E X C E R P T S
from CRITICAL REVIEWS on
Elsevier (Scopus), ISI Thomson Reuter (Web of Science)

Standard electronic data bases like *Scopus* and *Web of Science* are still **very much incomplet**e - especially failing to track older publications and citations, proceedings of international conferences, monographs, as well as non-English language science journals and proceedings. Thus, *Scopus* and *Web of Science* may in many cases yield misleading output results on publications and citations.

Google Scholar provides more (although still not) complete data, as do the specialized electronic data bases for publications in the area of physical sciences such as *INSPIRE* (*inspirehep.net*) and *ArXiv.org*.

Below are included few excerpts from professional critical reviews of the various deficiencies of *Scopus* and *Web of Science.*

==

http://am.ascb.org/dora/ - San Francisco Declaration on Research Assessment
http://am.ascb.org/dora/files/SFDeclarationFINAL.pdf

"Below we make a number of recommendations for improving the way in which the quality of research output is evaluated. Outputs other than research articles will grow in importance in assessing research effectiveness in the future, but the peer-reviewed research paper will remain a central research output that informs research assessment. Our recommendations therefore focus primarily on practices relating to research articles published in peer-reviewed journals but can and should be extended by recognizing additional products, such as datasets, as important research outputs. These recommendations are aimed at funding agencies, academic institutions, journals, organizations that supply metrics, and individual researchers."

"A number of themes run through these recommendations: ......
(3) the need to capitalize on the opportunities provided by online publication (such as relaxing unnecessary limits on the number of words, figures, and references in articles, and exploring new indicators of significance and impact)."

----

http://eprints.rclis.org/8605/1/Yang_citation.pdf

"Critics note that *Web of Science*: (1) cover mainly English-language journal articles published in the United States, United Kingdom, and Canada; (2) are limited to citations from journals and papers indexed in the ISI database; (3) provide different coverage between research fields; (4) do not count citations from books and other non-ISI sources; and (5) have citing errors (e.g., homonyms, synonyms, and inconsistency in the use of initials and in the spelling of non-English names)"

Problems in ISI Thomson/Web of Science -
http://www.harzing.com/pop_gs.htm

"The major disadvantage of the Web of Science is that it may provide a substantial underestimation of an individual academic's actual citation impact."
Web of Science General Search is limited to ISI-listed journals
Web of Science Cited Reference is limited to citations from ISI-listed journals
Web of Science Cited Reference counts citations to non-ISI journals only towards first author

Working with ISI data: Beware of Categorisation Problems
http://www.harzing.com/ISI_categories.htm

Lokman I. Meho - "The Rise and Rise of Citation Analysis"
http://arxiv.org/ftp/physics/papers/0701/0701012.pdf
"The ISI's citation databases have always been criticized by scientists on the basis that they index a limited number of journal titles, that they cover mainly English-language titles from North America and Western Europe, and that they do not cover citations from books and most conference proceedings."
" The Web has brought many changes and challenges to the field of citation analysis. Researchers and administrators who want to evaluate research impact and quality accurately will from now on have to use not only multiple sources – Web of Science and Scopus being the main two, but also Google Scholar, arXiv.org and others – but also different methods (e.g. citation counts as well as the h-index, and so on) to corroborate their findings. Relying exclusively on Web of Science and a single citation measure will, in many cases, no longer be an option for making accurate impact assessments."
----
http://arxiv.org/ftp/cs/papers/0612/0612132.pdf
L.Meho, K. Yang - "A New Era in Citation and Bibliometric Analyses - Web of Science, Scopus and Google Scholar" [J.Am.Soc.Info.Sci.Tech]

"Data collected in this study show that, in contrast to *WoS* and *Scopus*, which index citations mainly from journal articles and conference papers, citations found through *GS* come from many different types of documents, including journal articles, conference papers, doctoral dissertations, master's theses, technical reports, research reports, chapters, and books, among others (see Table 8). Data also show that the majority of citations found through *GS* come from documents published after 1993 (see Table 9)."

Wikipedia
http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Journal_Citation_Reports
"The use of these data has been subject to various criticisms, which are discussed in detail in the article on impact factors. The primary acknowledged limitation is that almost all the journals covered are English language journals from North America, western Europe and Australia, and that the information in the derived tables combines original research journals and review journals — which have very different citation behavior."

Wikipedia
http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Web_of_Science
"As with other scientific approaches, scientometrics and bibliometrics have their own limitations. Recently, a criticism was voiced pointing toward certain deficiencies of the journal impact factor (JIF) calculation process, based on Thomson Reuters Web of Science, such as: journal citation

distributions usually are highly skewed towards established journals; journal impact factor properties are field-specific and can be easily manipulated by editors, or even by changing the editorial policies; it is essentially nontransparent process.[14]

Regarding the more objective journal metrics, there is a growing view that for greater accuracy it has be supplemented with an article-based assessment and peer-review.[14] Thomson Reuters replied to criticism in general terms by stating that "no one metric can fully capture the complex contributions scholars make to their disciplines, and many forms of scholarly achievement should be considered."[15] "

Scopus - Facts
http://www.info.sciverse.com/scopus/scopus-in-detail/facts

- Scopus only indexes serial publications: journals, trade journals, book series and conference materials that have an ISSN (International Standard Serial Number) assigned to them.
- The only exception concerns conference papers, which can be captured via different routes than by being published in a serial publication with an ISSN.
- <u>Meeting abstracts are not covered by Scopus</u>. Confusion around the conference coverage in databases can arise from not making a distinction between the document types "conference papers" and "meeting abstracts". Whereas "conference papers" contain the final full-text version of a research paper (i.e. comparable to journal articles), "meeting abstracts" are short summaries of an ongoing research project. Often "meeting abstracts" are published in advance of a conference, while "conference papers" are made available after the conference as part of a proceedings volume.
- Other examples of document types not covered in Scopus are document types where the author is not the person behind the presented research such as obituaries and book reviews.

----
http://www.kcl.ac.uk/library/researchsupport/EvaluatingResearch/CitationAnalysis/docs/CitationsCountcoursePPTslides.pdf

Commercial Citation indexes
• Web of Science
– Science Citation Index (journal articles only)
– Social Science Citation Index (journal articles only)
– Arts & Humanities Citation index (journal articles only)
– Sci and Social Sci Conference Proceedings
– Book Citation Index (King's not currently subscribed, but on trial)
• Scopus – Science & Social Science journal articles/ conf procs, some books – but only citations back to 1996

==