problem of citation impact assessments for recent publication years in institutional evaluations. <i>Journal of Informetrics</i> , 2013, 7, 722-729.	2.9	25
244	The problem of percentile rank scores used with small reference sets. <i>Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology</i> , 2013, 64, 650-650.	2.6	5
245	How to calculate the practical significance of citation impact differences? An empirical example from evaluative institutional bibliometrics using adjusted predictions and marginal effects. <i>Journal of Informetrics</i> , 2013, 7, 562-574.	2.9	56
246	The research guarantors of scientific papers and the output counting: a promising new approach. <i>Scientometrics</i> , 2013, 97, 421-434.	3.0	61
247	Fallout and miss in journal peer review. <i>Journal of Documentation</i> , 2013, 69, 411-416.	1.6	8
248	Statistical tests and research assessments: A comment on Schneider (2012). <i>Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology</i> , 2013, 64, 1306-1308.	2.6	5
249	Multilevel statistical reformulation of citation-based university rankings: The Leiden ranking 2011/2012. <i>Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology</i> , 2013, 64, 1649-1658.	2.6	45
250	Comments to the response of Rodríguez Navarro. <i>EMBO Reports</i> , 2013, 14, 494-494.	4.5	4
251	Macro-Indicators of Citation Impacts of Six Prolific Countries: InCites Data and the Statistical Significance of Trends. <i>PLoS ONE</i> , 2013, 8, e56768.	2.5	47
252	Enhancing the h index for the objective assessment of healthcare researcher performance and impact. <i>Journal of the Royal Society of Medicine</i> , 2013, 106, 19-29.	2.0	17



#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
253	How to analyze percentile citation impact data meaningfully in bibliometrics: The statistical analysis of distributions, percentile rank classes, and top-cited papers. <i>Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology</i> , 2013, 64, 587-595.	2.6	61
254	Global Nanotribology Research Output (1996–2010): A Scientometric Analysis. <i>PLoS ONE</i> , 2013, 8, e81094.	2.5	33
255	The Normalization of Citation Counts Based on Classification Systems. <i>Publications</i> , 2013, 1, 78-86.	3.8	19
256	Research Misconduct—Definitions, Manifestations and Extent. <i>Publications</i> , 2013, 1, 87-98.	3.8	18
257	Redundancies in <i>H</i> Index Variants and the Proposal of the Number of Top-Cited Papers as an Attractive Indicator. <i>Measurement</i> , 2012, 10, 149-153.	0.2	4
258	Testing differences statistically with the Leiden ranking. <i>Scientometrics</i> , 2012, 92, 781-783.	3.0	19
259	In public peer review of submitted manuscripts, how do reviewer comments differ from comments written by interested members of the scientific community? A content analysis of comments written for <i>Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics</i> . <i>Scientometrics</i> , 2012, 93, 915-929.	3.0	15
260	The effect of several versions of one and the same manuscript published by a journal on its journal impact factor. <i>Scientometrics</i> , 2012, 92, 277-279.	3.0	2
261	The <i>Arena</i> principle: A way of thinking about success in science. <i>Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology</i> , 2012, 63, 2037-2051.	2.6	27
262	What factors determine citation counts of publications in chemistry besides their quality?. <i>Journal of Informetrics</i> , 2012, 6, 11-18.	2.9	181
263	HistCite analysis of papers constituting the <i>h</i> index research front. <i>Journal of Informetrics</i> , 2012, 6, 285-288.	2.9	28
264	Which are the best performing regions in information science in terms of highly cited papers? Some improvements of our previous mapping approaches. <i>Journal of Informetrics</i> , 2012, 6, 336-345.	2.9	24
265	The new Excellence Indicator in the World Report of the SCImago Institutions Rankings 2011. <i>Journal of Informetrics</i> , 2012, 6, 333-335.	2.9	119
266	Stata commands for importing bibliometric data and processing author address information. <i>Journal of Informetrics</i> , 2012, 6, 505-512.	2.9	7
267	Journal peer review as an information retrieval process. <i>Journal of Documentation</i> , 2012, 68, 527-535.	1.6	2
268	A New Family of Cumulative Indexes for Measuring Scientific Performance. <i>PLoS ONE</i> , 2012, 7, e47679.	2.5	21
269	Which Are the "Best" Cities for Psychology Research Worldwide?. <i>Europe's Journal of Psychology</i> , 2012, 8, .	1.3	5
270	Does Gender Matter in Grant Peer Review?. <i>Zeitschrift Fur Psychologie / Journal of Psychology</i> , 2012, 220, 121-129.	1.0	54



#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
271	Mapping (<scp>USPTO</scp>) patent data using overlays to <scp>G</scp> <scp>M</scp> <scp>aps</scp>. Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology, 2012, 63, 1442-1458.	2.6	55
272	Measuring the societal impact of research. EMBO Reports, 2012, 13, 673-676.	4.5	178
273	Percentile ranks and the integrated impact indicator (<i>I3</i>). Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology, 2012, 63, 1901-1902.	2.6	23
274	The Hawthorne effect in journal peer review. Scientometrics, 2012, 91, 857-862.	3.0	24
275	Closed versus open reviewing of journal manuscripts: how far do comments differ in language use?. Scientometrics, 2012, 91, 843-856.	3.0	32
276	Metrics to evaluate research performance in academic institutions: a critique of ERA 2010 as applied in forestry and the indirect H2 index as a possible alternative. Scientometrics, 2012, 91, 751-771.	3.0	12
277	Diversity, value and limitations of the journal impact factor and alternative metrics. Rheumatology International, 2012, 32, 1861-1867.	3.0	132
278	Heterogeneity of Inter-Rater Reliabilities of Grant Peer Reviews and Its Determinants: A General Estimating Equations Approach. PLoS ONE, 2012, 7, e48509.	2.5	44
279	Bibliometric analysis of scientific development in countries of the <i>Union of South American Nations</i> (<i>Unasur</i>). Profesional De La Informacion, 2012, 21, 607-612.	2.7	5
280	The detection of "hot regions" in the geography of science" A visualization approach by using density maps. Journal of Informetrics, 2011, 5, 547-553.	2.9	61
281	Is it necessary to consider suburbs (or small cities in the close proximity) and name variants in a citation impact analysis for bigger cities? An investigation using Munich as an example. Journal of Informetrics, 2011, 5, 695-697.	2.9	1
282	Mapping excellence in the geography of science: An approach based on Scopus data. Journal of Informetrics, 2011, 5, 537-546.	2.9	73
283	Scientific peer review. Annual Review of Information Science & Technology, 2011, 45, 197-245.	2.2	336
284	The calculation of the single publication <i>h</i> index and related performance measures. Online Information Review, 2011, 35, 291-300.	3.2	20
285	Seasonal bias in editorial decisions? A study using data from chemistry. Learned Publishing, 2011, 24, 325-328.	1.7	4
286	A Multilevel Modelling Approach to Investigating the Predictive Validity of Editorial Decisions: Do the Editors of a High Profile Journal Select Manuscripts that are Highly Cited After Publication?. Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series A: Statistics in Society, 2011, 174, 857-879.	1.1	54
287	Mimicry in science?. Scientometrics, 2011, 86, 173-177.	3.0	33
288	The effect of a two-stage publication process on the Journal Impact Factor: a case study on the interactive open access journal Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics. Scientometrics, 2011, 86, 93-97.	3.0	13

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
289	Does the h index for assessing single publications really work? A case study on papers published in chemistry. <i>Scientometrics</i> , 2011, 89, 835-843.	3.0	11
290	Is interactive open access publishing able to identify high-impact submissions? A study on the predictive validity of Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics by using percentile rank classes. <i>Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology</i> , 2011, 62, 61-71.	2.6	27
291	How fractional counting of citations affects the impact factor: Normalization in terms of differences in citation potentials among fields of science. <i>Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology</i> , 2011, 62, 217-229.	2.6	89
292	Turning the tables on citation analysis one more time: Principles for comparing sets of documents. <i>Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology</i> , 2011, 62, 1370-1381.	2.6	143
293	Do we need the E-index in addition to the h-index and its variants?. <i>Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology</i> , 2011, 62, 1433-1434.	2.6	7
294	Integrated impact indicators compared with impact factors: An alternative research design with policy implications. <i>Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology</i> , 2011, 62, 2133-2146.	2.6	116
295	Which cities produce more excellent papers than can be expected? A new mapping approach, using Google Maps, based on statistical significance testing. <i>Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology</i> , 2011, 62, 1954-1962.	2.6	61
296	Further steps towards an ideal method of measuring citation performance: The avoidance of citation (ratio) averages in field-normalization. <i>Journal of Informetrics</i> , 2011, 5, 228-230.	2.9	106
297	A multilevel meta-analysis of studies reporting correlations between the h index and 37 different h index variants. <i>Journal of Informetrics</i> , 2011, 5, 346-359.	2.9	227
298	Some interesting insights from aggregated data published in the World Report SIR 2010. <i>Journal of Informetrics</i> , 2011, 5, 486-488.	2.9	5
299	Getting to Yes: The Fate of Neuroradiology Manuscripts Rejected by Radiology over a 2-year Period. <i>Radiology</i> , 2011, 260, 3-5.	7.3	7
300	Peer Review and Bibliometric: Potentials and Problems. , 2011, , 145-164.		8
301	How Long is the Peer Review Process for Journal Manuscripts? A Case Study on <i>Angewandte Chemie International Edition</i> . <i>Chimia</i> , 2010, 64, 72-77.	0.6	22
302	Citation speed as a measure to predict the attention an article receives: An investigation of the validity of editorial decisions at <i>Angewandte Chemie International Edition</i> . <i>Journal of Informetrics</i> , 2010, 4, 83-88.	2.9	28
303	The citation speed index: A useful bibliometric indicator to add to the h index. <i>Journal of Informetrics</i> , 2010, 4, 444-446.	2.9	24
304	Towards an ideal method of measuring research performance: Some comments to the Opthof and Leydesdorff (2010) paper. <i>Journal of Informetrics</i> , 2010, 4, 441-443.	2.9	46
305	A content analysis of referees' comments: how do comments on manuscripts rejected by a high-impact journal and later published in either a low- or high-impact journal differ?. <i>Scientometrics</i> , 2010, 83, 493-506.	3.0	35
306	How accurately does Thomas Kuhn's model of paradigm change describe the transition from the static view of the universe to the big bang theory in cosmology?. <i>Scientometrics</i> , 2010, 84, 441-464.	3.0	27

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
307	The validity of staff editors'™ initial evaluations of manuscripts: a case study of Angewandte Chemie International Edition. <i>Scientometrics</i> , 2010, 85, 681-687.	3.0	15
308	The manuscript reviewing process: Empirical research on review requests, review sequences, and decision rules in peer review. <i>Library and Information Science Research</i> , 2010, 32, 5-12.	2.0	40
309	Reference standards and reference multipliers for the comparison of the citation impact of papers published in different time periods. <i>Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology</i> , 2010, 61, 2061-2069.	2.6	9
310	A meta-evaluation of scientific research proposals: Different ways of comparing rejected to awarded applications. <i>Journal of Informetrics</i> , 2010, 4, 211-220.	2.9	59
311	The h index research output measurement: Two approaches to enhance its accuracy. <i>Journal of Informetrics</i> , 2010, 4, 407-414.	2.9	55
312	Do Scientific Advancements Lean on the Shoulders of Giants? A Bibliometric Investigation of the Ortega Hypothesis. <i>PLoS ONE</i> , 2010, 5, e13327.	2.5	75
313	Do Author-Suggested Reviewers Rate Submissions More Favorably than Editor-Suggested Reviewers? A Study on Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics. <i>PLoS ONE</i> , 2010, 5, e13345.	2.5	30
314	Panel peer review of grant applications: what do we know from research in social psychology on judgment and decision-making in groups?. <i>Research Evaluation</i> , 2010, 19, 293-304.	2.6	52
315	From black box to white box at open access journals: predictive validity of manuscript reviewing and editorial decisions at <i>Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics</i> . <i>Research Evaluation</i> , 2010, 19, 105-118.	2.6	19
316	Does the Journal Peer Review Select the "Best" from the Work Submitted? The State of Empirical Research. <i>IETE Technical Review (Institution of Electronics and Telecommunication Engineers, India)</i> , 2010, 27, 93.	3.2	12
317	The Usefulness of Peer Review for Selecting Manuscripts for Publication: A Utility Analysis Taking as an Example a High-Impact Journal. <i>PLoS ONE</i> , 2010, 5, e11344.	2.5	32
318	A Reliability-Generalization Study of Journal Peer Reviews: A Multilevel Meta-Analysis of Inter-Rater Reliability and Its Determinants. <i>PLoS ONE</i> , 2010, 5, e14331.	2.5	130
319	Reviewer and editor biases in journal peer review: an investigation of manuscript refereeing at <i>Angewandte Chemie International Edition</i> . <i>Research Evaluation</i> , 2009, 18, 262-272.	2.6	36
320	Are there really two types of <i>h</i> index variants? A validation study by using molecular life sciences data. <i>Research Evaluation</i> , 2009, 18, 185-190.	2.6	23
321	Gender Effects in the Peer Reviews of Grant Proposals: A Comprehensive Meta-Analysis Comparing Traditional and Multilevel Approaches. <i>Review of Educational Research</i> , 2009, 79, 1290-1326.	7.5	128
322	Hirsch-Type Index Values for Organic Chemistry Journals: A Comparison of New Metrics with the Journal Impact Factor. <i>European Journal of Organic Chemistry</i> , 2009, 2009, 1471-1476.	2.4	30
323	Do we need the <i>h</i> index and its variants in addition to standard bibliometric measures?. <i>Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology</i> , 2009, 60, 1286-1289.	2.6	29
324	Universality of citation distributions – A validation of Radicchi et al.'s relative indicator $\langle i \rangle_c / \langle i \rangle_c^2 = \langle i \rangle_c / \langle i \rangle_c^2$ at the micro level using data from chemistry. <i>Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology</i> , 2009, 60, 1664-1670.	2.6	35

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
325	Convergent validity of bibliometric Google Scholar data in the field of chemistry—Citation counts for papers that were accepted by Angewandte Chemie International Edition or rejected but published elsewhere, using Google Scholar, Science Citation Index, Scopus, and Chemical Abstracts. <i>Journal of Informetrics</i> , 2009, 3, 27-35.	2.9	76
326	Extent of type I and type II errors in editorial decisions: A case study on Angewandte Chemie International Edition. <i>Journal of Informetrics</i> , 2009, 3, 348-352.	2.9	21
327	The influence of the applicants' gender on the modeling of a peer review process by using latent Markov models. <i>Scientometrics</i> , 2009, 81, 407-411.	3.0	10
328	The state of <i>h</i> index research. <i>EMBO Reports</i> , 2009, 10, 2-6.	4.5	310
329	Do women have less success in peer review?. <i>Nature</i> , 2009, 459, 602-602.	27.8	9
330	The luck of the referee draw: the effect of exchanging reviews. <i>Learned Publishing</i> , 2009, 22, 117-125.	1.7	44
331	Latent Markov modeling applied to grant peer review. <i>Journal of Informetrics</i> , 2008, 2, 217-228.	2.9	15
332	Do editors and referees look for signs of scientific misconduct when reviewing manuscripts? A quantitative content analysis of studies that examined review criteria and reasons for accepting and rejecting manuscripts for publication. <i>Scientometrics</i> , 2008, 77, 415-432.	3.0	42
333	Are there better indices for evaluation purposes than the <i>h</i> index? A comparison of nine different variants of the <i>h</i> index using data from biomedicine. <i>Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology</i> , 2008, 59, 830-837.	2.6	357
334	Selecting manuscripts for a high-impact journal through peer review: A citation analysis of communications that were accepted by Angewandte Chemie International Edition, or rejected but published elsewhere. <i>Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology</i> , 2008, 59, 1841-1852.	2.6	64
335	The Effectiveness of the Peer Review Process: Inter-Referee Agreement and Predictive Validity of Manuscript Refereeing at Angewandte Chemie. <i>Angewandte Chemie - International Edition</i> , 2008, 47, 7173-7178.	13.8	53
336	How to detect indications of potential sources of bias in peer review: A generalized latent variable modeling approach exemplified by a gender study. <i>Journal of Informetrics</i> , 2008, 2, 280-287.	2.9	20
337	What do citation counts measure? A review of studies on citing behavior. <i>Journal of Documentation</i> , 2008, 64, 45-80.	1.6	997
338	Is the <i>h</i> index related to (standard) bibliometric measures and to the assessments by peers? An investigation of the <i>h</i> index by using molecular life sciences data. <i>Research Evaluation</i> , 2008, 17, 149-156.	2.6	53
339	Does the Committee Peer Review Select the Best Applicants for Funding? An Investigation of the Selection Process for Two European Molecular Biology Organization Programmes. <i>PLoS ONE</i> , 2008, 3, e3480.	2.5	84
340	Citation Environment of Angewandte Chemie. <i>Chimia</i> , 2007, 61, 104-109.	0.6	28
341	Multiple publication on a single research study: Does it pay? The influence of number of research articles on total citation counts in biomedicine. <i>Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology</i> , 2007, 58, 1100-1107.	2.6	61
342	What do we know about the <i>h</i> index?. <i>Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology</i> , 2007, 58, 1381-1385.	2.6	445

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
343	Convergent validation of peer review decisions using the h indexExtent of and reasons for type I and type II errors. <i>Journal of Informetrics</i> , 2007, 1, 204-213.	2.9	55
344	Gender differences in grant peer review: A meta-analysis. <i>Journal of Informetrics</i> , 2007, 1, 226-238.	2.9	229
345	Bias cut. <i>Nature</i> , 2007, 445, 566-566.	27.8	14
346	A persistent problem. <i>EMBO Reports</i> , 2007, 8, 982-987.	4.5	120
347	Row-column (RC) association model applied to grant peer review. <i>Scientometrics</i> , 2007, 73, 139-147.	3.0	7
348	Gatekeepers of scienceâ€™Effects of external reviewersâ€™ attributes on the assessments of fellowship applications. <i>Journal of Informetrics</i> , 2007, 1, 83-91.	2.9	23
349	Potential sources of bias in research fellowship assessments: effects of university prestige and field of study. <i>Research Evaluation</i> , 2006, 15, 209-219.	2.6	30
350	Selecting scientific excellence through committee peer review - A citation analysis of publications previously published to approval or rejection of post-doctoral research fellowship applicants. <i>Scientometrics</i> , 2006, 68, 427-440.	3.0	98
351	Quality assurance in higher education â€™ meta-evaluation of multi-stage evaluation procedures in Germany. <i>Higher Education</i> , 2006, 52, 687-709.	4.4	38
352	Criteria Used by a Peer Review Committee for Selection of Research Fellows. A Boolean Probit Analysis. <i>International Journal of Selection and Assessment</i> , 2005, 13, 296-303.	2.5	15
353	Selection of research fellowship recipients by committee peer review. Reliability, fairness and predictive validity of Board of Trustees' decisions. <i>Scientometrics</i> , 2005, 63, 297-320.	3.0	113
354	Does the h-index for ranking of scientists really work?. <i>Scientometrics</i> , 2005, 65, 391-392.	3.0	302
355	Committee peer review at an international research foundation: predictive validity and fairness of selection decisions on post-graduate fellowship applications. <i>Research Evaluation</i> , 2005, 14, 15-20.	2.6	21
356	Social origin and gender of doctoral degree holders. <i>Scientometrics</i> , 2004, 61, 19-41.	3.0	18
357	Types of research output profiles: A multilevel latent class analysis of the Austrian Science Fund's final project report data. <i>Research Evaluation</i> , 0, , .	2.6	8
358	Funding decision-making systems: An empirical comparison of continuous and dichotomous approaches based on psychometric theory. <i>Research Evaluation</i> , 0, , nrw002.	2.6	0
359	Can altmetrics reflect societal impact considerations?: Exploring the potential of altmetrics in the context of a sustainability science research center. <i>Quantitative Science Studies</i> , 0, , 1-18.	3.3	9
360	A proposal to revise the disruption index. <i>Profesional De La Informacion</i> , 0, , .	2.7	9

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
361	Letter. New Google Scholar section with information on funded publications. Profesional De La Informacion, 0, , .	2.7	0
362	F1000Prime: an analysis of discipline-specific reader data from Mendeley. F1000Research, 0, 4, 41.	1.6	4
363	Bibliometrics-based heuristics: What is their definition and how can they be studied?Â- Research note. Profesional De La Informacion, 0, , .	2.7	3
364	Networks of reader and country status: an analysis of Mendeley reader statistics. PeerJ Computer Science, 0, 1, e32.	4.5	8
365	Are there biases in decisions to tweet on scientific papers? A plea for conducting an experimental Twitter study. Technical note. Profesional De La Informacion, 0, , .	2.7	0