



Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

Bibliometric uncertainty: data quality, reliability, and validity

Donner, P.

Citation

Donner, P. (2026, October 1). *Bibliometric uncertainty: data quality, reliability, and validity*. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/4310427>

Version: Publisher's Version

License: [Licence agreement concerning inclusion of doctoral thesis in the Institutional Repository of the University of Leiden](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/4310427>

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

References

- Abalkina, A. (2024). Challenges posed by hijacked journals in Scopus. *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology*, 75(4), 395–422. <https://doi.org/10.1002/asi.24855>
- Abramo, G. (2024). The forced battle between peer-review and scientometric research assessment: Why the CoARA initiative is unsound. *Research Evaluation*, rvae021. <https://doi.org/10.1093/reseval/rvae021>
- Abramo, G., Cicero, T., & D’Angelo, C. A. (2012). A sensitivity analysis of researchers’ productivity rankings to the time of citation observation. *Journal of Informetrics*, 6(2), 192–201. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joi.2011.12.003>
- Abt, H. A. (1992). What fraction of literature references are incorrect? *Publications of the Astronomical Society of the Pacific*, 104(673), 235. <https://doi.org/10.1086/132982>
- Aksnes, D. W., Langfeldt, L., & Wouters, P. (2019). Citations, citation indicators, and research quality: An overview of basic concepts and theories. *Sage Open*, 9(1), 2158244019829575. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244019829575>
- Aksnes, D. W., Piro, F. N., & Fossum, L. W. (2023). Citation metrics covary with researchers’ assessments of the quality of their works. *Quantitative Science Studies*, 4(1), 105–126. https://doi.org/10.1162/qss_a_00241
- Alperin, J. P., Muñoz Nieves, C., Schimanski, L. A., Fischman, G. E., Niles, M. T., & McKiernan, E. C. (2019). How significant are the public dimensions of faculty work in review, promotion and tenure documents? *ELife*, 8, e42254. <https://doi.org/10.7554/eLife.42254>
- Álvarez-Bornstein, B., Morillo, F., & Bordons, M. (2017). Funding acknowledgments in the Web of Science: Completeness and accuracy of collected data. *Scientometrics*, 112(3), 1793–1812. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-017-2453-4>
- Alwin, D. F. (2005). Reliability. In K. Kempf-Leonard (Ed.), *Encyclopaedia of social measurement* (Vol. 3, pp. 351–359). Elsevier.
- Aman, V., & van den Besselaar, P. (2024). Authorship regulations in performance-based funding systems and publication behaviour – A case study of German medical faculties. *Journal of Informetrics*, 18(2), 101500. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joi.2024.101500>
- Anonymous. (2002). Errors in citation statistics. *Nature*, 415, 101.
- ARC. (2015). *Excellence in Research for Australia (ERA) 2015 Evaluation*

- Handbook*. [http://archive.erc.gov.au/archive/files/ERA/2015/Key%20Documents/ERA](http://archive.erc.gov.au/archive/files/ERA/2015/Key%20Documents/ERA%2015%20Evaluation%20Handbook.pdf) 2015 Evaluation Handbook.pdf
- Baas, J., Schotten, M., Plume, A., Côté, G., & Karimi, R. (2020). Scopus as a curated, high-quality bibliometric data source for academic research in quantitative science studies. *Quantitative Science Studies*, 1(1), 377–386. https://doi.org/10.1162/qss_a_00019
- Baccini, A., De Nicolao, G., & Petrovich, E. (2019). Citation gaming induced by bibliometric evaluation: A country-level comparative analysis. *PLoS One*, 14(9), e0221212. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0221212>
- Baeza-Yates, R., & Ribeiro-Neto, B. (1999). *Modern information retrieval*. ACM Press.
- Barrios, M., Guilera, G., & Gómez-Benito, J. (2013). Impact and structural features of meta-analytical studies, standard articles and reviews in psychology: Similarities and differences. *Journal of Informetrics*, 7(2), 478–486. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joi.2013.01.012>
- Batini, C., & Scannapieco, M. (2006). *Data quality. Concepts, methodologies and techniques*. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer-Verlag. <https://doi.org/10.1007/3-540-33173-5>
- Berlemann, M., & Haucap, J. (2015). Which factors drive the decision to opt out of individual research rankings? An empirical study of academic resistance to change. *Research Policy*, 44(5), 1108–1115. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2014.12.002>
- Besançon, L., Cabanac, G., Labbé, C., & Magazinov, A. (2024). Sneaked references: Fabricated reference metadata distort citation counts. *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology*. <https://doi.org/10.1002/asi.24896>
- Bhandari, M., Busse, J., Devereaux, P., Montori, V. M., Swiontkowski, M., Tornetta III, P., Einhorn, T. A., Khera, V., & Schemitsch, E. H. (2007). Factors associated with citation rates in the orthopedic literature. *Canadian Journal of Surgery*, 50(2), 119.
- Bimber, B., & Guston, D. H. (1995). Politics by the same means: Government and science in the united states. In *Handbook of science and technology studies, revised edition* (pp. 554–571). SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Birkle, C., Pendlebury, D. A., Schnell, J., & Adams, J. (2020). Web of Science as a data source for research on scientific and scholarly activity. *Quantitative Science Studies*, 1(1), 363–376. https://doi.org/10.1162/qss_a_00018
- Bornmann, L., & Marx, W. (2018). Critical rationalism and the search for stan-

- dard (field-normalized) indicators in bibliometrics. *Journal of Informetrics*, 12(3), 598–604. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joi.2018.05.002>
- Braun, T., Glänzel, W., & Schubert, A. (1989a). Assessing assessments of British science. Some facts and figures to accept or decline. *Scientometrics*, 15, 165–170.
- Braun, T., Glänzel, W., & Schubert, A. (1989b). Some data on the distribution of journal publication types in the Science Citation Index database. *Scientometrics*, 15, 325–330. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02017057>
- Buchanan, R. A. (2006). Accuracy of cited references: The role of citation databases. *College & Research Libraries*, 67(4), 292–303. <https://doi.org/10.5860/crl.67.4.292>
- Bürkner, P.-C. (2017). brms: An R package for Bayesian generalized linear mixed models using Stan. *Journal of Statistical Software*, 80(1), 1–28. <https://doi.org/10.18637/jss.v080.i01>
- Carmines, E. G., & Woods, J. A. (2005). Validity assessment. In K. Kempf-Leonard (Ed.), *Encyclopaedia of social measurement* (Vol. 3, pp. 933–937). Elsevier.
- Caron, E., & van Eck, N. J. (2014). Large scale author name disambiguation using rule-based scoring and clustering. *Proceedings of the 19th International Conference on Science and Technology Indicators*, 79–86.
- Céspedes, L., Kozłowski, D., Pradier, C., Sainte-Marie, M. H., Shokida, N. S., Benz, P., Poitras, C., Ninkov, A. B., Ebrahimi, S., Ayeni, P., et al. (2025). Evaluating the linguistic coverage of OpenAlex: An assessment of metadata accuracy and completeness. *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology*. <https://doi.org/10.1002/asi.24979>
- Chaiworapongsa, T., Espinoza, J., Gotsch, F., Kim, Y. M., Kim, G. J., Goncalves, L. F., Edwin, S., Kusanovic, J. P., Erez, O., Than, N. G., et al. (2008). The maternal plasma soluble vascular endothelial growth factor receptor-1 concentration is elevated in SGA and the magnitude of the increase relates to Doppler abnormalities in the maternal and fetal circulation. *The Journal of Maternal-Fetal & Neonatal Medicine*, 21(1), 25–40. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14767050701832833>
- Chinchilla-Rodríguez, Z., Costas, R., Robinson-García, N., & Larivière, V. (2024). Examining the quality of the corresponding authorship field in Web of Science and Scopus. *Quantitative Science Studies*, 5(1), 76–97. https://doi.org/10.1162/qss_a_00288
- Cioffi, A., Coppini, S., Massari, A., Moretti, A., Peroni, S., Santini, C., &

- Shahidzadeh Asadi, N. (2022). Identifying and correcting invalid citations due to DOI errors in Crossref data. *Scientometrics*, 127(6), 3593–3612. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-022-04367-w>
- Colliander, C., & Ahlgren, P. (2019). Comparison of publication-level approaches to ex-post citation normalization. *Scientometrics*, 120(1), 283–300. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-019-03121-z>
- Corry, L. (2015). *A brief history of numbers*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Cruz-Castro, L., & Sanz-Menendez, L. (2021). What should be rewarded? Gender and evaluation criteria for tenure and promotion. *Journal of Informetrics*, 15(3), 101196. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joi.2021.101196>
- Csiszar, A. (2017). The catalogue that made metrics, and changed science. *Nature*, 551(7679), 163–165. <https://doi.org/10.1038/551163a>
- Culbert, J. H., Hobert, A., Jahn, N., Haupka, N., Schmidt, M., Donner, P., & Mayr, P. (2025). Reference coverage analysis of OpenAlex compared to Web of Science and Scopus. *Scientometrics*, 130(4), 2475–2492. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-025-05293-3>
- Cuxac, P., Lamirel, J.-C., & Bonvallot, V. (2013). Efficient supervised and semi-supervised approaches for affiliations disambiguation. *Scientometrics*, 97, 47–58. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-013-1025-5>
- D’Angelo, C. A., Giuffrida, C., & Abramo, G. (2011). A heuristic approach to author name disambiguation in bibliometrics databases for large-scale research assessments. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology*, 62(2), 257–269. <https://doi.org/10.1002/asi.21460>
- D’Angelo, C. A., & van Eck, N. J. (2020). Collecting large-scale publication data at the level of individual researchers: A practical proposal for author name disambiguation. *Scientometrics*, 123, 883–907. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-020-03410-y>
- Daraio, C., Di Leo, S., & Scannapieco, M. (2022). Accounting for quality in data integration systems: A completeness-aware integration approach. *Scientometrics*, 127(3), 1465–1490. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-022-04266-0>
- De Bellis, N. (2009). *Bibliometrics and citation analysis: from the Science Citation Index to cybermetrics*. Lanham, Toronto, Plymouth: Scarecrow Press.
- De Bruin, R., & Moed, H. (1990). The unification of addresses in scientific publications. In L. Egghe & R. Rousseau (Eds.), *Informetrics 1989/90* (pp. 65–78). Amsterdam: Elsevier Science Publishers.
- Dederke, J., Koch, M., & Willemin, S. (2024). The representation of Swiss

- higher education institutions in five bibliometric databases. *Qualität in Der Wissenschaft*, 18(4), 117–124.
- Demetrescu, C., Ribichini, A., & Schaerf, M. (2018). Accuracy of author names in bibliographic data sources: An Italian case study. *Scientometrics*, 117(3), 1777–1791. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-018-2945-x>
- Dickersin, K., Scherer, R., Suci, E. S. T., & Gil-Montero, M. (2002). Problems with indexing and citation of articles with group authorship. *JAMA*, 287(21), 2772–2774. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.287.21.2772>
- Dieks, D., & Chang, H. (1976). Differences in impact of scientific publications: Some indices derived from a citation analysis. *Social Studies of Science*, 6(2), 247–267. <https://doi.org/10.1177/030631277600600204>
- Donner, P. (2016a). Missing citations due to exact reference matching: Analysis of a random sample from WoS. Are publications from peripheral countries disadvantaged? *21st International Conference on Science and Technology Indicators-STI 2016. Book of Proceedings*, 85–89.
- Donner, P. (2016b). Enhanced self-citation detection by fuzzy author name matching and complementary error estimates. *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology*, 67(3), 662–670. <https://doi.org/10.1002/asi.23399>
- Donner, P. (2017). Document type assignment accuracy in the journal citation index data of Web of Science. *Scientometrics*, 113(1), 219–236. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-017-2483-y>
- Donner, P. (2020). A validation of coauthorship credit models with empirical data from the contributions of PhD candidates. *Quantitative Science Studies*, 1(2), 551–564. https://doi.org/10.1162/qss_a_00048
- Donner, P., & Blümel, C. (2024). Towards a valid bibliometric measure of epistemic breadth of researchers. *arXiv Preprint arXiv:2411.02005*. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2411.02005>
- Donner, P., Rimmert, C., & van Eck, N. J. (2020). Comparing institutional-level bibliometric research performance indicator values based on different affiliation disambiguation systems. *Quantitative Science Studies*, 1(1), 150–170. https://doi.org/10.1162/qss_a_00013
- Dubin, D. (2004). The most influential paper Gerard Salton never wrote. *Library Trends*, 52(4), 748–764.
- Dyachenko, E., & Pislyakov, V. (2010). Scientometric journals in scientometric databases. Microlevel analysis of lost citations. *11th International Conference on Science and Technology Indicators. Book of Abstracts*, 84–86.

- Efron, B., & Tibshirani, R. J. (1993). *An introduction to the bootstrap*. Dordrecht: Springer Science+Business Media.
- El-Ouahi, J. (2023). The Arabic Citation Index: Toward a better understanding of Arab scientific literature. *Quantitative Science Studies*, 4(3), 728–755. https://doi.org/10.1162/qss_a_00261
- Elzinga, A. (2012). Features of the current science policy regime: Viewed in historical perspective. *Science and Public Policy*, 39(4), 416–428. <https://doi.org/10.1093/scipol/scs046>
- Erman, N., & Todorovski, L. (2015). The effects of measurement error in case of scientific network analysis. *Scientometrics*, 104(2), 453–473. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-015-1615-5>
- European Commission and Directorate-General for Research and Innovation. (2024). *Science, research and innovation performance of the EU, 2024 – A competitive Europe for a sustainable future*. Publications Office of the European Union. <https://doi.org/doi/10.2777/965670>
- Fenton, A., Donner, P., Ambrasat, J., Fabian, G., & Heger, C. (2024). How accurate are Scopus publication counts of researchers? A survey-bibliometric comparison for Germany. *28th International Conference on Science, Technology and Innovation Indicators (STI2024), Berlin, Germany*. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.13991905>
- Franceschini, F., Maisano, D., & Mastrogiacomo, L. (2013). A novel approach for estimating the omitted-citation rate of bibliometric databases with an application to the field of bibliometrics. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology*, 64(10), 2149–2156. <https://doi.org/10.1002/asi.22898>
- Franceschini, F., Maisano, D., & Mastrogiacomo, L. (2014). Scientific journal publishers and omitted citations in bibliometric databases: Any relationship? *Journal of Informetrics*, 8(3), 751–765. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joi.2014.07.003>
- Franceschini, F., Maisano, D., & Mastrogiacomo, L. (2015a). Errors in DOI indexing by bibliometric databases. *Scientometrics*, 102(3), 2181–2186. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-014-1503-4>
- Franceschini, F., Maisano, D., & Mastrogiacomo, L. (2015b). Influence of omitted citations on the bibliometric statistics of the major manufacturing journals. *Scientometrics*, 103(3), 1083–1122. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-015-1583-9>
- Franceschini, F., Maisano, D., & Mastrogiacomo, L. (2016). The museum of

- errors/horrors in Scopus. *Journal of Informetrics*, 10(1), 174–182. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joi.2015.11.006>
- French, J. C., Powell, A. L., & Schulman, E. (2000). Using clustering strategies for creating authority files. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science*, 51(8), 774–786. [https://doi.org/10.1002/\(SICI\)1097-4571\(2000\)51:8%3C774::AID-ASI90%3E3.0.CO;2-P](https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1097-4571(2000)51:8%3C774::AID-ASI90%3E3.0.CO;2-P)
- Gadd, E., Holmes, R., & Shearer, J. (2021). Developing a method for evaluating global university rankings. *Scholarly Assessment Reports*, 3(1), 2. <https://doi.org/10.29024/sar.31>
- Gai, S.-S., Liu, X.-L., Zhang, S.-L., & Liu, R.-Y. (2015). The citation evolution law of papers published in the same year but different month. *Learned Publishing*, 28(2), 132–139. <https://doi.org/10.1087/20150207>
- Galvez, C., & Moya-Anegón, F. (2007). Standardizing formats of corporate source data. *Scientometrics*, 70(1), 3–26. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-007-0101-0>
- Gálvez, C., & Moya-Anegón, F. (2006). The unification of institutional addresses applying parametrized finite-state graphs (P-FSG). *Scientometrics*, 69(2), 323–345. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-006-0156-3>
- García-Pérez, M. A. (2010). Accuracy and completeness of publication and citation records in the Web of Science, PsycINFO, and Google Scholar: A case study for the computation of h indices in psychology. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology*, 61(10), 2070–2085. <https://doi.org/10.1002/asi.21372>
- García-Pérez, M. A. (2011). Strange attractors in the Web of Science database. *Journal of Informetrics*, 5(1), 214–218. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joi.2010.07.006>
- García-Pérez, M. A. (2015). Online supplemental information: A sizeable black hole for citations. *Scientometrics*, 102(2), 1655–1659. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-014-1348-x>
- Garfield, E. (1955). Citation indexes for science: A new dimension in documentation through association of ideas. *Science*, 122(3159), 108–111. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.122.3159.108>
- Garfield, E. (1964). Science citation index — a new dimension in indexing. *Science*, 144(3619), 649–654. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.144.3619.649>
- Garfield, E. (1978). False publication dates and other rip-offs. *Current Contents*, 20, 5–8.
- Garfield, E. (1979). *Citation indexing—its theory and application in science*,

- technology, and humanities*. ISI Press, Philadelphia.
- Garfield, E. (1983). Quality control at ISI: A piece of your mind can help us in our quest for error-free bibliographic information. *Current Contents*, 19, 5–12.
- Garfield, E. (1996). When to cite. *The Library Quarterly*, 66(4), 449–458.
- Garfield, E. (2001). Recollections of Irving H. Sher 1924–1996: Polymath/information scientist extraordinaire. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology*, 52(14), 1197–1202. <https://doi.org/10.1002/asi.1187>
- Gauch, S. (2021). The ironic becomings of reflexivity—The case of citation theory in bibliometrics. *Historical Social Research/Historische Sozialforschung*, 46(2), 155–177. <https://doi.org/10.12759/hsr.46.2021.2.155-177>
- Gauffriau, M. (2021). Counting methods introduced into the bibliometric research literature 1970–2018: A review. *Quantitative Science Studies*, 2(3), 932–975. https://doi.org/10.1162/qss_a_00141
- Giri, R., & Das, A. K. (2011). Indian Citation Index: a new web platform for measuring performance of Indian research periodicals. *Library Hi Tech News*, 28(3), 33–35. <https://doi.org/10.1108/07419051111145154>
- Glänzel, W. (1996). The need for standards in bibliometric research and technology. *Scientometrics*, 35, 167–176. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02018475>
- Glänzel, W. (2008). Seven myths in bibliometrics about facts and fiction in quantitative science studies. *Collnet Journal of Scientometrics and Information Management*, 2(1), 9–17. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09737766.2008.10700836>
- Glänzel, W., & Thijs, B. (2004). Does co-authorship inflate the share of self-citations? *Scientometrics*, 61(3), 395–404. <https://doi.org/10.1023/B:SCIE.0000045117.13348.b1>
- Gläser, J. (2024). How can we make “research quality” a theoretical concept? *Research Evaluation*, 33, rva038. <https://doi.org/10.1093/reseval/rvae038>
- Godin, B. (2005). *Measurement and statistics on science and technology: 1920 to the present*. Routledge.
- Gorin, S. V., Koroleva, A. M., Gerasimov, A. N., & Voronov, A. A. (2020). The Russian Science Citation Index (RSCI): the first three years (2016–2018). *European Science Editing*, 46, e51051. <https://doi.org/10.3897/ese.2020.e51051>
- Gorraiz, J., & Schloegl, C. (2008). A bibliometric analysis of pharmacology and pharmacy journals: Scopus versus Web of Science. *Journal of Information Science*, 34(5), 715–725. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0165551507086991>

- Grassano, N., Rotolo, D., Hutton, J., Lang, F., & Hopkins, M. M. (2017). Funding data from publication acknowledgments: Coverage, uses, and limitations. *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology*, 68(4), 999–1017. <https://doi.org/10.1002/asi.23737>
- Gunashekar, S., Wooding, S., & Guthrie, S. (2017). How do NIHR peer review panels use bibliometric information to support their decisions? *Scientometrics*, 112, 1813–1835. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-017-2417-8>
- Haddow, G., & Hammarfelt, B. (2019). Quality, impact, and quantification: Indicators and metrics use by social scientists. *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology*, 70(1), 16–26. <https://doi.org/10.1002/asi.24097>
- Hager, S., Schwarz, C., & Waldinger, F. (2024). Measuring science: Performance metrics and the allocation of talent. *American Economic Review*, 114(12), 4052–4090. <https://doi.org/10.1257/aer.20230515>
- Hammarfelt, B., Nelhans, G., Eklund, P., & Åström, F. (2016). The heterogeneous landscape of bibliometric indicators: Evaluating models for allocating resources at Swedish universities. *Research Evaluation*, 25(3), 292–305. <https://doi.org/10.1093/reseval/rvv040>
- Hammarfelt, B., & Rushforth, A. D. (2017). Indicators as judgment devices: An empirical study of citizen bibliometrics in research evaluation. *Research Evaluation*, 26(3), 169–180. <https://doi.org/10.1093/reseval/rvx018>
- Hargens, L. L., & Schuman, H. (1990). Citation counts and social comparisons: Scientists’ use and evaluation of citation index data. *Social Science Research*, 19(3), 205–221. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0049-089X\(90\)90006-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/0049-089X(90)90006-5)
- Harzing, A.-W. (2013). Document categories in the ISI Web of Knowledge: Misunderstanding the social sciences? *Scientometrics*, 94(1), 23–34. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-012-0738-1>
- Haslam, N., Ban, L., Kaufmann, L., Loughnan, S., Peters, K., Whelan, J., & Wilson, S. (2008). What makes an article influential? Predicting impact in social and personality psychology. *Scientometrics*, 76(1), 169–185. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-007-1892-8>
- Haunschild, R., Daniels, A. D., & Bornmann, L. (2022). Scores of a specific field-normalized indicator calculated with different approaches of field-categorization: Are the scores different or similar? *Journal of Informetrics*, 16(1), 101241. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joi.2021.101241>
- Haunschild, R., Schier, H., Marx, W., & Bornmann, L. (2018). Algorithmically generated subject categories based on citation relations: An empirical micro

- study using papers on overall water splitting. *Journal of Informetrics*, 12(2), 436–447. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joi.2018.03.004>
- Haupka, N., Culbert, J. H., Schniedermann, A., Jahn, N., & Mayr, P. (2024). Analysis of the publication and document types in OpenAlex, Web of Science, Scopus, Pubmed and Semantic Scholar. *arXiv Preprint arXiv:2406.15154*. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2406.15154>
- Hauschke, C., & Nazarovets, S. (2025). (Non-) retracted academic papers in OpenAlex. *Journal of Information Science*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/01655515251322478>
- Held, M., Laudel, G., & Gläser, J. (2021). Challenges to the validity of topic reconstruction. *Scientometrics*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-021-03920-3>
- Heneberg, P. (2013). Supposedly uncited articles of Nobel laureates and Fields medalists can be prevalently attributed to the errors of omission and commission. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology*, 64(3), 448–454. <https://doi.org/10.1002/asi.22788>
- Herzog, C., Hook, D., & Konkiel, S. (2020). Dimensions: Bringing down barriers between scientometricians and data. *Quantitative Science Studies*, 1(1), 387–395. https://doi.org/10.1162/qss_a_00020
- Hicks, D. (2012). Performance-based university research funding systems. *Research Policy*, 41(2), 251–261. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2011.09.007>
- Hicks, D., & Wang, J. (2011). Coverage and overlap of the new social sciences and humanities journal lists. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology*, 62(2), 284–294. <https://doi.org/10.1002/asi.21458>
- Hicks, D., Wouters, P., Waltman, L., de Rijcke, S., & Rafols, I. (2015). Bibliometrics: The Leiden Manifesto for research metrics. *Nature*, 520(7548), 429–431. <https://doi.org/10.1038/520429a>
- Hua, W. (2001). The development of the Chinese Social Sciences Citation Index. *The Indexer: The International Journal of Indexing*, 22(3), 128–129. <https://doi.org/10.3828/indexer.2001.22.3.6>
- Huang, C.-K., Neylon, C., Brookes-Kenworthy, C., Hosking, R., Montgomery, L., Wilson, K., & Ozaygen, A. (2020). Comparison of bibliographic data sources: Implications for the robustness of university rankings. *Quantitative Science Studies*, 1(2), 445–478. https://doi.org/10.1162/qss_a_00031
- Huang, S., Yang, B., Yan, S., & Rousseau, R. (2014). Institution name disambiguation for research assessment. *Scientometrics*, 99, 823–838. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-014-1388-1>

[//doi.org/10.1007/s11192-013-1214-2](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-013-1214-2)

- Hunter, J. E., & Schmidt, F. L. (2004). *Methods of meta-analysis: Correcting error and bias in research findings* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, London, New Delhi: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Irvine, J., Martin, B., Peacock, T., & Turner, R. (1985). Charting the decline in British science. *Nature*, *316*(6029), 587–590.
- Jacsó, P. (2009). Errors of omission and their implications for computing scientometric measures in evaluating the publishing productivity and impact of countries. *Online Information Review*, *33*(2), 376–385. <https://doi.org/10.1108/14684520910951276>
- JCGM. (2008). *Evaluation of measurement data – guide to the expression of uncertainty in measurement* (JCGM 100). Joint Committee for Guides in Metrology.
- Jergas, H., & Baethge, C. (2015). Quotation accuracy in medical journal articles—a systematic review and meta-analysis. *PeerJ*, *3*, e1364. <https://doi.org/10.7717/peerj.1364>
- Jiang, Y., Zheng, H.-T., Wang, X., Lu, B., & Wu, K. (2011). Affiliation disambiguation for constructing semantic digital libraries. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology*, *62*(6), 1029–1041. <https://doi.org/10.1002/asi.21538>
- Jin, B., & Wang, B. (1999). Chinese Science Citation Database: its construction and application. *Scientometrics*, *45*, 325–332. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02458440>
- Jonnalagadda, S., & Topham, P. (2010). NEMO: Extraction and normalization of organization names from PubMed affiliation strings. *Journal of Biomedical Discovery and Collaboration*, *5*, 50.
- Kamrani, P., Dorsch, I., & Stock, W. G. (2021). Do researchers know what the h-index is? And how do they estimate its importance? *Scientometrics*, *126*(7), 5489–5508. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-021-03968-1>
- Kealey, T. (1991). Government-funded academic science is a consumer good, not a producer good: a comparative reassessment of Britain’s scientific and technological achievements since 1794 and a comment on the bibliometry of B. Martin and J. Irvine. *Scientometrics*, *20*(2), 369–394.
- Kealey, T., & Micheals, P. J. (2019). Science and liberty. A complicated relationship. In P. J. Micheals & T. Kealey (Eds.), *Scientocracy. The tangled web of public science and public policy*. Washington, DC: Cato Institute.
- Klavans, R., & Boyack, K. W. (2017). Which type of citation analysis generates

- the most accurate taxonomy of scientific and technical knowledge? *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology*, 68(4), 984–998. <https://doi.org/10.1002/asi.23734>
- Korn, E. L., & Graubard, B. I. (1998). Confidence intervals for proportions with small expected number of positive counts estimated from survey data. *Survey Methodology*, 24, 193–201.
- Krauskopf, E. (2019). Missing documents in Scopus: the case of the journal *Enfermeria Nefrológica*. *Scientometrics*, 119(1), 543–547. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-019-03040-z>
- Krauskopf, E., & Salgado, M. (2023). Inconsistency in the registration of the Digital Object Identifier (DOI) of articles on Web of Science and Scopus. *Investigación Bibliotecológica: Archivonomía, Bibliotecología e Información*, 37(96), 129–144. <https://doi.org/10.22201/iibi.24488321xe.2023.96.58784>
- Kronman, U., Gunnarsson, M., & Karlsson, S. (2010). *The bibliometric database at the Swedish Research Council – Contents, methods and indicators*. Stockholm: Swedish Research Council.
- Leibel, C., & Bornmann, L. (2026). Introducing multiverse analysis to bibliometrics: The case of team size effects on disruptive research. *Quantitative Science Studies*. <https://doi.org/10.1162/QSS.a.475>
- Lenke, C., & Taubert, N. (2024). *Institutional coding*. <https://gitlab.ub.uni-bielefeld.de/ag-bibliometrie/institutional-coding>
- Lenzerini, M., & Daraio, C. (2019). Challenges, approaches and solutions in data integration for research and innovation. In W. Glänzel, H. F. Moed, U. Schmoch, & M. Thelwall (Eds.), *Springer handbook of science and technology indicators* (pp. 397–420). Cham: Springer Nature Switzerland AG. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-02511-3_15
- Levitt, J. M., & Thelwall, M. (2011). A combined bibliometric indicator to predict article impact. *Information Processing & Management*, 47(2), 300–308. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ipm.2010.09.005>
- Lewis, G., Cottrell, R., & Dixon, D. (1999). Bibliometric indicators to assist the peer review process in grant decisions. *Research Evaluation*, 8(1), 47–52. <https://doi.org/10.3152/147154499781777621>
- Leydesdorff, L. (1988). Problems with the “measurement” of national scientific performance. *Science and Public Policy*, 15(3), 149–152.
- Leydesdorff, L. (2001). *The challenge of scientometrics: The development, measurement, and self-organization of scientific communications* (2nd ed.). Universal Publishers.

- Leydesdorff, L. (2017). The positive side of discursive disagreements in the social sciences. *Journal of Informetrics*, 11(4), 1043. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joi.2017.09.006>
- Leydesdorff, L., Wouters, P., & Bornmann, L. (2016). Professional and citizen bibliometrics: Complementarities and ambivalences in the development and use of indicators—a state-of-the-art report. *Scientometrics*, 109(3), 2129–2150. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-016-2150-8>
- Liang, L., Zhong, Z., & Rousseau, R. (2014). Scientists’ referencing (mis) behavior revealed by the dissemination network of referencing errors. *Scientometrics*, 101(3), 1973–1986. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-014-1275-x>
- Liu, W. (2020). Accuracy of funding information in scopus: A comparative case study. *Scientometrics*, 124(1), 803–811. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-020-03458-w>
- Liu, W., Hu, G., & Tang, L. (2018). Missing author address information in Web of Science—An explorative study. *Journal of Informetrics*, 12(3), 985–997. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joi.2018.07.008>
- Liu, W., Huang, M., & Wang, H. (2021). Same journal but different numbers of published records indexed in Scopus and Web of Science Core Collection: Causes, consequences, and solutions. *Scientometrics*, 126(5), 4541–4550. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-021-03934-x>
- Locke, E. A. (2012). Construct validity vs. Concept validity. *Human Resource Management Review*, 22(2), 146–148. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2011.11.008>
- Lohr, S. L. (2010). *Sampling: Design and analysis*. Brooks/Cole, Cengage Learning.
- Lumley, T. (2004). Analysis of complex survey samples. *Journal of Statistical Software*, 9, 1–19.
- Lundberg, J. (2007). Lifting the crown—citation z-score. *Journal of Informetrics*, 1(2), 145–154. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joi.2006.09.007>
- Maisano, D., Mastrogiacomo, L., Ferrara, L., & Franceschini, F. (2025). A large-scale semi-automated approach for assessing document-type classification errors in bibliometric databases. *Scientometrics*, 1–38. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-025-05244-y>
- Martin, B. (1991). The bibliometric assessment of UK scientific performance a reply to Braun, Glänzel and Schubert. *Scientometrics*, 20(2), 333–357. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02017524>
- Martin, B. (1994). British science in the 1980s—has the relative decline contin-

- ued? *Scientometrics*, 29(1), 27–56. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02018382>
- Martin, B. R. (2017). When social scientists disagree: Comments on the Butler-van den Besselaar debate. *Journal of Informetrics*, 11(3), 937–940. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joi.2017.05.021>
- Martin, B. R., Irvine, J., Narin, F., & Sterritt, C. (1987). The continuing decline of British science. *Nature*, 330(6144), 123–126.
- McDonald, M. P. (2005). Validity, data sources. In K. Kempf-Leonard (Ed.), *Encyclopaedia of social measurement* (Vol. 3, pp. 939–948). Elsevier.
- McKiernan, E. C., Schimanski, L. A., Nieves, C. M., Matthias, L., Niles, M. T., & Alperin, J. P. (2019). Meta-research: Use of the journal impact factor in academic review, promotion, and tenure evaluations. *ELife*, 8, e47338. <https://doi.org/10.7554/eLife.47338>
- Mehrad, J., & Arastoopoor, S. (2012). Islamic World Science Citation Center (ISC): Evaluating scholarly journals based on citation analysis. *Acta Informatica Medica*, 20(1), 40. <https://doi.org/10.5455/aim.2012.20.40-43>
- Moed, H. F. (2005). *Citation analysis in research evaluation*. Dordrecht: Springer. <https://doi.org/10.1007/1-4020-3714-7>
- Moed, H. F., & van Leeuwen, T. N. (1995). Improving the accuracy of Institute for Scientific Information's journal impact factors. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science*, 46(6), 461–467. [https://doi.org/10.1002/\(SICI\)1097-4571\(199507\)46:6%3C461::AID-ASI5%3E3.0.CO;2-G](https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1097-4571(199507)46:6%3C461::AID-ASI5%3E3.0.CO;2-G)
- Moed, H. F., & Vriens, M. (1989). Possible inaccuracies occurring in citation analysis. *Journal of Information Science*, 15(2), 95–107. <https://doi.org/10.1177/016555158901500205>
- Moed, H., De Bruin, R., & van Leeuwen, T. (1995). New bibliometric tools for the assessment of national research performance: Database description, overview of indicators and first applications. *Scientometrics*, 33(3), 381–422. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02017338>
- Moed, H., & van Raan, A. (1988). Indicators of research performance: Applications in university research policy. In *Handbook of quantitative studies of science and technology* (pp. 177–192). Amsterdam: Elsevier Science Publishers.
- Mokhnacheva, Y. V. (2023). Document types indexed in WoS and Scopus: similarities, differences, and their significance in the analysis of publication activity. *Scientific and Technical Information Processing*, 50(1), 40–46. <https://doi.org/10.3103/S0147688223010033>
- Montesi, M., & Mackenzie Owen, J. (2008). Research journal articles as docu-

- ment genres: Exploring their role in knowledge organization. *Journal of Documentation*, 64(1), 143–167. <https://doi.org/10.1108/00220410810844196>
- National Science Board. (1973). *Science Indicators 1972*. National Science Foundation, Washington, DC. <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED084150.pdf>
- Nederhof, A. J. (1988). The validity and reliability of evaluation of scholarly performance. In *Handbook of quantitative studies of science and technology* (pp. 193–228). Amsterdam: Elsevier Science Publishers.
- Negishi, M., Sun, Y., & Shigi, K. (2004). Citation database for Japanese papers: A new bibliometric tool for Japanese academic society. *Scientometrics*, 60(3), 333–351. <https://doi.org/10.1023/B:SCIE.0000034378.38698.b2>
- Okubo, Y. (1997). *Bibliometric indicators and analysis of research systems: Methods and examples* (No. 1997/01; OECD Science, Technology and Industry Working Papers). OECD. <https://doi.org/10.1787/208277770603>
- Olenksy, M. (2015). *Data accuracy in bibliometric data sources and its impact on citation matching* [PhD thesis, Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, Philosophische Fakultät I]. <https://doi.org/10.18452/17122>
- Olenksy, M., Schmidt, M., & van Eck, N. J. (2016). Evaluation of the citation matching algorithms of CWTS and iFQ in comparison to the Web of Science. *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology*, 67(10), 2550–2564. <https://doi.org/10.1002/asi.23590>
- Orduña-Malea, E., Ayllón, J. M., Martín-Martín, A., & Delgado López-Cózar, E. (2017). The lost academic home: institutional affiliation links in Google Scholar Citations. *Online Information Review*, 41(6), 762–781. <https://doi.org/10.1108/OIR-10-2016-0302>
- Patsopoulos, N. A., Analatos, A. A., & Ioannidis, J. P. (2005). Relative citation impact of various study designs in the health sciences. *JAMA*, 293(19), 2362–2366. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.293.19.2362>
- Peritz, B. C. (1983). Are methodological papers more cited than theoretical or empirical ones? The case of sociology. *Scientometrics*, 5, 211–218. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02019738>
- Peroni, S., & Shotton, D. (2020). OpenCitations, an infrastructure organization for open scholarship. *Quantitative Science Studies*, 1(1), 428–444. https://doi.org/10.1162/qss_a_00023
- Polanyi, M. (1962). The republic of science: Its political and economic theory. *Minerva*, 1(1), 54–73.
- Porter, A. L. (1977). Citation analysis: Queries and caveats. *Social Studies of*

- Science*, 7(2), 257–267. <https://doi.org/10.1177/030631277700700207>
- Pranckutė, R. (2021). Web of Science (WoS) and Scopus: The titans of bibliographic information in today’s academic world. *Publications*, 9(1), 12. <https://doi.org/10.3390/publications9010012>
- Priem, J., Piwowar, H., & Orr, R. (2022). OpenAlex: A fully-open index of scholarly works, authors, venues, institutions, and concepts. In N. Robinson-Garcia, D. Torres-Salinas, & W. Arroyo-Machado (Eds.), *26th International Conference on Science and Technology Indicators, STI 2022* (p. sti22193). <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.6936227>
- Pritchard, A. (1969). Statistical bibliography or bibliometrics. *Journal of Documentation*, 25(4), 348–349.
- Reyes-Elizondo, A., Calero-Medina, C., Visser, M., & Waltman, L. (2016). *The challenge of identifying universities for a global university ranking [blog post]*. <https://www.cwts.nl/blog?article=n-q2w264>
- Reymert, I. (2021). Bibliometrics in academic recruitment: A screening tool rather than a game changer. *Minerva*, 59(1), 53–78. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11024-020-09419-0>
- Rice, D. B., Raffoul, H., Ioannidis, J. P., & Moher, D. (2020). Academic criteria for promotion and tenure in biomedical sciences faculties: Cross sectional analysis of international sample of universities. *British Medical Journal*, 369. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.m2081>
- Rimmert, C., Schwechheimer, H., & Winterhager, M. (2017). *Disambiguation of author addresses in bibliometric databases - technical report*. Bielefeld: Universität Bielefeld, Institute for Interdisciplinary Studies of Science (I²SoS). <https://pub.uni-bielefeld.de/record/2914944>
- Robinson-Garcia, N., Torres-Salinas, D., Vargas-Quesada, B., Chinchilla-Rodríguez, Z., & Gorraiz, J. (2023). Errors of measurement in scientometrics: Identification and calculation of systematic errors. *Proceedings of ISSI 2023 – the 19th International Conference of the International Society for Scientometrics and Informetrics*, 2, 387–393. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.8428899>
- Rodrigues, D., Lopes, A. L., & Batista, F. (2023). Web of Science citation gaps: An automatic approach to detect indexed but missing citations. *12th Symposium on Languages, Applications and Technologies (SLATE 2023)*. <https://doi.org/10.4230/OASICS.SLATE.2023.5>
- Rodrigues, D., Lopes, A., & Batista, F. (2025). Detecting incoherent citation data among three bibliometric platforms: OpenAlex, Sco-

- pus and Web of Science. *Journal of Information Science*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/01655515251330579>
- Romero, A., Cortés, J., Escudero, C., López, J., & Moreno, J. (2009). Measuring the influence of clinical trials citations on several bibliometric indicators. *Scientometrics*, 80(3), 747–760. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-008-2108-6>
- Rousseau, R., Egghe, L., & Guns, R. (2018). *Becoming metric-wise: A bibliometric guide for researchers*. Cambridge, Kidlington: Chandos Publishing.
- 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. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joi.2014.11.010>
- Rushforth, A., & de Rijcke, S. (2015). Accounting for impact? The Journal Impact Factor and the making of biomedical research in the Netherlands. *Minerva*, 53(2), 117–139. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11024-015-9274-5>
- Rushforth, A., & Hammarfelt, B. (2023). The rise of responsible metrics as a professional reform movement: A collective action frames account. *Quantitative Science Studies*, 4(4), 879–897. https://doi.org/10.1162/qss_a_00280
- Sargsyan, S., Mirzoyan, A., & Astsatryan, H. (2022). Towards the Armenian Science Citation Index. *PUBMET2022: The 9th Conference on Scholarly Communication in the Context of Open Science*, 80–81.
- Sauvayre, R. (2022). Misreferencing practice of scientists: Inside researchers' sociological and bibliometric profiles. *Social Epistemology*, 66(6), 719–730. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02691728.2021.2022807>
- Scheidsteger, T., Haunschild, R., & Bornmann, L. (2025). How similar are field-normalized citation impact scores obtained from OpenAlex and three popular commercial databases? An empirical comparison based on large German universities. *Scientometrics*, 1–33. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-025-05338-7>
- Schmidt, F. (2018). *Fehlerabschätzungen bei bibliometrischen Analysen* [Master's thesis, Technische Hochschule Köln]. <https://publiscologne.th-koeln.de/frontdoor/index/index/docId/1312>
- Schneider, J. W. (2013). Caveats for using statistical significance tests in research assessments. *Journal of Informetrics*, 7(1), 50–62. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joi.2012.08.005>
- Schubert, A., & Braun, T. (1986). Relative indicators and relational charts for comparative assessment of publication output and citation impact. *Scientometrics*, 9, 281–291. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02017249>

- Schubert, A., & Glänzel, W. (1983). Statistical reliability of comparisons based on the citation impact of scientific publications. *Scientometrics*, 5(1), 59–73. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02097178>
- Schubert, A., Glänzel, W., & Braun, T. (1988). Against absolute methods: Relative scientometric indicators and relational charts as evaluation tools. In A. F. J. van Raan (Ed.), *Handbook of quantitative studies of science and technology* (pp. 137–176). Amsterdam: Elsevier Science Publishers.
- Schulz, J. (2016). Using Monte Carlo simulations to assess the impact of author name disambiguation quality on different bibliometric analyses. *Scientometrics*, 107(3), 1283–1298. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-016-1892-7>
- Selivanova, I. V., Kosyakov, D. V., & Guskov, A. E. (2019). The impact of errors in the Scopus database on the research assessment. *Scientific and Technical Information Processing*, 46, 204–212. <https://doi.org/10.3103/S0147688219030109>
- Sher, I. H., Garfield, E., & Elias, A. W. (1966). Control and Elimination of Errors in ISI Services. *Journal of Chemical Documentation*, 6(3), 132–135. <https://doi.org/10.1021/c160022a0049>
- Shu, F., Julien, C.-A., Zhang, L., Qiu, J., Zhang, J., & Larivière, V. (2019). Comparing journal and paper level classifications of science. *Journal of Informetrics*, 13(1), 202–225. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joi.2018.12.005>
- Sigogneau, A. (2000). An analysis of document types published in journals related to physics: Proceeding papers recorded in the Science Citation Index database. *Scientometrics*, 47(3), 589–604. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1005628218890>
- Sinatra, R., Wang, D., Deville, P., Song, C., & Barabási, A.-L. (2016). Quantifying the evolution of individual scientific impact. *Science*, 354(6312), aaf5239. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aaf5239>
- Šipka, P. (2005). The Serbian citation index: Context and content. In P. Ingwersen & B. Larsen (Eds.), *Proceedings of ISSI 2005 - the 10th International Conference of the International Society for Scientometrics and Informetrics* (Vol. 2, pp. 710–711). Karolinska University Press.
- Sirtes, D. (2012). How (dis-) similar are different citation normalizations and the fractional citation indicator? (And how it can be improved). *Proceedings of 17th International Conference on Science and Technology Indicators (STI)*, 894–889.
- Sivertsen, G., & Rushforth, A. (2025). The ongoing reform of research assessment. In G. Sivertsen & L. Langfeldt (Eds.), *Challenges in research*

- policy: Evidence-based policy briefs with recommendations* (pp. 47–54). Cham: Springer Nature Switzerland. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-69580-3_7
- Spodick, D. H., & Goldberg, R. J. (1983). The editor’s correspondence: Analysis of patterns appearing in selected specialty and general journals. *The American Journal of Cardiology*, 52(10), 1290–1292. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0002-9149\(83\)90590-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/0002-9149(83)90590-8)
- Stahlschmidt, S., & Schmidt, M. (2019). Measurement variation in bibliometric impact indicators. In G. Catalano, C. Daraio, M. Gregori, H. F. Moed, & G. Ruocco (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 17th Conference of the International Society for Scientometrics and Informetrics (ISSI 2019)* (Vol. 2, pp. 1500–1506). Edizioni Efesto.
- Stahlschmidt, S., & Stephen, D. (2022). From indexation policies through citation networks to normalized citation impacts: Web of Science, Scopus, and Dimensions as varying resonance chambers. *Scientometrics*, 127(5), 2413–2431. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-022-04309-6>
- Struck, A. (2025). *Dependencies in topic delineation and tracking* [PhD thesis, Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin]. <https://doi.org/10.18452/30669>
- Suleimenov, E., Frolova, V., Rog, O., Khasenova, S., Seitkalieva, Z., & Kubieva, T. S. (2009). Creating the Kazakh science citation index. *Scientific and Technical Information Processing*, 36(3), 151–155. <https://doi.org/10.3103/S0147688209030046>
- Swedish Research Council. (2017). *The bibliometric database at the Swedish Research Council – Contents, methods and indicators. Version 2.1*. <https://www.vr.se/download/18.514d156f1639984ae0789d34/1529480565512/The+bibliometric+database+at+the+Swedish+Research+Council+-+contents,+methods+and+indicators.pdf>
- Taylor, J. R. (1997). *An introduction to error analysis* (2nd ed.). Sausalito: University Science Books.
- Teixeira da Silva, J. A. (2024). The inaccurate representation of an author’s publishing name, and impact on reference accuracy. *Scientometrics*, 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-024-05029-9>
- Thelwall, M. (2016). The discretised lognormal and hooked power law distributions for complete citation data: Best options for modelling and regression. *Journal of Informetrics*, 10(2), 336–346. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joi.2015.12.007>
- Thelwall, M., Kousha, K., Makita, M., Abdoli, M., Stuart, E., Wil-

- son, P., & Levitt, J. (2023). In which fields do higher impact journals publish higher quality articles? *Scientometrics*, 3915–3933. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-023-04735-0>
- Tierney, E., O’Rourke, C., & Fenton, J. (2015). What is the role of “the letter to the editor”? *European Archives of Oto-Rhino-Laryngology*, 272, 2089–2093. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00405-014-3289-7>
- Tiesinga, E., Mohr, P. J., Newell, D. B., & Taylor, B. N. (2021). CODATA recommended values of the fundamental physical constants: 2018. *Journal of Physical and Chemical Reference Data*, 50(3), 033105. <https://doi.org/10.1063/5.0064853>
- Tong, S., Chen, F., Yang, L., & Shen, Z. (2023). Novel utilization of a paper-level classification system for the evaluation of journal impact: An update of the CAS Journal Ranking. *Quantitative Science Studies*, 4(4), 960–975. https://doi.org/10.1162/qss_a_00270
- Traag, V. A., Waltman, L., & van Eck, N. J. (2019). From Louvain to Leiden: Guaranteeing well-connected communities. *Scientific Reports*, 9(1), 5233. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-019-41695-z>
- Tunger, D., Haustein, S., Ruppert, L., Luca, G., & Unterhalt, S. (2010). "The Delphic Oracle" - An Analysis of Potential Error Sources in Bibliographic Databases. *11th International Conference on Science and Technology Indicators. Book of Abstracts*, 282–283.
- Tüür-Fröhlich, T. (2016). *The non-trivial effects of trivial errors in scientific communication and evaluation*. Glückstadt: vwh Verlag Werner Hülsbusch.
- Valderrama-Zurián, J.-C., Aguilar-Moya, R., Melero-Fuentes, D., & Aleixandre-Benavent, R. (2015). A systematic analysis of duplicate records in Scopus. *Journal of Informetrics*, 9(3), 570–576. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joi.2015.05.002>
- Van Eck, N. J., & Waltman, L. (2017). Accuracy of citation data in Web of Science and Scopus. *Proceedings of the 16th International Conference of the International Society for Scientometrics and Informetrics*, 1087–1092. <https://arxiv.org/abs/1906.07011>
- Van Eck, N. J., Waltman, L., van Raan, A. F., Klautz, R. J., & Peul, W. C. (2013). Citation analysis may severely underestimate the impact of clinical research as compared to basic research. *PloS One*, 8(4), e62395. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0062395>
- Van Leeuwen, T. N., Moed, H. F., Tijssen, R. J., Visser, M. S., & van Raan, A. F. (2001). Language biases in the coverage of the science citation index and its

- consequences for international comparisons of national research performance. *Scientometrics*, 51(1), 335–346. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1010549719484>
- Van Leeuwen, T., Costas, R., Calero-Medina, C., & Visser, M. (2013). The role of editorial material in bibliometric research performance assessments. *Scientometrics*, 95, 817–828. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-012-0904-5>
- Van Leeuwen, T., van der Wurff, L., & De Craen, A. (2007). Classification of “research letters” in general medical journals and its consequences in bibliometric research evaluation processes. *Research Evaluation*, 16(1), 59–63. <https://doi.org/10.3152/095820207X196786>
- Van Raan, A. (2019). Measuring science: Basic principles and applications of advanced bibliometrics. In W. Glänzel, H. F. Moed, U. Schmoch, & M. Thelwall (Eds.), *Springer handbook of science and technology indicators* (pp. 69–94). Cham: Springer Nature Switzerland AG. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-02511-3_10
- Vinkler, P. (2010). *The evaluation of research by scientometric indicators*. Oxford, Cambridge, New Delhi: Chandos Publishing.
- Wade, N. (1975). Citation analysis: A new tool for science administrators. *Science*, 188(4187), 429–432. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.188.4187.429>
- a
- Wager, E., & Middleton, P. (2008). Technical editing of research reports in biomedical journals. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews*, 4. <https://doi.org/10.1002/14651858.MR000002.pub3>
- Walker, R. L., Sykes, L., Hemmelgarn, B. R., & Quan, H. (2010). Authors’ opinions on publication in relation to annual performance assessment. *BMC Medical Education*, 10, 1–6. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1472-6920-10-21>
- Waltman, L. (2016). A review of the literature on citation impact indicators. *Journal of Informetrics*, 10(2), 365–391. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joi.2016.02.007>
- Waltman, L., Calero-Medina, C., Kosten, J., Noyons, E. C., Tijssen, R. J., van Eck, N. J., van Leeuwen, T. N., van Raan, A. F., Visser, M. S., & Wouters, P. (2012). The Leiden Ranking 2011/2012: Data collection, indicators, and interpretation. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology*, 63(12), 2419–2432. <https://doi.org/10.1002/asi.22708>
- Waltman, L., & van Eck, N. J. (2012). A new methodology for constructing a publication-level classification system of science. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology*, 63(12), 2378–2392. <https://doi.org/10.1002/asi.22748>

- Waltman, L., & van Eck, N. J. (2019). Field normalization of scientometric indicators. In W. Glänzel, H. F. Moed, U. Schmoch, & M. Thelwall (Eds.), *Springer handbook of science and technology indicators* (pp. 281–300). Springer.
- Waltman, L., van Eck, N. J., van Leeuwen, T. N., Visser, M. S., & van Raan, A. F. (2011). Towards a new crown indicator: Some theoretical considerations. *Journal of Informetrics*, 5(1), 37–47. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joi.2010.08.001>
- Wang, J. (2013). Citation time window choice for research impact evaluation. *Scientometrics*, 94(3), 851–872. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-012-0775-9>
- Wang, Q., & Schneider, J. W. (2020). Consistency and validity of interdisciplinarity measures. *Quantitative Science Studies*, 1(1), 239–263. https://doi.org/10.1162/qss_a_00011
- Waytowich, V. L., Onwuegbuzie, A. J., & Jiao, Q. G. (2006). Characteristics of doctoral students who commit citation errors. *Library Review*. <https://doi.org/10.1108/00242530610655993>
- Whitley, B. E., & Kite, M. E. (2012). *Principles of research in behavioral science* (3rd ed.). New York, London: Routledge.
- Wildgaard, L. (2019). An overview of author-level indicators of research performance. In W. Glänzel, H. F. Moed, U. Schmoch, & M. Thelwall (Eds.), *Springer handbook of science and technology indicators* (pp. 361–396). Cham: Springer Nature Switzerland AG. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-02511-3_24
- Winterhager, M., Schwechheimer, H., & Rimmert, C. (2014). Institutionenkodierung als Grundlage für bibliometrische Indikatoren. *Bibliometrie - Praxis Und Forschung*, 3. <https://doi.org/10.5283/bpf.209>
- Woelert, P., & McKenzie, L. (2018). Follow the money? How Australian universities replicate national performance-based funding mechanisms. *Research Evaluation*, 27(3), 184–195. <https://doi.org/10.1093/reseval/rvy018>
- Wouters, P. F. (1999). *The citation culture* [PhD thesis, Universiteit van Amsterdam]. <https://dare.uva.nl/search?identifier=b101b769-100f-43e5-b8d2-cac6c11e5bbf>
- Xu, S., Hao, L., An, X., Zhai, D., & Pang, H. (2019). Types of DOI errors of cited references in Web of Science with a cleaning method. *Scientometrics*, 120, 1427–1437. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-019-03162-4>
- Zacharewicz, T., Lepori, B., Reale, E., & Jonkers, K. (2019). Performance-based research funding in EU Member States—a comparative assessment. *Science*

- and Public Policy*, 46(1), 105–115. <https://doi.org/10.1093/scipol/scy041>
- Zhang, L., Cao, Z., Shang, Y., Sivertsen, G., & Huang, Y. (2024). Missing institutions in OpenAlex: Possible reasons, implications, and solutions. *Scientometrics*, 129(10), 5869–5891. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-023-04923-y>
- Zhu, J., Hu, G., & Liu, W. (2019). DOI errors and possible solutions for Web of Science. *Scientometrics*, 118, 709–718. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-018-2980-7>
- Zuccala, A., & van Leeuwen, T. (2011). Book reviews in humanities research evaluations. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology*, 62(10), 1979–1991. <https://doi.org/10.1002/asi.21588>