

Paper Productivity of Ground-based Large Optical Telescopes from 2000 to 2009

Sang Chul Kim^{A,B}

^A Korea Astronomy and Space Science Institute, Daejeon 305-348, Republic of Korea

^B Email: sckim@kasi.re.kr

Abstract:

We present an analysis of the scientific (“refereed”) paper productivity of the current largest (diameter > 8 m) ground-based optical(-infrared) telescopes during the ten year period from 2000 to 2009. The telescopes for which we have gathered and analysed the scientific publication data are the two 10 m Keck telescopes, the four 8.2 m Very Large Telescopes (VLT), the two 8.1 m Gemini telescopes, the 8.2 m Subaru telescope, and the 9.2 m Hobby-Eberly Telescope (HET). We have analysed the rate of papers published in various astronomical journals produced by using these telescopes. While the total numbers of papers from these observatories are largest for the VLT followed by Keck, Gemini, Subaru, and HET, the number of papers produced by each component of the telescopes are largest for Keck followed by VLT, Subaru, Gemini, and HET. In 2009, each telescope of the Keck, VLT, Gemini, Subaru, and HET observatories produced 135, 109, 93, 107, and 5 refereed papers, respectively. We have shown that each telescope of the Keck, VLT, Gemini, and Subaru observatories is producing 2.1 ± 0.9 *Nature* and *Science* papers annually and the rate of these papers among all the refereed papers produced by using that telescope is 1.7 ± 0.8 %. Extending this relation, we propose that this ratio of the number of *Nature* and *Science* papers over the number of whole refereed papers that will be produced by future extremely large telescopes (ELTs) will be remained similar. From the comparison of the publication trends of the above telescopes, we suggest that (i) having more than one telescope of the same kind at the same location and (ii) increasing the number of instruments available at the telescope are good ways to maximize the paper productivity.

Keywords: history and philosophy of astronomy — sociology of astronomy — astronomical data bases: miscellaneous

1 Introduction

Astronomy is a science driven by discovery¹, and the essential components in the astronomical discoveries are telescopes and instruments. Since 1990, the world’s largest optical telescopes with 8 to 10 m in diameter have appeared and gave birth to new innovations in astronomy. After 10 – 20 years of use by the largest optical telescopes, the necessity for larger telescope has increased and we are witnessing the development of 25 – 42 m extremely large telescopes (ELTs).

Table 1 lists the current largest, ground-based optical telescopes (diameter $D \geq 8$ m). There are five, more active telescopes mainly built in the 20th century : USA’s two 10 m Keck telescopes, four 8.2 m Very Large Telescope (VLT) of the European Southern Observatory (ESO), two 8.1 m Gemini telescopes of the consortium of USA, UK, Canada, Chile, Australia, Brazil, and Argentina, 8.2 m Subaru telescope of Japan, and 9.2 m Hobby-Eberly Telescope (HET). The other three telescopes at the lower part of Table 1 are built later in the 21st century, and are in the early part of their operations, which are the 10.4 m Gran Telescopio Canarias (GTC), the 10 m South African

Large Telescope (SALT), and the two 8.4 m (on a single mount) Large Binocular Telescope (LBT).

Table 2 lists the three planned ELT projects, of which telescope diameters are larger than 20 m. When these state-of-the-art telescopes are completed, how much impact will they bring to the astronomical research? One of the methods to answer this question is to scrutinize the impacts the current largest telescopes have brought since their completions. The analysis of the major scientific papers published by using these telescopes would be the essential part in this area, which will be shown in this paper.

Counting the number of published papers or the number of citations of specific papers which used certain telescopes is one of the ways to measure the impact and importance of these telescopes or facilities (e.g., Davoust & Schmadel (1987); Leverington (1996); Schulman et al. (1997); Abt (1998, 2000); Trimble & Ceja (2008); Crabtree (2008); Trimble (2009); Crabtree (2011)), and analyzing citations is a method to measure the amount of impact of a certain paper (Stanek 2008).

From analysis of 11,831 papers published in 20 journals of astronomy and astrophysics from 2001 to 2003, Trimble & Ceja (2008) suggested that the *Hubble Space Telescope (HST)* is responsible for the largest number of optical papers, while the most frequently

¹http://www.gmto.org/sciencecase/GMT-ID-01404-GMT_Science_Case.pdf

Table 1: Current Ground-based Large Optical Telescopes (diameter ≥ 8 m)

Telescope	Diameter	Partner Country/Institute	Operation Start Year
Keck VLT ^a	10 m (36 \times 1.8 m segments) \times 2 8.2 m \times 4	USA (Caltech, University of California) ESO members (Austria, Belgium, Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Italy, Netherlands, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, United Kingdom)	1993, 1996 1998, 1999, 2000, 2000
Gemini	8.1 m \times 2 (N, S hemispheres)	USA (48%), UK (24%), Canada (14%), Chile (5%), Australia (5%), Brazil (2%), Argentina (2%)	1999, 2000
Subaru HET ^b	8.2 m 9.2 m (91 segments)	Japan USA (90%), Germany (10%)	1999 1999
GTC ^c	10.4 m (36 segments)	Spain (90%), University of Florida (5%), Mexico (5%)	2008
SALT ^d	10 m (91 segments)	Republic of South Africa (35%), Poland, HET, USA, Germany, New Zealand, UK, India	2005
LBT ^e	8.4 m \times 2 (single mount)	USA (50%), Italy (25%), Germany (25%)	2008

^a Very Large Telescope

^b Hobby-Eberly Telescope

^c Gran Telescopio Canarias

^d South African Large Telescope

^e Large Binocular Telescope

Table 2: Extremely Large Telescope (ELT) Projects in Progress

Telescope	Diameter	Partner Country/Institute
Giant Magellan Telescope (GMT)	25 m (7 \times 8.4 m segments)	USA, Korea, Australia
Thirty Meter Telescope (TMT)	30 m (492 \times 1.4 m segments)	USA, Canada ^a
European Extremely Large Telescope (E-ELT)	42 m (984 \times 1.4 m segments)	ESO

^aJapan (Collaborating Institution), China and India (Observers)

cited optical papers come from the Sloan Digital Sky Survey (SDSS), Keck, and the Anglo-Australian Telescope (AAT). Grothkopf et al. (2005) also showed that the *HST* surpasses both VLT and Keck in the total number of papers, as well as in the numbers of papers per year (their figure 1; see also Ringwald et al. (2003); Meylan et al. (2004); Apai et al. (2010), but see also Leverington (1997b)).

By analysing papers resulting from optical telescopes larger than 2 m diameter published in 1990-1991 and cited in 1993, Trimble (1995) and Trimble (1996) found that the largest numbers of papers and citations came from 4 m class telescopes, the Canada-France-Hawaii Telescope (CFHT) and AAT, followed by the Cerro-Tololo Inter-American Observatory (CTIO) 4 m, while the largest impact factors (five or more citations per paper per year) came from the University of Hawaii's 2.2 m and the Multi-Mirror Telescope in Arizona (Trimble & Ceja 2008). The analysis of papers published in 2001 and 2002, which is after the completions of 8 m class telescopes, Trimble & Ceja (2007) showed that the largest optical telescopes are responsible for the largest numbers of papers, while 4 m class telescopes displayed continued fading, except for the infrared United Kingdom InfraRed Telescope (UKIRT) and InfraRed Telescope Facility (IRTF).

From the analysis of 1000 most highly-cited papers published between 1991 and 1998 (125 from each year) and 452 astronomy papers published in *Nature* during 1989 – 1998, Benn & Sánchez (2001) showed that the bigger the telescope, the more the paper cited, with citation fraction \propto diameter². Trimble, Zaich, & Bosler

(2005) also suggested that big telescopes produce more papers and more citations per paper than small ones, from the analysis of 2100 papers produced in 2001. Ahn et al. (2008) suggested that the amount of papers produced by a large ($D \sim 3.6 - 10$ m) telescope is roughly proportional to the diameter of its primary mirror (see also Leverington (1997a)). They also estimated the numbers of refereed and *Nature/Science* papers that might be produced by the Giant Magellan Telescope (GMT) annually to be 330 and 17, respectively: the former by using the rough equation of $N/D \sim 14$ (N is number of refereed papers and D is the diameter of a telescope in meter) and the filled aperture 21.4 m of the GMT, and the latter by using another rough equation of $\langle n/A \rangle \sim 0.05$ (n is number of *Nature/Science* papers published by Keck I and each VLT telescope, and A is the collecting area of the primary mirror). Frogel (2010) initiated a series of papers to investigate what effects the new facilities, data archives, and means of information change had on astronomical publications, first by analysing the 100 most cited papers in each year from 2000 to 2009.

In this paper, we present an analysis of the publications based on results from the largest ground-based optical telescopes of Keck, VLT, Gemini, Subaru, and HET telescopes during the years of 2000 – 2009. Using the data, we try to find (i) the temporal trend of the publications from the above telescopes, and (ii) if there is any correlation in the refereed paper publications and the *Nature/Science* paper publications, where the latter is assumed to be the paragon of high-impact journals. The paper is organized as follows:

Sect. 2 describes the data utilized in this work. Sect. 3 presents the analysis results : Sect. 3.1 focuses on the total number of papers and Sect. 3.2 focuses on the *Nature* and *Science* papers. Finally, Sect. 4 summarizes and discusses the results.

2 Data

Among the telescopes with diameter larger than 8 m in Table 1, we selected Keck, VLT, Gemini, Subaru, and HET telescopes for the analysis of telescope productivity, because these telescopes might be considered as general purpose telescopes and/or are well after the completion and actively produce scientific papers. GTC, SALT, and LBT were completed after 2005, implying that they are still in the process of being shaken down (Trimble (2009), their table 9). Being completed in 1999 and producing many papers, HET is also included, although its structure is not a usual one: it sits at a fixed elevation angle of 55° and rotates in azimuth to access 81% of the sky visible from McDonald Observatory². Having similar structure to that of HET, SALT³ also has many papers published⁴ since its completion of 2005.

The data on the papers published by the Keck telescopes were obtained from the online site of http://www2.keck.hawaii.edu/library/keck_papers.html, those from the VLT telescopes are from <http://archive.eso.org/wdb/wdb/library/publications/form>, those from the Gemini telescopes are from <http://www.gemini.edu/science/publications/>, those from the Subaru telescope are from <http://subarutelescope.org/Observing/Proposals/Publish/index.html>, and those from the HET are from http://www.as.utexas.edu/mcdonald/het/sci_pub.html. We consider only “refereed” papers in this study, and we exclude any of the symposium proceedings. For the Gemini Observatory papers, the observatory webpage provides two separate pages: (i) ‘papers by users’ which are based on data taken with the Gemini telescopes or from the Gemini Science Archive, and (ii) ‘papers by Gemini staff’ which are science and engineering papers published by the staff in journals and conference proceedings. From the two sources we collected all the refereed papers which have used the Gemini Observatory data for their researches, excluding any overlap papers.

The five databases obtained from these five observatories are then merged together and scrutinized to find any overlapped papers. All these overlap papers appearing in more than one database are carefully examined in the full texts. If these papers are actually produced based on the data obtained at multiple telescopes, then the information is kept, while it is discarded if not. The detailed cases where two (or more) papers are kept in the final list are : (1) when two telescopes appear in the title (e.g. Venn et al. (2001)); (2) when two telescopes appear in the footnote attached to the title (e.g. Zheng et al. (2000));

(3) when one telescope appears in the footnote attached to the title and another telescope in the footnote attached to author(s) as like an affiliation (e.g. Hu et al. (2002)); (4) when one telescope appears in the footnote attached to the title and another telescope in the section describing the observations (usually Section 2) (e.g. Vreeswijk et al. (2004)); (5) when one telescope appears in the footnote attached to the title and a public use data and/or any existing data from another telescope is used (e.g. Schaye et al. (2000), Dessauges-Zavadsky et al. (2002)); (6) when two telescopes appear in footnotes attached to authors (e.g. Drory et al. (2001)); (7) when two telescopes appear in the Abstract (e.g. Da Rocha et al. (2002)); and (8) when two telescopes appear in the main text, in the section describing the observations (e.g. De Breuck et al. (2001)).

There are several cases which are excluded from the final list: (1) one telescope is kept in the final list when data of the telescope are used in the analysis (e.g. Figure), while another telescope is not kept if only a previous study that used the telescope is cited (e.g. Pettini & Bowen (2001); Barth et al. (2003)); (2) when a paper used data from a telescope, while another telescope is just mentioned because a large program aims to get data in the future with all of these telescopes, only the former is kept (e.g. Fischer et al. (2005)); (3) when a different telescope in an observatory is actually used instead of the large ($D > 8$ m) telescope, it is excluded from the list (e.g. Höflich et al. (2004)). In spite of the careful inspection of each of the overlap papers, a small fraction of papers (typically $\lesssim 1\%$) remain ambiguous if the telescope listed has actually contributed to the paper.

Since it takes long for optical telescopes today to ramp up to normal operations (Trimble 2009), it is worthwhile to check the operation start years of the selected telescopes. The two Keck telescopes are built in 1993 May and 1996 October⁵. The first light for the VLT unit 1 telescope (‘Antu’) was obtained in late May 1998, and it went into routine scientific operation on 1999 April 1⁶. The first lights for the units 2, 3, and 4 of the VLT telescopes (named ‘Kueyen’, ‘Melipal’, and ‘Yepun’, respectively) were obtained 1999 March 1⁷, 2000 January 26⁸, and 2000 September 3⁹, respectively. Gemini North saw first light in 1999, and began scientific operations in 2000¹⁰, while Gemini South opened a year later than its twin in 2000¹¹. Subaru telescope saw first light in 1999 January 28¹². Since the start of the Keck telescopes was 1993, it could be reasonably deduced that the Keck telescopes were already in the process of normal operations and paper productions in 2001 as seen in the table 9 of Trimble (2009), while naturally more than one telescope brought about synergies. On the other hand,

⁵http://keckobservatory.org/about/the_observatory

⁶<http://www.eso.org/public/teles-instr/vlt.html>

⁷<http://www.eso.org/public/news/eso9921/>

⁸<http://www.eso.org/public/news/eso0004/>

⁹<http://www.eso.org/public/news/eso0028/>

¹⁰http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Gemini_Observatory

¹¹http://astro-canada.ca/_en/a2113.html

¹²<http://www.spacetoday.org/Japan/Japan/Astronomy.html>

²http://www.as.utexas.edu/mcdonald/het/het_gen_01.html

³<http://www.salt.ac.za/telescope/overview/>

⁴<http://www.salt.ac.za/science/publications/science/>

VLT, Gemini, Subaru, and HET telescopes, built in 1998 – 2000, 1999 – 2000, 1999, and 1999, respectively, should be still in their early phases in 2000 and 2001, which are confirmed in Figure 2 in the next Section.

Table 3 shows the final paper productivities of the Keck, VLT, Gemini, Subaru, and HET observatories during the period of 2000 – 2009. The number fraction of the excluded papers to the total number of papers provided on the Web by each observatory is typically $\lesssim 1\%$.

3 Results

3.1 Total Number of Papers

Figure 1 shows the pie charts for the papers produced by using the Keck, VLT, Gemini, Subaru, and HET telescopes, displaying the percentages of various journals, where the journals with percentage larger than 1% are labeled. While *Astrophysical Journal Supplements* (*ApJS*) is shown separately, *Astrophysical Journal* (*ApJ*) include the *Astrophysical Journal Letters* (*ApJL*) publications (see Frogel (2010) for the history on the separation of *ApJ* and *ApJL*). Keck telescopes published 57.2% of papers in *ApJ* (including *ApJL*) (it becomes 59.7% if *ApJS* is also included), and 75.9% in the American journals of *ApJ*, *ApJS*, and *Astronomical Journal* (*AJ*). While Gemini telescopes published 45.2% of papers in *ApJ*, the value becomes 59.8% if *AJ* is also included. Subaru telescope has 60.9% of papers published in the American journals of *ApJ*, *ApJS*, and *AJ*, while 19.3% of papers are published in the *Publications of the Astronomical Society of Japan* (*PASJ*). HET published 78.6% of papers in *ApJ* and *AJ*, and 82.4% in the American journals of *ApJ*, *AJ*, and *ApJS*. The ESO VLT observatory, however, has published dominantly in the European journal *Astronomy and Astrophysics* (*A&A*) (50.9%) and the UK journal *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society* (*MNRAS*) (14.2%), while still 29.8% of papers are published in the American journals of *ApJ*, *AJ*, and *ApJS* (Abt 2010). While 12.5% of Keck telescope papers are published in *A&A* and *MNRAS*, 29.8% of VLT papers are published in the American journals. While Abt (2010) notes that most (55%) of the astronomical articles in journals with impact factors (Frogel 2010) greater than 2.0 are published in just four journals of *A&A*, *AJ*, *ApJ* (including *ApJL* and *ApJS*), and *MNRAS*, the percentages of papers published in these journals by using the Keck, VLT, Gemini, Subaru, and HET telescopes are 88.5%, 94.9%, 88.7%, 75.2%, and 95.4%, respectively. If *PASJ* is also included, the percentage for the Subaru increases to 94.5%.

Figure 2 (a) shows the yearly distribution of the refereed papers produced by using the Keck (triangles), VLT (squares), Gemini (pentagons), Subaru (circles), and HET (diamonds) observatories for the period of 2000 – 2009. The two Keck telescopes ($\text{‘K} \times 2\text{’}$, triangles) show very stable, but still ascending slope in the number of papers up to 2007 ($N(2007) = 308$), after which it slightly decreased. The four VLT telescopes

($\text{‘V} \times 4\text{’}$, squares) show rapid increase in the number of papers from 2000 to 2007 and again the value of 2007 ($N = 470$) is the maximum during the ten years. In 2003, the number of papers produced by using VLT crossed over that by using Keck (Grothkopf et al. 2005; Trimble & Ceja 2008). Built in 1999 and 2000, the two Gemini telescopes also show rapid increase in the number of paper from 2000 ($N = 16$) to 2009 ($N = 185$), while the latter is the maximum number among the ten years. Having only one 8.2 m telescope unlike others above, the Subaru telescope shows steady increase in the number of papers, and the maximum value is in 2009 ($N = 107$). Unlike the above telescopes, the 9.2 m HET shows almost steady value of 13.1 ± 5.4 for the number of papers each year from 2000 to 2009. While Abt (2010) showed that the astronomical research rates in the US, the UK, and Europe have not reached a maximum and seem still increasing, it will be needed to gather data for at least a few more years in the future to see if it is the same for the publications from the above telescopes since some telescopes show leveling off or even decrease in the number of papers after 2007. It is worth here to note that Frogel (2010) (his figure 1) found the rise of the total number of authors for the top 100 papers during the period of 2000 – 2009 is steep from 2000 to 2007 and levels off from 2007 to 2009. As he writes that it is not easy to determine if such a rise is typical for all astronomical articles or is confined to the top 100 for each year, it could be interested to find if there is any correlation in the leveling off of both the total number of papers from the largest optical telescopes and the total number of authors for the top 100 papers after 2007.

Since the Keck, VLT, and Gemini observatories have two, four, and two telescopes, respectively, it is not fair to compare with each other and also with the Subaru and the HET. We, therefore, divided the total number of papers produced by the Keck, VLT, and Gemini observatories by 2, 4, and 2, respectively, and showed the result in Figure 2 (b), which shows the number of papers produced by using each individual telescope. Unlike the other telescopes, each telescope of the Keck observatory (‘K’) shows the largest values in the numbers of papers. After 2002, VLT keeps the top position among the three 8 m class telescopes of VLT, Subaru, and Gemini. While each data point is connected by broken lines, we showed the non-weighted least squares fit results by solid lines and obtained the slopes for each of the Keck, VLT, Gemini, and Subaru telescope as 7.7 ± 1.2 , 12.1 ± 1.2 , 9.9 ± 0.7 , and 9.6 ± 0.8 , respectively. VLT shows the largest value in the slope, and Gemini, Subaru, and Keck follow. VLT could have the largest slope, probably because it has (i) VLTI (VLT interferometer) : the capability of combining all the telescopes also using smaller auxiliary telescopes ($\sim 4\%$ of VLT papers are from the VLTI), (ii) powerful suite of instruments, (iii) data reduction pipelines, (iv) a queue-based observing system (about half the time), (v) data archive, (vi) synergy of having largest number of same telescopes at the same place and/or (vii) good (especially technical) support (Grothkopf et al. 2005). The reality is that it is probably some combination of these possibilities,




Figure 1: The distribution of journals published by using (a) the two Keck telescopes, (b) the four VLT telescopes, (c) the two Gemini telescopes, (d) the Subaru telescope, and (e) the HET during 2000 – 2009 are shown in pie chart. Journals with percentage of papers larger than 1% are labeled, and the empty slots without labels in panels (a) to (d) are all other journals with percentages less than 1%.




Figure 2: (a) Yearly distribution of the refereed papers published by using the Keck, VLT, Gemini, and Subaru telescopes for the period of 2000 – 2009. ‘ $K \times 2$ ’ (triangles) is for the two Keck telescopes, ‘ $V \times 4$ ’ (squares) for the four VLT telescopes, ‘ $G \times 2$ ’ (pentagons) for the two Gemini telescopes, ‘S’ (circles) is for the Subaru telescope, and ‘H’ (diamonds) is for the Hobby-Eberly Telescope. (b) The numbers of papers in panel (a) are divided by 2, 4, and 2 for Keck, VLT, and Gemini telescopes, respectively, to show the number of papers produced by each telescope. Non-weighted least squares fits to the data are shown as solid lines, and the slopes for the Keck, VLT, Gemini, and Subaru telescopes are 7.8 ± 1.2 , 13.1 ± 1.2 , 12.6 ± 1.0 , and 9.6 ± 0.8 , respectively.

Table 3: Number of Papers Published by the Current Largest ($D > 8$ m) Ground-based Optical Telescopes During 2000 – 2009

Observatory ^a	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	Sum
Keck	161	161	176	199	208	217	265	308	262	269	2226
VLT	50	105	158	253	326	344	398	470	466	436	3006
Gemini	16	35	51	50	71	99	136	166	162	185	971
Subaru	17	23	50	50	68	63	81	95	88	107	642
HET	9	13	10	19	19	7	19	18	12	5	131
Sum	253	337	445	571	692	730	899	1057	990	1002	6976

^aIncludes all the component telescopes : two for Keck and Gemini, four for VLT

and of course the common factor is ESO's larger operations budget. The fact that each of the 10 m Keck telescopes produce a larger number of papers than any each of the other 8 m class telescopes is consistent with the finding of Ahn et al. (2008) that $N \propto D$ for large optical telescopes (where, N is number of refereed papers and D is the diameter of a telescope in meter) (see also Abt (1980); Leverington (1997a)). This, on the other hand, could result from the fact that almost every aspect of a telescope project is scaling with the telescope diameter: its construction budget, its operational budget, the user community, the level of user support, etc.

The order of the slope values of the fittings of the number of refereed papers over year for each of the telescopes could be explained by other parameters, e.g., the number of instruments of the telescopes. Currently, the number of instruments of the five telescopes are : VLT - 12 (FORs1, FORs2, ISAAC, UVES, NCAO, VIMOS, FLAMES, VISIR, SINFONI, CRILES, HAWK-I, and X-shooter), Gemini - 11 (Altair, GMOS, GNIRS, Michelle, NIFS, NIRI, FLAMINGOS-2, GMOS, NICI, Phoenix, and T-ReCS), Keck - 9 (HIRES, LRIS, NIRC, DEIMOS, ESI, NIRC2, NIRSPEC, NIRSPAO, and OSIRIS), Subaru - 8 (AO188, COMICS, FMOS, FOCAS, HDS, IRCS, MOIRCS, and Suprime-Cam), and HET - 3 (LRS, MRS, and HRS). This decreasing order of the number of instruments from VLT (12) to HET (3) is almost similar to that of the slopes above, i.e. VLT (12.1 ± 1.2), Gemini (9.9 ± 0.7), Subaru (9.6 ± 0.8), Keck (7.7 ± 1.2), and almost flat HET. The existence of data archives for the observatories of VLT (<http://archive.eso.org/>), Gemini (<http://www3.cadc-ccda.hia-ihp.nrc-cnrc.gc.ca/gsa/>) and Subaru (<http://smoka.nao.ac.jp/>) coincide with the highest values for the slopes of these three telescopes, especially for the Subaru having larger slope than does Keck.

The fact, however, that Keck shows the largest values in the number of refereed papers per unit telescope could also be the result of earlier starts of the Keck telescopes than those of other telescopes, so that they could be in more stable operations. This is confirmed in Figure 3, where the data for Keck are shifted forward +4.5 years (the mean of the start years of two Keck telescopes of 1993 and 1996 is taken to be 1994.5) assuming that VLT, Gemini, Subaru, and HET started at around 1999. Panel (b) of Figure 3 shows that, if the telescopes of VLT, Gemini, and/or Subaru have

similar time for them to be stable enough for scientific operations as in the case of Keck, each component of them would have almost similar productivity as that of each of the Keck telescopes, especially for the four VLT telescopes.

Another way to compare the productivities of telescopes is to look at the number of papers as a function of age, where the 'age' is set to zero when the first paper using the telescope is published (Keck - 1996 January; VLT - 1999 March; Gemini - 2000 December; Subaru - 2000 February; HET - 2000 January). This variation versus the different ages is shown in Figure 4. Figure 4 (a) shows almost same results as in Figure 3 (a). Figure 4 (b), however, shows good progress for each of the Keck telescopes while, for the near futures of VLT, Subaru, and Gemini, more data is needed more data to see if they will show an increase in productivity as for the ages of [9, 11] of Keck or leveling off as for the ages of [11, 13] of Keck.

3.2 Nature and Science Papers

Citations to the papers are usually considered as the typical measure of the impact that journals/papers bring about (e.g. Apai et al. (2010)) and Frogel (2010) showed that *Nature* and *Science* are not included in the five journals (*A&A*, *AJ*, *ApJ*, *ApJS*, and *MNRAS*) that account for 80 to 85% of the total citations for each year. These two journals, however, still hold the highest impact factors¹³, and are generally regarded as paragon of high-impact journals (see, e.g., Metcalfe 2005). Here, we assume that the publications in *Nature* and *Science* are the prototype of high impact papers in astronomy, meaning any of new discoveries, breakthroughs in a specific field of astronomy, or new findings for celestial objects/phenomena. It is true, however, that there are opposite opinions on the journals of *Nature* and *Science* that they are too sensational. In spite of the fact that these two journals are highly ranked by Thomson Reuters, the Thomson Reuters Institute for Scientific Information (ISI) uses citation metrics only as one indicator among others to predict Nobel prizewinners. Since 'of the 28

¹³The impact factors for *Nature* and *Science* for the years of 2006, 2007, 2008, and 2009 are 26.681, 28.751, 31.434, and 34.480 and 30.028, 26.372, 28.103, and 29.747, respectively, which is released by Journal Citation Reports, Thomson Reuters.




Figure 3: Same as in Figure 2, but the data for Keck are shifted toward +4.5 years, so that all telescopes approximately have almost similar zero point in time, i.e., beginning of the science operations.




Figure 4: Same as in Figure 2, but the horizontal axis is for the ages of the observatories. The age is set to zero when the first paper using the telescope is published.

Table 4: Statistics of *Nature* and *Science* Papers During 2000 – 2009

Observatory	Min	Max	Mean	σ	Median
Keck (N)	1	11	6.9 ± 1.1	3.4	8
VLT (N)	1	11	6.4 ± 0.9	2.9	7
Gemini (N)	0	9	3.6 ± 1.1	3.5	2
Subaru (N)	0	4	1.5 ± 0.4	1.3	1
Keck (%)	0.6	6.2	3.1 ± 0.5	1.7	3.2
VLT (%)	1.2	6.7	2.5 ± 0.5	1.6	2.1
Gemini (%)	0.0	12.5	4.2 ± 1.3	4.0	4.0
Subaru (%)	0.0	6.3	2.4 ± 0.6	2.0	2.5

physics Nobel prizewinners from 2000 to 2009, just 5 are listed in ISI's top 250 most-cited list for that field' (Frey & Osterloh 2010).

Figure 5 (a) shows the yearly distribution of the number of papers published in *Nature* and *Science* by using the Keck, VLT, Gemini, and Subaru telescopes for the period of 2000 – 2009, and Figure 5 (b) shows the rate of *Nature* and *Science* papers among all the refereed papers produced by using the telescopes. Table 6 shows the statistics of these papers, where the upper part is for the number of papers and the lower part is for the rate of *Nature* and *Science* papers among all the refereed papers produced by using the telescopes. The Keck telescopes produce the largest mean ($N = 6.9 \pm 1.1$, $\sigma = 3.4$) number of *Nature* and *Science* papers, and the VLT (mean $N = 6.4 \pm 0.9$, $\sigma = 2.9$) follows it. Gemini shows a somewhat larger fluctuation like Keck (mean $N = 3.6 \pm 1.1$, $\sigma = 3.5$), and Subaru shows rather low, but still steady distribution (mean $N = 1.5 \pm 0.4$, $\sigma = 1.3$). The mean rates of *Nature* and *Science* papers among all the refereed papers produced by these observatories are between 2.4 and 4.2, while the median values are 2.1 (VLT), 2.5 (Subaru), 3.2 (Keck), and 4.0 (Gemini). Gemini still shows larger value of dispersion ($\sigma = 4.0$) in the rate of *Nature* and *Science* papers among all the refereed papers than the other observatories ($\sigma = 1.6, 1.7$, and 2.0 for VLT, Keck, and Subaru, respectively). The reason why there is no *Nature* and/or *Science* papers from the HET could be attributed, among others, to the small number of papers based on the HET data and possibly to the fact that its structure is designed in a very special way (see Section 1), specifically for spectroscopy, at very low cost.

In Figure 5 (a) the primary reason why the Subaru Observatory shows least number of *Nature* and *Science* papers compared to the other observatories is because the number of component telescopes is different. We, therefore, plotted in Figure 6 (a) the yearly distribution of the number of papers published in the two journals of *Nature* and *Science* by using each of the Keck, VLT, Gemini, and Subaru telescopes for the period of 2000 – 2009. Figure 6 (b) shows the rate of *Nature* and *Science* papers among all the refereed papers produced by using each of the telescopes. Table 7 shows the statistics of these papers, where the upper part is for the number of papers and the lower part is for the

Table 5: Statistics of *Nature* and *Science* Papers Produced by Using Each Telescope During 2000 – 2009

Telescope	Min	Max	Mean	σ	Median
Each Keck (N)	0.5	5.5	3.5 ± 0.5	1.7	4
Each VLT (N)	0.3	2.8	1.6 ± 0.2	0.7	1.8
Each Gemini (N)	0	4.5	1.8 ± 0.5	1.7	1
Subaru (N)	0	4	1.5 ± 0.4	1.3	1
Each Keck (%)	0.3	3.1	1.6 ± 0.3	0.8	1.6
Each VLT (%)	0.3	1.7	0.6 ± 0.1	0.4	0.5
Each Gemini (%)	0.0	6.3	2.1 ± 0.6	2.0	2.0
Subaru (%)	0.0	6.3	2.4 ± 0.6	2.0	2.5

rate of *Nature* and *Science* papers among all the refereed papers produced by using each of the telescopes.

Compared to the other 8 m class telescopes (mean values of $N = 1.5 - 2.3$, median $N = 1 - 1.8$), the 10 m Keck telescope shows the largest mean ($N = 3.5 \pm 0.5$, $\sigma = 1.7$) and median ($N = 4$) number of papers. While each telescope of the observatories shows similar rate of *Nature* and *Science* papers among all the refereed papers produced by using each of the telescopes (mean $N = 0.7 - 2.3$, median $N = 0.6 - 2.5$), VLT shows the lowest rate and Subaru shows the highest rate. Since the total numbers of refereed papers produced by each of the VLT telescopes is not small (see Figure 2 (b)), it could be concluded that the users of the VLT telescopes tend to publish more papers in the usual astronomical journals than in the journals of *Nature* and *Science*. From each of the Keck, VLT, Gemini and Subaru telescopes, the overall mean and median values in Table 7 are $N = 2.1 \pm 0.9$ and $N = 2.0 \pm 1.4$, respectively, for the number of *Nature* and *Science* papers and $1.7 \pm 0.8\%$ and $1.6 \pm 0.9\%$, respectively, for the rates. We, therefore, could conclude that each of the current 8 to 10 m class telescopes is producing 2.1 ± 0.9 *Nature* and *Science* papers annually and the rate of these papers among all the refereed papers produced by using that telescope is $1.7 \pm 0.8\%$.

In the meanwhile, it is necessary to note that these statistics represent only the current trend considering the number of the active, fore-front astronomical facilities including the largest ($D > 8$ m) ground-based optical telescopes, space telescopes, specially designed/special purpose telescopes, etc. and the policies of the *Nature* and *Science* journals regarding the balance among the different disciplines represented in the journals. In the next decade, some, many, or most of the above optical/infrared telescopes currently producing many *Nature* and *Science* papers will be probably substituted by ELTs in the sense that producing new discoveries and doing highest impact sciences at that time.

Telescopes smaller than ELTs could get some ideas on their long-term performance from the case of CFHT. CFHT is one of the most competitive telescopes among the 4 m class (Benn & Sánchez 2001), and has produced around 130 refereed papers in 2010 (Veillet 2011) in the current era of large ($D \sim 8 - 10$ m) opti-




Figure 5: (a) Yearly distribution of the number of papers published in *Nature* and *Science* by using the Keck, VLT, Gemini, and Subaru telescopes for the period of 2000 – 2009. ‘K×2’ (triangles) is for the two Keck telescopes, ‘V×4’ (squares) for the four VLT telescopes, ‘G×2’ (pentagons) for the two Gemini telescopes, and ‘S’ (circles) is for the Subaru telescope. (b) The rate of the number of papers published in *Nature* and *Science* divided by the total number of refereed papers for the Keck, VLT, Gemini, and Subaru telescopes for the period of 2000 – 2009. Symbols are same as in panel (a).




Figure 6: (a) Yearly distribution of the number of papers published in *Nature* and *Science* by using each of the Keck, VLT, Gemini, and Subaru telescopes for the period of 2000 – 2009. ‘K’ (triangles) is for each of the two Keck telescopes, ‘G’ (pentagons) for each of the two Gemini telescopes, ‘V’ (squares) for each of the four VLT telescopes, and ‘S’ (circles) is for the Subaru telescope itself. (b) The rate of the number of papers published in *Nature* and *Science* divided by the total number of refereed papers for each of the Keck, VLT, Gemini, and Subaru telescopes for the period of 2000 – 2009. Symbols are same as in panel (a).

cal telescopes though its being only 3.6 m in diameter. The annual number of refereed publications based significantly on CFHT has been more or less over 50 since 2000, and it already became larger than 100 in 2007¹⁴. This productive trend of results might be based on the efforts made by the Observatory like the followings :

- Queued Service Observing (QSO) mode affords as much real observing time as requested by the observers. The QSO personnel select the observing conditions according to the sky clearance and seeing so that the optimum condition is given to every successful observing proposal.
- The obtained data are provided to the principal investigators after the preprocessing is finished, so that observers do not need to spend a minute on it.
- CFHT affords high-performance wide-field imagers (field of view of $0.96^\circ \times 0.94^\circ$ in optical, and $20' \times 20'$ in near-infrared wavebands), which is a big advantage of this telescope making it possible for this telescope to achieve high level of paper production (Cuby et al. 2007).
- CFHT carries out large programs and collaborative observing projects with many other facilities, which maximized the value of the telescope.

4 Summary and Discussion

We have analysed the ten year (2000 – 2009) publication record of the current largest ($D > 8$ m) ground-based optical telescopes of Keck, VLT, Gemini, Subaru, and HET. During the ten year period, the telescopes of Keck, VLT, Gemini, and Subaru showed increasing numbers of refereed papers and this tendency is still preserved when we divided the number of papers by the number of telescope components (2 for Keck and Gemini, and 4 for the VLT telescopes). Each telescope of the Keck, VLT, Gemini, Subaru, and HET observatories produced 135, 109, 93, 107, and 5 refereed papers, respectively, in 2009. For the ten year period, the number of papers produced by each of the telescopes is largest for the Keck, while the largest slope in the change of the annual number of papers is for the VLT. It is worthwhile to note that the impact of papers based on archival data can have a significant impact on a telescope's productivity. For example, almost half of papers published using *HST* data are based on at least some archival data¹⁵, and this could be also a factor for VLT, Gemini, and Subaru as mentioned in §3.1. While the astronomical literature continues to grow exponentially by 2 – 3% (Frogel 2010), 4% (Abt 1998), 5% (White 2007; Trimble & Ceja 2008), 6–7% (Abt 2010), or 8.8% (Abt 1995) annually, we will need more data for the next several years to see if the number of papers produced by using the telescopes will still increase or not, since some of the telescopes (Keck and VLT) show somewhat less publications in 2008 and 2009 than the year of 2007 (see Figure 2 (a)).

¹⁴CFHT Annual Report 2007 : http://www.cfht.hawaii.edu/AnnualReports/AR2007e_web.pdf

¹⁵<http://archive.stsci.edu/hst/bibliography/pubstat.html>

For the papers published in the two multi-disciplinary, high-impact journals of *Nature* and *Science* (Frogel 2010), we have shown that each telescope of the Keck, VLT, Gemini, and Subaru observatories is producing 2.1 ± 0.9 *Nature* and *Science* papers annually and the rate of these papers among all the refereed papers produced by using that telescope is 1.7 ± 0.8 %. Extending this relation obtained from the current largest ground-based optical telescopes, we may be able to conclude that this ratio of the number of *Nature* and *Science* papers over the number of whole refereed papers that will be produced by future ELTs of GMT, TMT and E-ELT will remain similar. If, therefore, one of the future larger telescopes produces, e.g., 330 refereed papers annually, the above *simple* calculation suggests that ~ 6 *Nature* and/or *Science* papers might be included in these publications annually.

From the comparison of the publication trends of the telescopes, we may conclude the followings :

- While the telescope productivity means papers per telescope, it is expected that the more telescopes of the same kind at the same location, the more synergies occur. This includes the effectiveness of maintenance, less number of observatory personnel, less cost for the facilities and more chances to use the instruments that are made to be attached to the same telescope. Although this fact might not be the critical factor for telescope productivity, the specific example of the VLT is worth noting. The four VLT telescopes currently have the largest number of instruments (12 ; see §3.1, four of the instruments can be used at the same time), largest number of papers among the telescopes considered in this study, and largest slope value (12.1 ± 1.2) of the fitting of the number of refereed papers over year.
- The important factors that influence the growth rate of paper production are ramp-up in efficient operations, reliable instruments, useful instruments, and the number of good instruments available at the telescope. The latter point might be supported by the fact that the order of the number of instruments is almost the same as that of the slope values of the fitting of the number of refereed papers over year : VLT ($12, 12.1 \pm 1.2$), Gemini ($11, 9.9 \pm 0.7$), Keck ($9, 7.7 \pm 1.2$), Subaru ($8, 9.6 \pm 0.8$), and HET (3, almost flat), where (number of instruments, the slope value).

Although it might not be able to have more than one telescope at a site to maximize the productivity, it is a natural and necessary way to increase the number of good instruments available and to afford the archive to maximize the use of the data. There are also many other items that affect the productivities of telescopes, such as :

- user base of the telescope,
- publication traditions of journals (e.g., US vs European journals) (Schulman et al. 1997; Abt 1998, 2010; Frogel 2010), and
- support on the telescope users (pool of the management personnel),

of which investigation in the future might give us more lessons, although it is not easy to get some of the data (e.g. budget). The first item above, the user base of the telescope, might be correlated with the telescope subscription rate. Frogel (2010) showed that (in his figure 1) the membership numbers for the American Astronomical Society (AAS) have stayed flat for the last 10 – 20 years (cf. Abt (2000)), while those for the International Astronomical Union increased about 20% over the same period. This almost constant number of AAS membership shows no correlation with the increase of the numbers of papers of US telescopes of Keck, HET (90% portion for US) and Gemini (48% portion for US) as shown in this study. This indicates that the analysis of the user base of the large optical telescopes might need the database of actual telescope users, needless to say that of optical astronomers of the countries that operate the telescopes, specifically for VLT, Gemini, and HET which are being operated by two or more countries. The rather detailed analysis on the journal of AJ by Bracher (1999) might represent the studies on the publication traditions of journals.

Acknowledgments

S.C.K. would like to thank the referee, Dennis Crabtree, for providing prompt and thoughtful comments and detailed comments on English that greatly helped improve the original manuscript. S.C.K. is also grateful to Dr. Hong Soo Park for his kind help in using the SuperMongo and helpful discussion, and to Drs. Jaemann Kyeong and A-Ran Lyo for their kind encouragements. S.C.K. is a member of the Dedicated Researchers for Extragalactic Astronomy (DREAM) team in Korea Astronomy and Space Science Institute (KASI).

5 Appendix

The following five tables are squeezed into one table (Table 3) in the PASA edition, which are shown here in arXiv version only.

References

- Abt, H. A. 1980, *PASP*, 92, 249
- Abt, H. A. 1995, *ApJ*, 455, 407
- Abt, H. A. 1998a, *PASP*, 110, 210
- Abt, H. A. 2000, *PASP*, 112, 1417
- Abt, H. A. 2010, *PASP*, 122, 955
- Ahn, S.-H., Park, B.-G., Kim, Y.-S., Chun, M.-Y., Kim, H.-I., Sung, H.-I., Lee, D.-W., & Kim, S. C. 2008, *PKAS*, 23, 123 (Erratum: 2010, *PKAS*, 25, 51)
- Apai, D., Lagerstrom, J., Reid, I. N., Levay, K. L., Fraser, E., Nota, A., & Henneken, E. 2010, *PASP*, 122, 808
- Barth, A. J., Sari, R., Cohen, M. H., Goodrich, R. W., Price, P. A., Fox, D. W., Bloom, J. S., Soderberg, A. M., Kulkarni, S. R. 2003, *ApJ*, 584, L47
- Benn, C. R., & Sánchez, S. F. 2001, *PASP*, 113, 385
- Bracher, K. 1999, *AJ*, 117, 12
- Crabtree, D. 2008, *SPIE*, 7016, 70161A
- Crabtree, D. 2011, *AAS*, 217, 15719
- Cuby, J.-G., et al. 2007, A preparatory document to the 2007 CFHT Users' Meeting (http://www.cfht.hawaii.edu/UM2007/UM07_Prep.pdf)
- Da Rocha, C., Mendes de Oliveira, C., Bolte, M., Ziegler, B. L., & Puzia, T. H. 2002, *AJ*, 123, 690
- Davoust, E., & Schmadel, L. D. 1987, *PASP*, 99, 700
- De Breuck, C. et al. 2001, *AJ*, 121, 1241
- Dessauges-Zavadsky, M., Prochaska, J. X., & D'Odorico, S. 2002, *A&A*, 391, 801
- Drory, N. et al. 2001, *ApJ*, 562, L111
- Fischer, D. A. et al. 2005, *ApJ*, 620, 481
- Frey, B. S., & Osterloh, M. 2010, *Nature*, 465, 871
- Frogel, J. A. 2010, *PASP*, 122, 1214
- Grothkopf, U., Leibundgut, B., Macchetto, D., Madrid, J. P., & Leitherer, C. 2005, *The Messenger*, 119, 45
- Höflich, P. et al. 2004, *ApJ*, 617, 1258
- Hu, E. M. et al. 2002, *ApJ*, 568, L75
- Leverington, D. 1996, *Q. J. R. astr. Soc.*, 37, 643
- Leverington, D. 1997a, *Nature*, 385, 196
- Leverington, D. 1997b, *Nature*, 387, 12
- Meylan, G., Madrid, J. P., & Macchetto, D. 2004, *PASP*, 116, 790
- Metcalf, T. S. 2005, *BAAS*, 37, 555
- Pettini, M., & Bowen, D. V. 2001, *ApJ*, 560, 41
- Ringwald, F. A., Culver, J. M., Lovell, R. L., Kays, S. A., & Torres, Y. V. 2003, *BAAS*, 35, 1063
- Schaye, J., Rauch, M., Sargent, W. L. W., & Kim, T.-S. 2000, *ApJ*, 541, L1
- Schulman, E., French, J. C., Powell, A. L., Eichhorn, G., Kurtz, M. J., & Murray, S. S. 1997, *PASP*, 109, 1278

Table 6: Number of Papers Published by Using the Keck Telescopes During 2000 – 2009

Journal	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	Sum
ApJ	83	81	97	109	114	131	157	183	152	166	1273
AJ	36	42	44	37	40	30	34	33	34	31	361
MNRAS	5	8	6	15	11	11	19	34	26	17	152
A&A	11 ^a	17	9	4	12	7	17	16	13	21	127
Icarus	1	2	6	6	6	11	10	14	11	8	75
PASP	7	3	9	5	2	3	10	6	3	8	56
ApJS	4	2	4	6	10	7	3	8	6	6	56
Nature	7	1	1	6	2	6	4	4	5	6	42
Science	3	2	0	2	1	5	3	6	4	1	27
NewAR	0	2	0	2	0	1	4	0	2	0	11
Ap&SS	0	1	0	3	0	0	0	1	0	2	7
JGR	2	0	0	2	1	0	1	1	0	0	7
ARA&A	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	1	5
GeoRL	0	0	0	0	3	1	0	1	0	0	5
AdSpR	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	3
AN	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	2
PASJ	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	2
NuPhA	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
PhST	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2
Others ^b	2	0	0	0	4	0	1	0	2	2	11
Sum	161	161	176	199	208	217	265	308	262	269	2226

^aThe only one paper published in *A&A Supplements* in 2000 is included here

^bJournals with only one paper during 2000 – 2009

Table 7: Number of Papers Published by Using the VLT During 2000 – 2009

Journal	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	Sum
A&A	35	56	86	129	177	176	204	230	228	210	1531
ApJ	11	23	42	66	81	78	95	106	103	115	720
MNRAS	1	5	11	26	33	51	59	80	93	67	426
AJ	2	7	8	20	16	14	18	14	13	15	127
ApJS	0	0	2	0	5	5	3	21	8	5	49
Nature	1	6	2	4	4	7	9	1	6	6	46
Icarus	0	0	0	3	3	5	1	7	4	3	26
Science	0	1	2	3	0	0	2	5	4	1	18
AN	0	2	1	2	0	0	1	2	3	5	16
PASP	0	0	0	0	1	6	2	1	1	4	15
JGR	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	1	0	6
NewAR	0	4	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	5
NewA	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	4
EM&P	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
P&SS	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	3
AdSpR	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
PhRvL	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	2
ARA&A	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Others ^a	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	1	0	2	6
Sum	50	105	158	253	326	344	398	470	466	436	3006

^aJournals with only one paper during 2000 – 2009

Table 8: Number of Papers Published by Using the Gemini Telescopes During 2000 – 2009

Journal	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	Sum
ApJ	7	12	18	18	33	46	56	89	71	89	439
MNRAS	2	6	4	5	10	13	27	33	29	38	167
AJ	1	4	9	14	10	19	22	20	22	21	142
A&A	2	6	5	5	7	5	12	11	22	21	96
Icarus	2	2	3	0	1	3	1	4	5	2	23
Nature	1	0	0	1	1	5	6	1	3	3	21
ApJS	0	0	0	1	2	1	2	4	3	4	17
PASP	0	3	4	1	4	1	1	1	1	0	16
Science	1	0	0	1	1	3	3	0	5	1	15
NewAR	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	5
Ap&SS	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	5
JOSAA	0	2	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	5
AN	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	3
RMxAA	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	3
PASA	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	2
ApOpt	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
P&SS	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2
Others ^a	0	0	2	0	0	1	1	2	0	2	8
Sum	16	35	51	50	71	99	136	166	162	185	971

^aJournals with only one paper during 2000 – 2009

Table 9: Number of Papers Published by Using the Subaru Telescope During 2000 – 2009

Journal	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	Sum
ApJ	0	11	22	25	31	30	43	28	37	65	292
PASJ	15	10	21	9	11	12	8	10	15	13	124
AJ	1	1	1	9	13	6	8	6	5	5	55
MNRAS	0	0	3	4	5	4	10	9	9	4	48
A&A	1	0	3	0	4	5	2	5	11	13	44
ApJS	0	0	0	1	1	0	2	33	6	1	44
Nature	0	0	0	1	1	2	2	1	1	1	9
Science	0	1	0	0	1	2	0	0	2	0	6
Icarus	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4
PASP	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	3
JGR	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	3
AN	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	2
P&SS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	2
Others ^a	0	0	0	1	1	1	2	0	0	1	6
Sum	17	23	50	50	68	63	81	95	88	107	642

^aJournals with only one paper during 2000 – 2009

Table 10: Number of Papers Published by Using the HET During 2000 – 2009

Journal	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	Sum
ApJ	3	3	2	4	11	3	10	10	6	2	54
AJ	4	7	5	9	6	3	7	4	4	0	49
A&A	1	1	2	3	0	1	1	2	1	0	12
PASP	1	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	6
MNRAS	0	0	0	2	1	0	1	1	0	0	5
ApJS	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	2	5
Sum	9	13	10	19	19	7	19	18	12	5	131

- Stanek, K. Z. 2008, (arXiv:0809.0692)
- Trimble, V. 1995, PASP, 107, 977
- Trimble, V. 1996, Scientometrics, 36, 237
- Trimble, V. 2009, Exp. Astron., 26, 133
- Trimble, V., Zaich, P., & Bosler, T. 2005, PASP, 117, 111
- Trimble, V., & Ceja, J. A. 2007, AN, 328, 983
- Trimble, V., & Ceja, J. A. 2008, AN, 329, 632
- Veillet, C. 2011, private communication
- Venn, K. A. et al. 2001, ApJ, 547, 765
- Vreeswijk, P. M. et al. 2004, A&A, 419, 927
- White, S. D. M. 2007, RPPh, 70, 883
- Zheng, W. et al. 2000, AJ, 120, 1607