

Ruth's Rankings 8: Readings

1: Sample articles addressing rankings issues from leading contributors to bibliometric literature

Leiden: van Raan, AFJ, van Leeuwen, TN & Visser, MS. (2011) Language effect in university rankings; particularly Germany and France are wronged in citation-based rankings. *Scientometrics*, 88(2); 495-498

CSIC –SCImago Labs: Lopec-Illescas, C., de Moya-Anegón, F & Moed, HF (2011). A ranking of universities should account for differences in their disciplinary specialization. *Scientometrics* 88 (2): 563-574

CNJ (Italy): Abramo, G & D'Angelo, CA (2014). How do you define and measure research productivity? *Scientometrics* 101(2),1129-1144

2. Cited in paper:

Bornmann, L & de Moya- Anegón (2014). What proportion of excellent papers makes an institution one of the best worldwide? Specifying thresholds for the interpretation of the results of the SCImago Institutions Ranking and the Leiden Rankings. *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology* 65(4)732-736. Note: presentation of data in the SIR rankings is a score based on 100 not the actual percent.

3. Scholarly readings explaining metrics

Additional articles from SIR authors (recommended from [General Considerations](#))

International collaboration:

Guerrero Bote, V.P., Olmeda-Gomez, C., De Moya-Anegon, F. (2013) Quantifying the benefits of international scientific collaboration. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology*, 64 (2), 392-404 [abstract: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/asi.22754>]

Lancho-Barrantes, B.S., Guerrero-Bote, V.P., de Moya-Anegón, F. (2013) Citation increments between collaborating countries. *Scientometrics*, 94 (3), 817-831

Normalized impact:

González-Pereira, B., Guerrero-Bote, V., Moya-Anegón, F. (2010). A new approach to the metric of journal's scientific prestige: The SJR indicator. *Journal of Informetrics*, 4(3), 379–391. [abstract <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.joi.2010.03.002>]

High quality publications

Miguel, S., Chinchilla-Rodríguez, Z., Moya-Anegón, F. (2011) Open Access and Scopus: A New Approach to Scientific From the Standpoint of Access. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology*, 62 (6),1130-1145 [abstract . <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/asi.21532>]

Specialization index:

Moed, H.F., Moya-Anegón, F., López-Illescas, C., Visser, M. (2011). Is concentration of university research associated with better research performance? *Journal of Informetrics*. 5 (4) 649-658 [abstract. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.joi.2011.06.003>]

Lopez-Illescas, C., de Moya-Anegón, F., Moed, H.F. (2011) A ranking of universities should account for differences in their disciplinary specialization. *Scientometrics*, 88 (2), 563-574. [abstract <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11192-011-0398-6>]

Excellence rate:

Bornmann, L., De Moya Anegón, F., Leydesdorff, L. (2012) The new Excellence Indicator in the World Report of the SCImago Institutions Rankings 2011. *Journal of Informetrics*, 6 (2), 333-335 <http://arxiv.org/ftp/arxiv/papers/1110/1110.2305.pdf>

CWTS - LEIDEN:

Readings suggested and annotated by Ludo Waltman of Leiden

Background Article:

Waltman, L et al. (2012) The Leiden Ranking 2011/2012:: Data collection, indicators, and interpretation *JASIST*, 63 (12), 2419 access4848 ed 21 Feb, 2015 at <http://arxiv.org/ftp/arxiv/papers/1202/1202.3941.pdf>

This is the best overview; although there have been changes in methodology since then

Fields:

Ruiz-Castillo, J. & Waltman, L. (2015) Field-normalized citation impact indicators using algorithmically constructed classification systems of science. *Journal of Informetrics*. 9(1).102–117 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.joi.2014.11.010>. [Available through Elsevier] This describes how Leiden started assigning fields at the article level

Fractional Counting:

Waltman, L. & van Eck, N.J. (Jan 2015) Field-normalized citation impact indicators and the choice of an appropriate counting method accessed online February 2015 at [arXiv:1501.04431v1](https://arxiv.org/abs/1501.04431v1) Explains how Leiden Ranking uses fractional counting to handle publications co-authored by multiple institutions. Full (or whole) counting yields results that are biased in favor of certain fields of science.