

# Yet Another View on Citation Scores

Wil van der Aalst

3-1-2023

“How to evaluate scientific research?” is a controversial topic. The easiest way to evaluate productivity and impact is to count the number of published papers and the number of citations. Clearly, this is very naïve because it is possible to publish many papers that are incremental or of low quality. Counting the total number of citations has the problem that one may be a co-author of a single high-cited paper. This does not say much about the contribution of the author, and citations tend to follow a power-law distribution (i.e., just a few papers attract most of the citations). To address the limitations of simply counting papers and citations, the scientific community has created journal and conference rankings, and metrics like the Hirsch index (first proposed by Jorge Hirsh in 2005, and adapted in many different ways).

Of course, all of these measures should be taken with a grain of salt. In the Netherlands, the “Recognition and Rewards” (“Erkennen en Waarderen”) program [6] was initiated to improve the evaluation of academics and to give credits to people working in teams or focusing on teaching. Similar initiatives can be seen in other countries and at the European level [7]. Although the goals of such programs are reasonable and it is impossible to disagree with statements such as “quality is more important than quantity” and “one should recognize and value team performance and interdisciplinary research”, suitable measures are lacking. Such programs are often used to abandon any measure to quantify and evaluate productivity and impact. In some universities, it has even become “politically incorrect” to talk about published papers and the number of citations. Yet, when evaluating and selecting academics, committee members still secretly look at the data provided by Google Scholar, Scopus, and Web of Science. This is because it is difficult to evaluate and compare academic performance in an objective and qualitative way. **This creates the risk that evaluations and selections become highly subjective, e.g., based on taste, personal preferences, and criteria not known to the individuals evaluated.** Moreover, in such processes, quantitative data are still used, but in an implicit and inconsistent manner.

Given the above, my personal opinion is that **we cannot avoid using objective data-driven approaches to evaluate productivity and impact**. Of course, quantitative measures should **only support expert assessment** and are not a substitute for informed judgment. When using citation scores, one should definitely consider the “Leiden Manifesto for research metrics” [1], which provides ten principles to guide research evaluations.

Some of the **practical challenges** that I see in research evaluations are the following:

- **Subjectivity.** Rankings of journals and conferences tend to be problematic. Journal lists are highly subjective. For example, in the field of Information Systems, the “College of Senior Scholars” selected a “basket” of journals as the top journals in their field. However, the definition of Information Systems is considered in a very particular manner, mostly driven by non-technical US-based academics publishing in these journals and serving on the editorial boards of the journals they select. The CORE ranking of conferences is much broader, but has similar problems (e.g., the ranking was established by a few computer departments in Australia and New Zealand and is now used all over the globe to decide on research funding and travel budgets). The intentions behind these lists are good. However, **it is unavoidable that there are topical biases and scoping issues**. Moreover, such rankings are like a self-fulfilling prophecy. This leads to a variant of the **Matthew effect** (“the rich get richer”), i.e., the higher the ranking of a conference or journal, the more people want to submit to it, automatically leading to a higher status. This combined with a narrow focus, leads to a degenerate view of research quality and discourages innovations in new directions. Although research is changing rapidly, these journal lists tend to be relatively stable. Moreover, highly-ranked journals and conferences have many papers that are rarely cited. Hence, just looking at the publication venue says little about the quality, novelty, and impact of the work.
- **Biased data sources and data quality problems.** There are multiple databases that can be used to evaluate productivity and impact, e.g., Elsevier’s Scopus and Google Scholar (both released in 2004) and Web of Science (online since 2002). Also, dedicated tools running on top of these platforms, such as InCites (using the Web of Science) and SciVal (using Scopus), have been developed. Web of Science has a strong focus on journals published in the US and favors traditional disciplines such as Physics. Conferences are only partially covered. For a researcher in Computer Science, the number of citations in Google

Scholar may be 2–3 times higher than the number of citations in Scopus, and over 10 times the number of citations in Web of Science! For a researcher in Physics, the differences between Google Scholar, Scopus, and Web of Science may be much smaller. This means that Web of Science is simply irrelevant for many disciplines. Google Scholar has the most extensive coverage, but also data quality problems. Google Scholar simply crawls academic-related websites and also counts non-peer-reviewed documents. One may also find stray citations where minor variations in referencing lead to duplicate records for the same paper [8]. Also, Scopus and Web of Science have such problems, but to a lesser degree. In Microsoft Academic Graph, my output and citations were split over eight different user profiles due to my last name (“W. van der Aalst”, “Van der Aalst”, etc.). Although Microsoft Academic Graph was discontinued, these flawed data are still used in all kinds of rankings (e.g. Research.com). These examples illustrate that the impact of data quality problems and limited coverage are not equally distributed. Considering data quality and coverage, Scopus can be seen as the “middle road”.

- **Different publication practices.** Finally, there are different publication traditions that significantly impact the most common measures used today. In many disciplines, the average number of authors is around two. However, in areas like physics, the average is above ten authors, and there are papers with hundreds or even thousands of authors. An article on measuring the Higgs Boson Mass published in Physical Review Letters has **5,154 authors** (cf. <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.114.191803>). This 33-page article has 24 pages to list the authors, and only 9 pages are devoted to the actual paper. When counting H-indices in the standard way, this paper will increase the H-index by one for more than 5000 authors. Also, the order in which authors are listed varies from discipline to discipline. In mathematics, it is common to list authors alphabetically. In other disciplines, the order is based on contribution. Also, the “last author” position may have a specific meaning (e.g., the project leader or most senior researcher). Also, in Computer Science, conference publications are regarded as important and comparable to journal publications. In other areas, conference publications “do not count”, and all work is published in journals. The above shows that counting just journal papers while ignoring the number of authors may have hugely diverging consequences for different disciplines.

These challenges are hard to address. However, as stated before, **I do not think it is wise to resort to subjective evaluations of research productivity and impact while ignoring the data that are there.** Therefore, I liked the **approach and work presented by John Ioannidis and his colleagues** [2,3,4,5]. Ioannidis et al. propose to use a **composite indicator** (called **C-score**) which is the sum of the standardized six log-transformed citation indicators (**NC, H, Hm, NS, NSF, NSFL**):

- total number of citations received (**NC**),
- Hirsch index for the citations received (**H**),
- Schreiber co-authorship adjusted Hm index for the citations received (**Hm**),
- total number of citations received to papers for which the scientist is single author (**NCS**),
- total number of citations received to papers for which the scientist is single or first author (**NCSF**), and
- total number of citations received to papers for which the scientist is single, first, or last author (**NCSFL**).

The resulting **C-score** focuses on impact (citations) rather than productivity (number of publications) and incorporates information on co-authorship and author positions (single, first, last author). Each **NC, H, Hm, NS, NSF, NSFL** score is normalized to a value between 0 and 1, and these are summed up. Hence, the **C-score** has a range between 0 and 6.

In the dataset [2], data for 194,983 scientists are reported. The selection is based on the top 100,000 scientists by **C-score** (with and without self-citations) or a percentile rank of 2% or above in the subfield. The researchers are classified into 22 scientific fields and 174 sub-fields. The dataset is based on all Scopus author profiles as of September 1, 2022. Scopus can be seen as the middle ground between Google Scholar and Web of Science. As mentioned, Google Scholar has much better coverage, but also more data quality problems. Web of Science is unusable for many disciplines due to its bias towards specific types of journals. Note that Ioannidis et al. tried to avoid the problems mentioned before, i.e., they aimed to avoid subjectivity and biased data, addressed data quality problems, and compensated for different publication practices (e.g., the number of authors).

The data set [2] looks as follows (after hiding some of the columns and showing the first 40 rows):

The screenshot shows an Excel spreadsheet with a table containing 40 rows of data. The columns are labeled as follows: A (author name), B (institution), C (country), D (NC), E (H), F (Hm), G (NS), H (NSF), I (NSFL), J (C), K (NC), L (H), M (Hm), N (NS), O (NSF), P (NSFL), Q (C), R (NC), S (H), T (Hm), U (NS), V (NSF), W (NSFL), X (C), Y (NC), Z (H), AA (Hm), AB (NS), AC (NSF), AD (NSFL), AE (C). The data is color-coded: orange for the first three columns (A-C), yellow for columns D-J, and white for columns K-AA. The first row of data is: A: van der Aalst, Wil M.P., B: Rheinisch-Westfälische Technische Hochschule Aachen, C: deu, D: 42854, E: 99, F: 64, G: 2359, H: 39206, I: 79281, J: 2295, K: 39536, L: 259, M: 37070, N: 12026, O: 3228, P: 12765, Q: 199278, R: 3293, S: 10516, T: 10516, U: 10516, V: 10516, W: 10516, X: 10516, Y: 10516, Z: 10516, AA: 10516, AB: 10516, AC: 10516, AD: 10516, AE: 10516.

The first three columns show the author, institution, and country. The orange columns show the **NC**, **H**, **Hm**, **NS**, **NSF**, **NSFL**, and **C** values for each author ignoring self-citations. The first orange column shows the **overall rank** based on the **C**-score, and the last orange column shows the **C**-score itself (with a value between 0 and 6). The yellow columns show the **NC**, **H**, **Hm**, **NS**, **NSF**, **NSFL**, and **C** values for each author, including self-citations. The final columns aim to show the positioning of the author's work in the respective subfields. The top-ranked Science-Matrix category and second-ranked Science-Matrix category are listed per author, including the fraction of papers in these fields, the **C**-score-based ranking in the top-ranked field, and the total number of authors within the subfield.

To illustrate the data [2], I take myself as an example:

- **Author name:** van der Aalst, Wil M.P.
- **Institution:** Rheinisch-Westfälische Technische Hochschule Aachen
- **Country:** deu (Germany)
- **Without self-citations:**
  - total number of citations received (**NC**): 42,854
  - Hirsch index for the citations received (**H**): 99
  - Schreiber co-authorship adjusted Hm index for the citations received (**Hm**): 64

- total number of citations received to papers for which the scientist is single author (**NCS**): 6,678
- total number of citations received to papers for which the scientist is single or first author (**NCSF**): 21,516
- total number of citations received to papers for which the scientist is single, first, or last author (**NCSFL**): 35,435
- **C-score**: 4.8916
- **Global rank across all fields based on C-score**: 275
- **Including self-citations:**
  - total number of citations received (**NC**): 50,145
  - Hirsch index for the citations received (**H**): 107
  - Schreiber co-authorship adjusted Hm index for the citations received (**Hm**): 68
  - total number of citations received to papers for which the scientist is single author (**NCS**): 7,365
  - total number of citations received to papers for which the scientist is single or first author (**NCSF**): 24,116
  - total number of citations received to papers for which the scientist is single, first, or last author (**NCSFL**): 41,397
  - **C-score**: 4.9370
  - **Global rank across all fields based on C-score**: 243
- **First subfield**: Artificial Intelligence & Image Processing
- **Fraction of papers in the first subfield**: 0.4585
- **Second subfield**: Information & Communication Technologies
- **Fraction of papers in the second subfield**: 0.1444
- **Global ranking within the first subfield based on C-score**: 7
- **Number of researchers in the first subfield**: 321,592

Hence, my global ranking based on the **C**-score not considering self-citations is 275, my global ranking based on the **C**-score also considering self-citations is 243, and I'm ranked 7<sup>th</sup> among the 321,592 in Artificial Intelligence & Image Processing.



For researchers from **RWTH Aachen University**, the table looks as follows:

Table 1\_Analysis.xlsx - Excel

Tell me what you want to do...

File Home Insert Page Layout Formulas Data Review View Tell me what you want to do... Share

B12

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O
	authfull	inst_name	cntry	rank (N)	NCSFL (n)	H21 (ns)	Hm21 (ns)	NCS (ns)	NCSFL (n)	NCSFL (C (ns))	sm-subfield-1	sm-subfi	rank s	sm-subfield-1	
1	van der Aalst, Wil M.P.	Rheinisch-Westfälische Tex.deu	deu	275	42,854	99	64,5252	6,678	21,516	35,435	4,8916	Artificial Intelligence	0.4585	7	321,59
1476	Bolm, Carsten	Rheinisch-Westfälische Tex.deu	deu	1,477	33,154	94	56,9778	747	9,938	29,181	4,5766	Organic Chemistry	0.7232	45	154,10
1798	Waser, Rainer	Rheinisch-Westfälische Tex.deu	deu	1,797	37,292	87	44,6863	1,017	9,779	27,204	4,5408	Applied Physics	0.5030	64	289,91
3443	Wagner, Wolfgang	Medizinische Fakultät, RW de	deu	3,442	24,861	69	35,8701	1,060	9,610	20,675	4,4042	Developmental Biol	0.0968	178	127,68
4049	Enders, Dieter	Rheinisch-Westfälische Tex.deu	deu	4,048	32,578	74	46,8528	72	21,643	31,235	4,3678	Organic Chemistry	0.8319	108	154,10
6622	Floege, Jürgen	Rheinisch-Westfälische Tex.deu	deu	6,621	26,877	82	34,6901	4,21	4,955	11,874	4,2589	Urology & Nephrolo	0.5838	49	79,72
7123	Peters, N.	Rheinisch-Westfälische Tex.deu	deu	7,122	11,515	53	29,9762	3,414	4,773	9,545	4,2414	Energy	0.5033	67	265,59
8359	Wurtig, Matthias	Rheinisch-Westfälische Tex.deu	deu	8,358	20,587	67	31,8113	4,28	4,618	15,410	4,2018	Applied Physics	0.4628	213	289,91
9553	Pitsch, Heinz	Rheinisch-Westfälische Tex.deu	deu	9,552	13,287	57	34,6744	1,145	2,961	10,039	4,1692	Energy	0.5804	76	265,59
9685	Kühl, Christiane K.	Uniklinik RWTH Aachen de	deu	9,684	13,902	54	23,8514	1,439	7,299	8,461	4,1135	Nuclear Medicine &	0.5742	45	105,57
11419	Ney, Hermann	Rheinisch-Westfälische Tex.deu	deu	11,418	20,519	65	38,7281	384	1,133	17,582	4,1240	Artificial Intelligence	0.4647	205	321,59
11939	Schulz, Jörg B.	Uniklinik RWTH Aachen de	deu	11,938	26,087	82	30,8310	1,20	4,703	10,361	4,1135	Neurology & Neuro	0.6643	1,067	305,85
16316	Kobbelt, Leif	Rheinisch-Westfälische Tex.deu	deu	16,315	9,555	53	30,0762	711	2,335	8,440	4,0294	Software Engineerin	0.6157	13	21,49
16416	Keim, Wilhelm	Rheinisch-Westfälische Tex.deu	deu	16,415	11,651	43	24,4306	1,120	2,678	9,877	4,0277	Organic Chemistry	0.4902	431	154,10
17453	Okuda, Jun	Rheinisch-Westfälische Tex.deu	deu	17,452	11,883	56	32,7794	438	1,465	10,197	4,0103	Organic Chemistry	0.4812	386	154,10
18673	Hecht, Stefan	Rheinisch-Westfälische Tex.deu	deu	18,672	14,235	59	27,5540	280	2,374	9,236	3,9921	Organic Chemistry	0.2797	445	106,54
18785	De Doncker, Rik W.	Rheinisch-Westfälische Tex.deu	deu	18,784	16,861	56	32,6706	107	2,474	14,570	3,9907	Electrical & Electroni	0.8577	43	106,54
19973	Czakon, Michal	Rheinisch-Westfälische Tex.deu	deu	19,972	8,413	45	21,9406	1,083	4,611	4,831	3,9733	Nuclear & Particle Ph	0.8676	303	141,56
19998	Albrecht, Markus	Rheinisch-Westfälische Tex.deu	deu	19,997	5,890	38	23,4575	1,893	4,443	4,793	3,9729	Organic Chemistry	0.5068	381	154,10
21845	Gottstein, Günter	Rheinisch-Westfälische Tex.deu	deu	21,844	12,257	57	32,9274	1,78	1,664	9,611	3,9476	Materials	0.9072	236	267,14
23984	Hoelderich, W. F.	Rheinisch-Westfälische Tex.deu	deu	23,983	8,799	48	31,9333	404	1,324	7,948	3,9204	Physical Chemistry	0.6590	96	37,10
24492	Krämer, Michael	Rheinisch-Westfälische Tex.deu	deu	24,491	25,866	81	20,3749	420	1,325	2,474	3,9143	Nuclear & Particle Ph	0.8463	331	141,56
25444	Lammers, Twan	Uniklinik RWTH Aachen de	deu	25,443	13,201	62	20,9482	145	3,544	7,708	3,9032	Pharmacology & Pha	0.2625	212	134,74
26326	Zimmermann, Hans Jürgen	Rheinisch-Westfälische Tex.deu	deu	26,325	5,865	24	15,8929	3,876	4,640	5,739	3,8935	Artificial Intelligence	0.4444	550	321,59
28126	Trautwein, Christian	Uniklinik RWTH Aachen de	deu	28,125	28,762	90	31,8109	21	1,364	7,380	3,8744	Gastroenterology &	0.3877	412	95,37
28591	Dronskowski, Richard V.	Rheinisch-Westfälische Tex.deu	deu	28,590	10,860	42	24,2150	286	2,172	8,043	3,8697	Inorganic & Nuclear	0.4144	151	70,19
31169	Marx, Nikolaus	Uniklinik RWTH Aachen de	deu	31,168	21,079	60	18,8579	63	4,318	6,275	3,8435	Cardiovascular Syste	0.4217	1,253	199,27
33707	Herpertz-Dahlmann, Beate	Uniklinik RWTH Aachen de	deu	33,706	11,249	61	22,7263	295	1,208	3,801	3,8198	Developmental & Ch	0.2791	215	19,06
34599	Marquardt, Wolfgang	Rheinisch-Westfälische Tex.deu	deu	34,598	8,559	47	31,5516	318	563	6,924	3,8120	Chemical Engineerin	0.4636	106	67,88
34697	Felderhof, B. Ubbo	Rheinisch-Westfälische Tex.deu	deu	34,696	3,829	30	24,5444	1,502	2,340	3,464	3,8112	Fluids & Plasmas	0.5236	274	48,58

Ready 216 of 194983 records found

Key Data simplified



For researchers working in **Germany**, the table looks as follows:

Table\_1\_Analysis.xlsx - Excel  
Tell me what you want to do...

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O
	authfull	inst_name	entry	rank (N)	NC9621	H21 (n)	Hm21 (	NCS(ns)	NCSF(n)	NCSFL (	C (ns)	sm-subfield-1	sm-subfi	rank s	sm-subfield-
1	Grimme, Stefan	Universität Bonn	deu	40	89,873	99	61,4692	29,603	65,151	81,271	5,2184	Chemical Physics	0.4613	2	95,895
43	Sheldrick, George M.	Georg-August-Universität C	deu	42	143,376	52	29,4868	126,508	128,811	135,982	5,2083	Inorganic & Nuclear	0.3456	1	70,192
116	Mann, Matthias	Max-Planck-Institut für Bio	deu	115	179,890	199	80,9208	1,101	7,375	111,422	5,0259	Developmental Biol	0.3269	11	127,685
171	Sies, Helmut	Leibniz Research Institute f	deu	170	57,593	111	67,9401	10,345	17,143	42,351	4,9773	Biochemistry & Mole	0.4750	13	201,173
229	Bork, Peer	European Molecular Biolog	deu	228	181,563	177	64,3198	1,334	7,808	57,801	4,9268	Developmental Biol	0.3297	17	127,685
259	Neese, Frank	Max Planck Institute for Cc	deu	258	45,841	102	56,8199	12,977	17,024	32,162	4,9043	Chemical Physics	0.3778	8	95,895
276	van der Aalst, Wil M.P.	Rheinisch-Westfälische Te	deu	275	42,854	99	64,5252	6,678	21,516	35,435	4,8916	Artificial Intelligence	0.4585	7	321,592
319	Fürstner, Alois	Max Planck Institute for Cc	deu	318	35,440	98	62,9131	5,448	25,485	34,540	4,8646	Organic Chemistry	0.5793	4	154,108
347	Ackermann, Lutz	Georg-August-Universität (	deu	346	36,445	101	62,8925	6,058	17,076	34,035	4,8472	Organic Chemistry	0.7056	6	154,108
350	Reetz, Manfred	Max Planck Institute for Cc	deu	349	33,479	94	60,4842	6,060	24,676	31,833	4,8446	Organic Chemistry	0.6472	9	154,108
396	Blöchl, P. E.	Technische Universität Cla	deu	395	60,069	41	21,3778	48,507	54,890	58,641	4,8192	Applied Physics	0.3404	21	289,917
414	Springel, Volker	Max Planck Institute for As	deu	413	55,056	106	46,9922	5,619	17,423	28,056	4,8073	Astronomy & Astrop	0.9101	1	47,944
424	Maier, Joachim	Max Planck Institute for So	deu	423	55,175	124	62,7452	4,631	5,035	38,199	4,8024	Energy	0.2679	4	265,592
433	Antonietti, Markus	Max-Planck-Institut für Kol	deu	432	109,033	161	80,8316	282	8,202	61,696	4,7983	Nanoscience & Nanc	0.2295	14	103,235
454	Binder, Kurt	Johannes Gutenberg-Unive	deu	453	36,288	87	60,7603	5,583	14,375	32,640	4,7895	Fluids & Plasmas	0.3108	5	48,581
468	Wittchen, Hans Ulrich	Technische Universität Dre	deu	467	70,832	120	47,8812	2,561	14,065	33,013	4,7825	Psychiatry	0.4919	13	71,064
492	Crutzen, P. J.	Max Planck Institute for Cl	deu	491	50,265	96	51,2010	6,522	11,809	24,734	4,7715	Meteorology & Atmc	0.6983	2	66,873
503	Herrmann, Wolfgang A.	Technical University of Mu	deu	502	39,937	93	46,9924	4,489	21,745	31,332	4,7677	Organic Chemistry	0.7039	16	154,108
598	Stamatakis, Alexandros	Heidelberg Institute for Th	deu	597	53,986	49	20,7997	28,655	36,109	43,342	4,7345	Evolutionary Biology	0.2381	7	27,371
617	Holsboer, Florian	Max Planck Institute of Psy	deu	616	62,499	122	55,8357	3,178	5,871	23,501	4,7276	Psychiatry	0.3817	18	71,064
637	Singer, Wolf	Max Planck Institute for Br	deu	636	43,660	93	49,6258	4,969	7,881	35,240	4,7213	Neurology & Neuros	0.6719	68	305,851
638	Brenner, Hermann	German Cancer Research C	deu	637	103,605	127	52,9228	779	11,497	30,547	4,7209	Oncology & Carcinog	0.3094	22	293,195
671	Kaufmann, Stefan H.E.	Max Planck Institute for In	deu	670	37,891	103	57,5552	4,194	6,860	27,220	4,7130	Immunology	0.4046	31	138,599
694	Hell, Stefan W.	Max Planck Institute for M	deu	693	41,294	102	45,6227	3,836	10,209	31,219	4,7056	Optics	0.2174	3	64,044
697	Hashmi, A. Stephen K.	Universität Heidelberg	deu	696	30,194	83	45,8373	4,964	17,988	27,954	4,7050	Organic Chemistry	0.5595	22	154,108
707	Jonas, Jost B.	Universität Heidelberg	deu	706	100,813	112	48,3032	1,026	15,043	23,845	4,7029	Ophthalmology & Of	0.6519	3	69,077
755	Andreas, Meinrat O.	Max Planck Institute for Cl	deu	754	43,074	95	48,2626	2,970	13,347	24,849	4,6904	Meteorology & Atmc	0.7097	4	66,873
759	Hartl, F. Ulrich	Max-Planck-Institut für Bio	deu	758	44,225	108	41,9758	3,334	10,215	30,260	4,6897	Developmental Biol	0.3882	53	127,685
836	Friederici, Angela D.	Max Planck Institute for Ht	deu	835	30,667	89	55,5647	3,843	9,746	23,521	4,6734	Experimental Psycho	0.4288	12	29,975
844	Löschner, Wolfgang	Tierärztliche Hochschule H	deu	843	28,707	77	52,3948	3,996	14,383	25,482	4,6720	Neurology & Neuros	0.5689	64	305,851
874	List, Benjamin	Max Planck Institute for Cc	deu	873	30,841	82	44,8588	5,201	10,313	29,803	4,6640	Organic Chemistry	0.5953	31	154,108

Ready 10561 of 194983 records found 100%

For researchers working in **The Netherlands**, the table looks as follows:

Table\_1\_Analysis.xlsx - Excel

Tell me what you want to do...

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	
	authfull	inst_name	entry	rank (N)	NCSF621	H21 (ns)	Hm21 (	NCSF(ns)	NCSF(n)	NCSFL (	C (ns)	sm-subfield-1	sm-subfi	rank s	sm-subfield-1	
1																
27	Dinarelo, Charles A.	Radboud University Medici nld	nld	26	100,508	163	87,8870	24,134	30,630	54,469	5,2787	Immunology	0.4229	2	138,599	
59	Clevers, Hans	Hubrecht Institute for Devl nld	nld	58	131,335	176	68,8009	8,276	14,021	89,141	5,1486	Developmental Biolc	0.4358	6	127,685	
146	Spek, Anthony L.	Bijvoet Centre for Biomole nld	nld	145	171,442	81	43,9741	32,226	32,305	44,559	4,9989	Inorganic & Nuclear	0.4166	2	70,192	
429	Van Genuchten, Martinus T	Universiteit Utrecht nld	nld	428	38,108	75	39,9536	17,128	20,363	31,450	4,7996	Environmental Engin	0.5080	2	54,000	
485	Bakker, Arnold B.	Erasmus Universiteit Rotte nld	nld	484	56,846	111	57,8381	1,505	20,588	31,924	4,7749	Business & Managem	0.5266	2	48,100	
564	van der Heijde, Desirée	Leids Universiteair Medisch nld	nld	563	73,532	131	45,9654	1,733	12,283	30,600	4,7428	Arthritis & Rheumatc	0.8314	4	35,286	
605	Feringa, B. L.	Stratigh Institute for Cher nld	nld	604	55,095	113	60,8949	1,942	6,076	42,851	4,7319	Organic Chemistry	0.5465	18	154,108	
611	Rosendaal, Frits R.	Leids Universiteair Medisch nld	nld	610	69,181	123	50,8156	2,590	7,812	25,127	4,7288	Cardiovascular Syste	0.3403	32	199,278	
778	Beenakker, C. W.J.	Lorentz Institute for Theor nld	nld	777	27,917	76	47,0385	7,849	12,607	24,092	4,6864	Applied Physics	0.4083	34	289,917	
818	Cuijpers, Pim	Vrije Universiteit Amsterda nld	nld	817	44,558	108	51,9002	1,699	13,716	22,358	4,6778	Psychiatry	0.4109	25	71,064	
933	Schaufeli, Wilmar B.	Universiteit Utrecht nld	nld	932	53,016	98	52,3753	797	14,590	35,369	4,6545	Business & Managem	0.4078	6	48,100	
1002	't Hooft, Gerard	Universiteit Utrecht nld	nld	1,001	22,475	44	40,2000	17,540	21,013	22,233	4,6444	Nuclear & Particle Ph	0.6259	11	141,567	
1007	Fauser, Bart C.J.M.	University Medical Center nld	nld	1,006	40,633	95	36,3594	4,321	11,607	23,669	4,6437	Obstetrics & Reprod	0.5667	4	87,536	
1016	Berendsen, Herman J.C.	Rijksuniversiteit Groningen nld	nld	1,015	90,747	66	37,0524	4,34	36,877	77,394	4,6426	Chemical Physics	0.4083	40	95,895	
1019	Katsnelson, Mikhail I.	Radboud Universiteit nld	nld	1,018	80,355	92	44,8099	2,757	8,004	17,591	4,6424	Applied Physics	0.4807	36	289,917	
1102	Lips, P.	Vrije Universiteit Amsterda nld	nld	1,101	44,145	105	40,0421	3,626	8,222	19,458	4,6293	Endocrinology & Me	0.4065	37	84,176	
1126	van Os, Jim	University Medical Center nld	nld	1,125	67,123	111	51,5551	667	10,303	26,562	4,6255	Psychiatry	0.7072	30	71,064	
1228	Mackenbach, Johan P.	Erasmus MC nld	nld	1,227	37,891	92	49,9563	1,908	9,018	23,944	4,6104	Public Health	0.2579	6	59,062	
1273	de Kloet, E. Ronald	Leids Universiteair Medisch nld	nld	1,272	36,366	92	49,7507	1,603	10,745	23,158	4,6034	Neurology & Neuros	0.3739	113	305,851	
1290	Bos, Johannes L.	University Medical Center nld	nld	1,289	31,985	82	35,9662	6,235	9,346	21,117	4,6012	Developmental Biolc	0.3542	96	127,685	
1359	van IJzendoorn, Marinus H	Erasmus Universiteit Rotte nld	nld	1,358	38,827	93	46,8270	1,956	8,238	23,314	4,5934	Developmental & Ch	0.4101	15	19,061	
1363	Blasse, George	Debye Instituut voor Nano nld	nld	1,362	20,399	66	50,4333	5,629	10,530	19,512	4,5930	Inorganic & Nuclear	0.2882	14	70,192	
1375	de Vos, Willem	Wageningen University & F nld	nld	1,374	82,824	135	60,0351	742	1,934	29,843	4,5900	Microbiology	0.5135	21	175,943	
1515	Reedijk, Jan	Leiden Institute of Chemist nld	nld	1,514	44,668	80	45,8962	3,272	3,932	28,569	4,5728	Inorganic & Nuclear	0.6279	9	70,192	
1540	Dekker, Cees	Kavli Institute of Nanoscienc nld	nld	1,539	50,174	91	37,7907	2,840	3,339	41,857	4,5696	Nanoscience & Nanc	0.3132	43	103,235	
1554	Dorenbos, Pieter	Delft University of Technol nld	nld	1,553	20,128	68	49,0306	7,646	9,247	12,103	4,5683	Applied Physics	0.4931	49	289,917	
1571	Scheffer, Marten	Leiden Institute of Chemist nld	nld	1,554	28,089	91	53,9091	2,735	4,788	20,741	4,5683	Energy	0.2719	13	265,592	
1555	Koper, Marc T.M.	Wageningen University & F nld	nld	1,570	50,033	90	40,1531	842	16,360	25,157	4,5672	Ecology	0.3993	28	59,970	
1759	Grol, Richard	Radboud Universiteit Medici nld	nld	1,758	30,814	78	41,9687	2,574	9,371	20,477	4,5453	Public Health	0.3088	12	59,062	
1823	Seidell, Jacob C.	Vrije Universiteit Amsterda nld	nld	1,822	40,637	93	44,5808	2,165	6,258	15,040	4,5382	Endocrinology & Me	0.2141	75	84,176	
1833	Krishna, Rajamani	Van 't Hoff Institute for Mc nld	nld	1,832	30,405	90	52,4329	1,574	8,572	14,171	4,5378	Chemical Engineerin	0.4524	5	67,880	

Ready 4063 of 194883 records found

100%

The people having **Artificial Intelligence & Image Processing** as the first subfield, the table looks as follows:

Table 1\_Analysis.xlsx - Excel

Tell me what you want to do...

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O
	authfull	inst_name	cntry	rank (N)	NC9621	H21 (n)	Hm21 (n)	NCS (ns)	NCSF (n)	NCSFL (n)	C (ns)	sm-subfield-1	sm-subf1	rank s	sm-subfield-
31	Zadeh, Lotfi A.	University of California, Be	usa	30	108,896	57	53,3690	102,258	102,381	108,707	5,2706	Artificial Intelligence	0.4055	1	321,592
49	Jain, Anil	Michigan State University	usa	49	94,530	136	78,7909	7,200	43,113	84,248	5,1811	Artificial Intelligence	0.7880	2	321,592
58	Hinton, Geoffrey	Google LLC	usa	57	222,230	94	54,6175	6,625	38,259	182,728	5,1512	Artificial Intelligence	0.5105	3	321,592
82	Bengio, Yoshua	Montreal Institute for Lear	can	81	191,194	114	49,6589	6,956	29,790	110,239	5,0974	Artificial Intelligence	0.6406	4	321,592
111	Yager, Ronald	Machine Intelligence Instit	usa	110	39,627	85	74,1262	25,790	31,216	38,370	5,0366	Artificial Intelligence	0.7984	5	321,592
191	Xu, Zeshui	Business School of Sichuan	chn	190	41,064	99	74,5742	12,263	22,378	30,258	4,9595	Artificial Intelligence	0.6120	6	321,592
276	van der Aalst, Wil M.P.	Rheinisch-Westfälische Te	deu	275	42,854	99	64,5252	6,678	21,516	35,435	4,8916	Artificial Intelligence	0.4585	7	321,592
299	Deb, Kalyanmoy	Michigan State University	usa	298	62,259	73	46,6607	5,313	45,683	53,178	4,8744	Artificial Intelligence	0.6837	8	321,592
327	Lowe, David G.	Google LLC	usa	326	67,759	37	24,5706	55,208	55,240	65,982	4,8595	Artificial Intelligence	0.6548	9	321,592
422	Kleinberg, Jon	Cornell University	usa	421	45,752	82	46,7833	12,465	15,578	27,793	4,8037	Artificial Intelligence	0.3823	14	321,592
440	Pentland, Alex	MIT Media Lab	usa	439	56,178	92	55,5384	4,636	9,381	48,863	4,7964	Artificial Intelligence	0.5054	13	321,592
515	Yang, Xin she	Middlesex University	gbr	514	35,424	66	40,0190	13,999	24,746	28,882	4,7642	Artificial Intelligence	0.4654	12	321,592
527	Schmidhuber, Jürgen	IDSIA Dalle Molle Institute	che	526	76,278	66	33,9623	9,634	10,021	71,506	4,7573	Artificial Intelligence	0.7327	15	321,592
560	Mallat, Stéphane	Collège de France	fra	559	44,024	44	27,7333	23,586	38,278	42,161	4,7445	Artificial Intelligence	0.3162	18	321,592
631	Cao, Jinde	Southwest University	chn	630	46,541	105	73,8833	1,552	8,229	29,782	4,7231	Artificial Intelligence	0.3179	11	321,592
634	Shamir, Adi	Weizmann Institute of Scie	isr	633	42,202	62	38,9333	14,158	14,662	29,780	4,7221	Artificial Intelligence	0.5631	19	321,592
660	Jordan, Michael I.	University of California, Be	usa	659	86,635	111	55,9921	930	5,929	64,655	4,7157	Artificial Intelligence	0.4167	20	321,592
780	Pedrycz, Witold	University of Alberta	can	779	32,757	79	57,9762	5,017	9,540	23,277	4,6861	Artificial Intelligence	0.7035	16	321,592
781	Herrera, Francisco	Universidad de Granada	esp	780	57,273	112	58,9984	516	12,699	48,384	4,6859	Artificial Intelligence	0.8094	17	321,592
795	Canny, John	University of California, Be	usa	794	28,256	48	34,5429	21,321	22,151	27,195	4,6825	Artificial Intelligence	0.2622	24	321,592
814	Han, Jiawei	University of Illinois Urban	usa	813	70,458	120	60,9885	310	14,924	41,470	4,6794	Artificial Intelligence	0.5304	22	321,592
881	Mendel, Jerry M.	University of Southern Cali	usa	880	29,629	69	48,5095	5,963	11,557	27,774	4,6619	Artificial Intelligence	0.4659	21	321,592
901	Girshick, Ross	Facebook Research	usa	900	118,183	59	16,8219	9,834	25,597	38,939	4,6593	Artificial Intelligence	0.8690	27	321,592
937	Blei, David	Columbia University	usa	936	48,346	64	32,8500	2,661	32,218	41,429	4,6543	Artificial Intelligence	0.5561	26	321,592
979	Boneh, Dan	Stanford University	usa	978	39,931	83	42,4560	1,104	31,394	34,863	4,6484	Artificial Intelligence	0.5299	29	321,592
1003	Zhang, Zhengyou	Tencent	chn	1,002	27,049	53	32,5262	17,265	19,335	23,613	4,6443	Artificial Intelligence	0.6295	30	321,592
1017	Zhou, Zhi Hua	Nanjing University	chn	1,016	37,327	87	49,9143	2,328	9,968	30,246	4,6425	Artificial Intelligence	0.6649	25	321,592
1050	Unser, Michael	Ecole Polytechnique Fédér	che	1,049	29,940	81	45,3591	4,397	9,884	27,060	4,6367	Artificial Intelligence	0.2556	23	321,592
1220	Lampert, Leslie	Microsoft Research	usa	1,219	23,329	46	36,9417	14,657	18,221	22,513	4,6121	Artificial Intelligence	0.3258	33	321,592
1266	Elad, Michael	Technion - Israel Institute	isr	1,265	41,868	70	39,1512	3,910	12,865	22,672	4,6044	Artificial Intelligence	0.3640	34	321,592
1278	Szeliski, Richard	University of Washington	usa	1,277	40,968	84	45,0357	2,705	6,175	32,810	4,6025	Artificial Intelligence	0.6099	35	321,592

Ready 6826 of 194983 records found

Readers interested in creating their own analyses can download the dataset created by John Ioannidis and his colleagues [2] and read the supporting articles [3,4,5]. In my view, this is a great initiative to address the apparent problems related to naively counting papers and citations. As usual, the impact of scientific work can only be measured after some time. Hence, measures such as the **C**-score should **not be used to evaluate early career researchers**. However, it could help younger researchers to set goals. Also, one should never forget the first principle of the Leiden Manifesto for research metrics [1]: "Quantitative evaluation should support qualitative, expert assessment. Quantitative metrics can challenge bias tendencies in peer review and facilitate deliberation. This should strengthen peer review, because making judgments about colleagues is difficult without a range of relevant information. However, assessors must not be tempted to cede decision-making to the numbers. Indicators must not substitute for informed judgment. Everyone retains responsibility for their assessments." However, as also demonstrated in [8], **it is very well possible to conduct a fair and inclusive cross-disciplinary comparison of research performance using Google Scholar or Scopus as a data source and more refined measures that correct for the number of authors**.

## References

- [1] Hicks, D., Wouters, P., Waltman, L. et al. Bibliometrics (2015), The Leiden Manifesto for research metrics. Nature 520, 429–431, <https://doi.org/10.1038/520429a>
- [2] Ioannidis, J. (2022), "September 2022 data-update for "Updated science-wide author databases of standardized citation indicators"", Mendeley Data, V5, doi: 10.17632/btchxktzyw.5 <https://elsevier.digitalcommonsdata.com/datasets/btchxktzyw/5>
- [3] Ioannidis J., Klavans R., Boyack . K. (2016), Correction: Multiple Citation Indicators and Their Composite across Scientific Disciplines. PLOS Biology 14(8): e1002548. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pbio.1002548>
- [4] Ioannidis J., Baas J., Klavans R., Boyack K. (2019), A standardized citation metrics author database annotated for scientific field. PLoS Biol 17(8): e3000384. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pbio.3000384>
- [5] Ioannidis J., Boyack K., Baas J. (2020), Updated science-wide author databases of standardized citation indicators. PLoS Biol 18(10): e3000918. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pbio.3000918>
- [6] Recognition and Rewards ("Erkennen en Waarderen") program (2019), an initiative by VSNU, NFWO, KNAW, NWO and ZonMw, <https://recognitionrewards.nl/>
- [7] COARA (2022), Agreement on reforming research assessment, <https://coara.eu/>.
- [8] Harzing, AW., Alakangas, S. Google Scholar, Scopus and the Web of Science: a longitudinal and cross-disciplinary comparison. Scientometrics 106, 787–804 (2016). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-015-1798-9>