

Uncertain research country rankings. Should we continue producing uncertain rankings?

Alonso Rodríguez-Navarro

*Departamento de Biotecnología-Biología Vegetal, Universidad Politécnica de Madrid,
Avenida Puerta de Hierro 2, 28040, Madrid, Spain*

*Departamento de Estructura de la Materia, Física Térmica y Electrónica y GISC,
Universidad Complutense de Madrid, Plaza de las Ciencias 3, 28040, Madrid, Spain*

E-mail address: alonso.rodriguez@upm.es. Telephone number: +34 916333869

ORCID 0000-0003-0462-223X

Abstract

Citation-based country rankings consistently categorize Japan as a developing country, even in those from the most reputed institutions. This categorization challenges the credibility of such rankings, considering Japan's elevated scientific standing. In most cases, these rankings use percentile indicators, which render accurate rankings if country citations fit an ideal model of distribution, but they are misleading in cases of deviations. The ideal model implies a power law citation-based double rank—in the global and country lists. This report conducts a systematic examination of deviations from the ideal model and their consequential impact on evaluations. The study evaluates six selected countries across three scientifically relevant topics and utilizes Leiden Ranking assessments of over 300 universities. The findings reveal four types of deviations from the ideal model, occurring in the upper and lower tails of the distributions. These deviations lead to incorrect assessments, which in turn may lead to misguided research policies.

Key words: citation metrics, research evaluation, country rankings, scientometrics

1. INTRODUCTION

Research drives the progress of knowledge and technology, and all developed countries invest significant amounts of funds in research. However, not all of their research is focused on pushing the boundaries of knowledge; incremental innovations also play a significant role in the technological development of countries. The ratio of these two types of research can vary widely among countries, defining research systems with very different structures (Rodríguez-Navarro and Brito 2021b). Despite these different structures, most research assessments rely on universal size and efficiency indicators applicable to all countries without considering their structural differences.

Regarding the size of the research systems, indicators such as the number of publications (Leydesdorff and Wagner 2009) and even the number of the top 10% most cited papers (European Commission 2022) correlate with funding, providing reasonably accurate information about size. But size is not sufficient to define a research system, and size indicators do not correlate with the number of Nobel Prizes (Rodríguez-Navarro 2011). Therefore, society needs to know not only the size of its research system but also its efficiency, which implies the productivity of its investments in research. This is a challenging task because the results of research cannot be counted or weighted like common merchandise. Technological advances may be more easily estimated, but the contribution of research to pushing the boundaries of knowledge cannot be easily quantified.

Building on the ideas from pioneering studies (Garfield 1955; Merton 1979; Narin 1976; Price 1965), a multitude of countries, institutions, and researchers have utilized bibliometric measurements to assess the scientific or technological success of countries and institutions (Aksnes et al. 2019; Godin 2003; Mingers and Leydesdorff 2015; Waltman 2016). Regardless of these efforts, country and institution research rankings frequently yield evidently misleading results. For instance, reports from the US National Science Board (National Science Board 2018, 2020, 2022) and European Commission (European Commission 2018, 2020, 2022) depict Japan's research level surprisingly low. Despite the 17 Nobel laureates of Japanese researchers in natural sciences in this century, in the European Commission rankings, Japan's research **excellence** is equated to that of Turkey and falls well below that of Italy and Spain.

Similarly, the Australian Strategic Policy Institute (Gaida et al. 2023), in a study of 44 technologies, positions India and Italy ahead of Japan based on the number of top 10% most cited papers ($P_{\text{top } 10\%}$; henceforth, I will use this Leiden Ranking nomenclature) and the h -index.

These results contradict more reliable deductions based on the number of Nobel Prizes (Schlagberger et al. 2016) or triadic patents (Rodríguez-Navarro and Brito 2021b). While occasional explanations attribute the discrepancy to the lesser visibility of Japanese publications (Pendlebury 2020), other evidence suggests that the poor research evaluations of Japan arise from the use of inappropriate metrics (Rodríguez-Navarro and Brito 2024a), implying similar failures may occur in other countries.

In summary, the shortcomings of research assessments in Japan raise the possibility that these failures are widespread across countries but undetected. Japan's case is obvious because the mistake affects a very successful country, but in other countries or institutions, detection might be more difficult. This potential for extended failures in research assessments requires investigation because the continuous publication of uncertain rankings does not align with society's needs.

1.1. Citation metrics for research assessments

Bibliometric research assessments based on citation metrics are the simplest and most commonly used method to evaluate the scientific success of countries and institutions, although these methods should not be employed for individual or a small number of papers (Aksnes et al. 2019). As mentioned earlier, the number of scientific papers serves as a measure of the size of the system, a necessary component in any research assessment, but size alone is insufficient to describe a research system.

To complement the number of publications, an extensive array of research indicators have been proposed using citation metrics (Waltman 2016; Wildgaard et al. 2014). These metrics can be categorized into three types: citation-only metrics, citation-based rank metrics, and metrics combining these two basic types. For comparative purposes, if citation metrics are going to be applied to different disciplines and publication years, they should be normalized to account for the differences in citation practices across research fields. It is a fundamental principle long recognized that using

citation metrics, two publications in different research fields can only be compared after normalizing their number of citations (Mcalister et al. 1983; Schubert and Braun 1996).

In citation-only metrics, the number of citations is utilized to assess the relevance of papers, and the evaluations of countries and institutions are obtained using the number of citations of all their publications. This number of citations can be used directly or in combination with the number of papers. The mean number of citations, as in the case of the impact factor of journals (Garfield 1999), is the simplest of these metrics, but there are also more elaborated formulas (Docampo and Besoule 2019; Prathap 2010; Waltman et al. 2011).

Citation-based rank metrics are non-parametric indicators obtained from the number of citations (Conover and Iman 1981). In this approach, global papers in certain years and research disciplines or topics are ordered by their number of citations, starting with the most cited paper, and concurrently, the same is done with the publications of institutions or countries. Consequently, each publication has two ranks—in the global and local lists—and only these ranks are further used. The most studied metrics of this type are the top percentile metrics (Bornmann et al. 2013; Waltman and Schreiber 2013). In this case, the global list is segmented at certain top percentile levels, e.g., at the top 10% or 1%. Then, the percentile indicator is the number of papers in the local list that are present in the selected percentile of the global list, which coincides with the local rank of the least cited paper of those included—papers with the same number of citations raise an issue that has technical solutions (Waltman and Schreiber 2013). This method is intuitive because the concept of success is associated with a high number of citations and, consequently, with a high number of papers in a narrow top percentile. Other metrics of this type are based on the two ranks, either using the whole list of papers, as in the e_p index (Rodríguez-Navarro and Brito 2018a), or only a few papers in the top positions in the lists, as in the Rk index (Rodríguez-Navarro and Brito 2024b).

The third type of metric employs both citation-based ranks and the number of citations. A widely known indicator of this type is the h -index, which has generated an abundant bibliography about it and derivative indices (Bihari et al. 2021; Bornmann and Daniel 2007). The h -index is the simplest combination of parametric and non-parametric statistics; it only requires that a rank and the number of citations are equal

(Hirsch 2005). However, it is not an accurate indicator (Brito and Rodríguez-Navarro 2021; Waltman and van Eck 2012).

1.2. Uncertain definitions

Although the contribution to pushing the boundaries of knowledge seems to be the most important objective of assessment, the relationship of most country rankings (European Commission 2018, 2020, 2022; National Science Board 2018, 2020, 2022) with this contribution is not clear. While most country rankings do not explicitly state that they pretend to evaluate this type of contribution, an imprecise terminology does not exclude it.

The term *impact* of a paper is widely used in scientometrics, implying the attention that other researchers paid to it in terms of the number of citations. However, the relationship between *impact* and pushing the boundaries of knowledge would need to be standardized if the term were used to measure such activity. The term *excellence* is also widely used, normally associated with highly cited papers but not necessarily with the progress of knowledge. For example, “Strong representation in the ranks of highly cited publications is considered an indicator of scientific excellence” (Science and Technology Observatory 2019, p. 29); “The share of the top 1% of highly cited scientific publications as a percentage of the total scientific publications (Figure 6.1-8) is often used as a proxy for scientific excellence;” (European Commission 2020, p. 369) or “We measure scientific research excellence with a field-normalized count of the 10% most cited publications.” (Hardeman and van Roy 2013, p. 18). Regarding top percentile references, the difference between $P_{top\ 10\%}$ and $P_{top\ 1\%}$ is high, which makes unclear the level of the term *excellence*. With reference to pushing the frontiers of knowledge, the notion that one out of every 10 scientific publications really contributes to the progress of knowledge is unrealistic.

Regrettably, *excellence* and *impact* are not the only fuzzy concepts in research assessments. If what has to be measured is not clearly established, terms such as *research performance*, *scientific performance*, and *scientific importance*, which have been widely used for many years since the outset of scientometrics (Aksnes et al. 2023; Bazeley 2010; Crespo and Simoes 2021; Irvine and Martin 1989; Leydesdorff 1988; Mcalister et al. 1983; Narin and Hamilton 1996; Taylor and Ellison 1967), have an

uncertain meaning. Even the term *progress of knowledge* may refer equally to the progress of knowledge that is associated with either *normal* or *revolutionary science* (Kuhn 1970). Consequently, it includes incremental developments, which are important in technological progress (Banbury and Mitchel 1995) but cannot be considered contributions to pushing the boundaries of knowledge.

1.3. Science breakthroughs

The concept of breakthrough (Sorensen et al. 2016) may resolve the puzzle created by other terms concerning the contribution to pushing the boundaries of knowledge because it pinpoints an important discovery. For evaluation purposes, breakthrough publications can be linked to very highly cited publications (Bornmann et al. 2018; Hollingsworth 2008; Min et al. 2021; Schneider and Costas 2017; Wuestman et al. 2020). Although not all breakthroughs are very highly cited (Hu and Rousseau 2019), and not all very highly cited papers report scientific breakthroughs (Garfield 1973), at the country or institutional level, the positive and negative deviations cancel out, and the number of very highly cited papers could be used as convenient metrics for breakthroughs. More importantly, at the global level, the number of breakthroughs has been associated with concrete percentiles in the range of 0.01–0.02% % (Bornmann et al. 2018; Poege et al. 2019), providing a threshold of reference to calculate the contribution or probability of contribution of countries and institutions to pushing the boundaries of knowledge. In this sense, the former President of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, William H. Press, considers that “the benefits of scientific discovery have been heavy tailed,” (Press 2013), implying that they are infrequent achievements, although more frequent than could be expected from a normal probability distribution, which is not heavy tailed.

1.4. Deviations from a universal citation distribution model

Most indicators used in research assessments are statistical data, whose value is enhanced if they measure what we want to measure about the research system, either breakthroughs or less important achievements. In both cases, for a reliable mathematical treatment of these data, there must exist a mathematical model. The proposal and discussion of possible models can be tackled using both citation and rank distributions.

Regarding citations, a lognormal citation distribution (Radicchi et al. 2008) has extensive support (Golosovsky 2021), in which, additionally, the σ parameter is quite constant, around 1.0–1.2 (Radicchi et al. 2008; Rodríguez-Navarro and Brito 2018b; Thelwall 2016; Viiu 2018). Concerning rank metrics, a power law links global and local ranks in countries and institutions (Rodríguez-Navarro and Brito 2018b). As a consequence of their double-rank basis, percentile indicators are also linked by a power law (Brito and Rodríguez-Navarro 2018). It is worth noting that the double rank power law does not require a lognormal distribution of citations.

The power law that links percentile indicators has special importance in research assessment, and has been demonstrated to hold for countries and institutions. For example, despite the 10-fold difference existing between the number of top 10% and 1% most cited papers, the European Commission country rankings based on the $P_{\text{top 10\%}}/P$ and $P_{\text{top 1\%}}/P$ ratios (European Commission 2018, 2020, 2022) are very similar. Consistently, analysis of the Leiden Ranking indicates that evaluations based on several top percentiles are equivalent (Rodríguez-Navarro and Brito 2021a; Waltman et al. 2012b). More significantly, in 500 universities in the Leiden Ranking, the $PP_{\text{top 10\%}}$ ($P_{\text{top 10\%}}/P$ ratio expressed as percentage) and MNCS (average number of normalized citations) indicators are highly correlated (Perianes-Rodríguez and Ruiz-Castillo 2016; Waltman et al. 2012b). These two indicators have completely different bases of calculation, and their correlation would be impossible in the absence of a common model of citation distribution for all universities.

Contrasting with the above support, deviations from the lognormal distribution (Perianes-Rodríguez and Ruiz-Castillo 2016; Shahmandi et al. 2020; Waltman et al. 2012a) and from the double rank power law (Rodríguez-Navarro and Brito 2018b) have been described. These deviations cast doubt on the accuracy of research indicators, which is especially relevant if the research evaluation is focused on breakthroughs. In this case, the evaluation may need to be based on the calculation of probabilities for infrequent papers rather than on counting them (Rodríguez-Navarro and Brito 2019); this probability calculation would be inaccurate if there exist large deviations from a mathematical model.

In summary, empirical data show concordances but also deviations from ideal, universal models of citation and rank distributions. This poses an interesting question

about how deviations from these ideal models affect research assessments based on the number of citations or citation-based rank metrics.

2. Aim of this study

This study stems from the unequivocal finding that the evaluations of Japan and several of its universities do not accurately reflect their scientific level, and the conjecture that similar wrong evaluations may occur in other countries. Given this context, the study aims to investigate deviations from the ideal models described above and how these deviations could affect the assessment of research systems. A secondary research question explores whether research assessments require more than a single indicator to assess the efficiency or quality of research.

To achieve these objectives, this study has three parts. The first part addresses the deviations by studying the citation and rank distributions in selected countries and research topics. The second part investigates deviations from the double rank model in many universities, taking advantage of the large amount of data provided by the Leiden Ranking. The last part discusses that a single indicator is not sufficient to describe the research systems of some countries and institutions. It is concluded that research rankings based on a single indicator of efficiency or quality may overlook important information. While a single indicator is sufficient and accurate in some cases, without additional information, it is unknown in which cases this occurs, which makes the entire ranking uncertain.

3. MATERIALS AND METHODS

Citations in the topics of solar cells/photovoltaics, semiconductors, and immunity were obtained from Clarivate Web of Sciences. Searches were performed making use of the Advanced Search tool in the Web of Science Core Collection, edition: Science Citation Index Expanded. The searches were limited to articles (DT=) using a four-year publication window (2014–2017) and counting the citations in a four-year window (2019–2022). The global search was limited to the 75 most productive countries (Clarivate InCites). Domestic searches included one country and excluded the other 74. Focusing on domestic papers is advantageous in this study because, in general terms,

deviations in the lower tail are more evident in domestic than in international collaborative papers (unpublished results).

For double rank analysis, global and country papers were ordered based on their number of citations, starting with the one with the highest number of citations. Then, the global ranks of country papers were obtained after their identification in the global list. Histograms with logarithmic binning also include the numbers of papers with zero, one, and two citations. In some figures, the histogram of a synthetic series of lognormally distributed random numbers is included to guide the eye. These series were generated as described previously (Rodríguez-Navarro and Brito 2018b).

The university data used in this study were obtained from the CWTS Leiden Ranking 2023 (<https://zenodo.org/records/8027120>). The reported data are the means of four periods of evaluation, from 2015–2018 to 2018–2021, using fractional counting. Universities with less than 10 papers in the top 1% most cited papers ($P_{\text{top } 1\%}$) in any of the four evaluation periods were eliminated.

4. RESULTS

4.1. The upper tail of citation distributions

The measurement or estimation of the contribution or capacity of countries and institutions to pushing the boundaries of knowledge should be one of the most important aims of research assessment. In every topic or research field evaluated, this information can be obtained by studying the very highly cited papers that constitute the extreme upper tail of the citation distribution of global papers. To address the question of whether this extreme of the upper tail conforms to or deviates from the ideal models, double rank analysis is the most convenient.

To perform this analysis, I chose three important research topics: solar cells/photovoltaics, semiconductors, and immunity, which have experienced rapid evolution in recent years. In two of these topics, solar cells and semiconductors, incremental innovations have proven extremely important, whereas this type of innovation holds less significance in immunity. I then selected six countries based on their distinct research system models. Table 1 provides a basic description of these 18 cases in terms of P , $P_{\text{top } 10\%}/P$, and $P_{\text{top } 1\%}/P_{\text{top } 10\%}$. In the absence of deviations from the

ideal model, the ratios $P_{\text{top } 10\%}/P$ and $P_{\text{top } 1\%}/P_{\text{top } 10\%}$ should be equal (Rodríguez-Navarro and Brito 2019). This is evident in a few cases, such as the USA in solar cells, and Germany and South Korea in semiconductors. In other cases, differences are high in either of the two senses, such as Germany and Japan in immunity. Overall, describing a general pattern for the comparisons of these ratios proves challenging: each country and topic may be different. The existence of high deviations from equality in these ratios is noteworthy, as it precludes the use of simple indicators like $P_{\text{top } 10\%}/P$ to assess contributions to pushing the boundaries of knowledge.

Table 1. Basic description of scientific publications in terms of P , $P_{\text{top } 10\%}/P$, and $P_{\text{top } 1\%}/P_{\text{top } 10\%}$ in 18 selected cases

Country	Solar cells			Semiconductors			Immunity		
	P	$P_{\text{top } 10\%}/P$	$P_{\text{top } 1\%}/P_{\text{top } 10\%}$	P	$P_{\text{top } 10\%}/P$	$P_{\text{top } 1\%}/P_{\text{top } 10\%}$	P	$P_{\text{top } 10\%}/P$	$P_{\text{top } 1\%}/P_{\text{top } 10\%}$
Global	61202			58081			42586		
Germany	1834	0.077	0.063	1748	0.065	0.061	1177	0.091	0.056
India	3138	0.052	N/C	3056	0.046	0.056	962	0.021	N/C
Japan	2742	0.059	0.092	3167	0.058	0.087	1491	0.057	0.106
South Korea	4193	0.068	0.102	2668	0.066	0.068	1088	0.053	N/C
UK	892	0.182	0.204	810	0.115	0.204	893	0.103	0.076
USA	5474	0.146	0.141	6004	0.149	0.111	7946	0.145	0.122

Publication window: 2014–2017; citation window: 2019–2022. N/C, not calculated because $P_{\text{top } 1\%}$ is too low

For double rank analysis, the country rank (ordinate axis) is plotted versus the global rank (abscissa axis; Rodríguez-Navarro and Brito 2018b). Then, to study deviations, the double rank plot of the actual data is compared to the plot of data mathematically generated. Using as a model the power law defined by P and $P_{\text{top } 10\%}$, the comparison reveals three different patterns (Fig. 1): (i) the reference and actual plots practically overlap (e.g., South Korea in semiconductors), ensuring the accuracy of the evaluations based on P and $P_{\text{top } 10\%}$; (ii) the most cited papers have smaller global ranks than expected from P and $P_{\text{top } 10\%}$ (e.g., Japan in immunity and South Korea in solar cells), implying that evaluations based on P and $P_{\text{top } 10\%}$ undervalue the research capacity; (iii) the most cited papers have larger global ranks than expected from P and

$P_{\text{top } 10\%}$ (e.g., the USA in immunity), implying that evaluations based on P and $P_{\text{top } 10\%}$ overvalue the research capacity. These last two patterns imply that, in these cases, P and $P_{\text{top } 10\%}$ should not be used to predict the contribution to pushing the boundaries of knowledge.




Figure 1. Country versus global ranks of domestic papers. Comparison of actual global ranks (open circles) with those calculated for the power law defined by P and $P_{\text{top } 10\%}$ (closed circles). Publication window: 2014–2017; citation window: 2019–2022




Figure 2. Country versus global ranks of domestic papers. Comparison of actual global ranks (open circles) with those calculated for the power law defined by $P_{\text{top } 10\%}$ and $P_{\text{top } 1\%}$ (closed circles). Publication and citation windows, as in Figure 1

Analysis of the data in Fig. 1 considering the global number of papers (Table 1) allows calculating that deviations from the power law occur in the top 1–2% most cited papers. This calculation suggested that even restricting the analysis exclusively to the top 10% of the most cited papers would not allow a correct evaluation of the tail. Fig. 2 shows that this conjecture is correct. This figure uses the power law defined by $P_{\text{top } 10\%}$ and $P_{\text{top } 1\%}$ instead of P and $P_{\text{top } 10\%}$ as in Fig. 1 in two notable cases: South Korea in

solar cells and the USA in immunity. In both cases, the deviations between the actual and calculated data persist, although they are reduced.

A simple conclusion can be drawn from the study of the extreme upper tail of the citation distribution. It implies that, as a general rule, the contribution of countries to pushing the boundaries of knowledge cannot be predicted from citation metrics based on papers that are not in the extreme upper tail. Restricting the rank analysis to the top 10% of most cited papers improves the prediction a little, but not sufficiently.




Figure 3. Histogram with logarithmic binning of citations to world publications in the scientific topics of solar cells, semiconductors, and immunity (from top to bottom). Blue bars correspond to a lognormal synthetic series to guide the eye. Publication and citation windows, as in Figure 1

4.2. Inflated lower tail in citation distributions

Another difficulty in describing the research systems of countries arises from deviations from the lognormal distribution in the less-cited papers (Rodríguez-Navarro and Brito 2024a). To study the lower tail, the double rank approach has little sensitivity, and I

used a logarithmic binning approach, including the number of papers with 0, 1, and 2 citations.

A first analysis of the global papers in the three topics studied here (Fig. 3) shows that their distributions of citations may not fit the lognormal model. In immunity, the distribution can be described as lognormal with a minor excess of papers that are uncited or with one citation. In solar cells and semiconductors, the distributions are more complex, showing an excess of papers in all bins on the left of the mode in the histogram. The deviations from the lognormal model of the global citation distribution in these two topics are the contributions of many countries. These country contributions are likely unequal and could even be highly variable in some countries. This is exactly what occurs to a degree that cannot be ignored in evaluations.




Figure 4. Histogram with logarithmic binning of citations to publications from the UK, Japan, and South Korea on the scientific topic of solar cells. Publication and citation windows, as in Figure 1

Fig. 4 shows the logarithmic binning histograms of three countries—UK, Japan, and South Korea—in the topic of solar cells. For easier comparison, the distributions of the UK and Japan have been scaled up to the level of South Korea in the 32–49 bin. While the UK distribution of papers deviates moderately from the lognormal model, in Japan and South Korea, the deviations are important and affect a large proportion of the papers. A visual inspection of Fig. 4 suggests that above 8 or 13 citations, the three distributions follow similar patterns. This similarity suggests that it would be possible the development of simple and reliable indicators for the upper tail. In solar cells, in my

conditions of counting, the threshold for the top 10% most cited papers is 47 citations, which is well above the threshold of 8–13 citations. This indicates that, in the absence of deviations at the extreme of this tail (South Korea semiconductors in Fig. 1), indicators based on $P_{\text{top } 10\%}$ and $P_{\text{top } 1\%}$ would be accurate indicators for the upper tail. In contrast, when dividing $P_{\text{top } 10\%}$ and $P_{\text{top } 1\%}$ by P , the accuracy is lost because, for similar upper tails, the value of P is highly variable depending on the inflation of the lower tail. In other words, in the absence of further information, the meaning of $P_{\text{top } 10\%}/P$ or $P_{\text{top } 1\%}/P$ is uncertain.




Figure 5. Plots of $P_{\text{top } 5\%}/P_{\text{top } 50\%}$ and $P_{\text{top } 1\%}/P_{\text{top } 10\%}$ versus $P_{\text{top } 10\%}/P$ in selected universities. Data from the CWTS Leiden Ranking 2023, means of four evaluation periods, and fractional counting. A and B panels: Physical and engineering sciences; C and D panels: Biomedical and health sciences. Evaluation periods and selection of universities are described in the text

4.3. Uncertainties in universities

To further investigate the deviations of citation distributions from the ideal model, I utilized the extensive data provided by the Leiden Ranking. If the double-rank power law model applies, the $P_{\text{top } 10\%}/P$, $P_{\text{top } 5\%}/P_{\text{top } 50\%}$, and $P_{\text{top } 1\%}/P_{\text{top } 10\%}$ ratios should be equal (Rodríguez-Navarro and Brito 2019).

To test this requirement, I selected two fields, *Physical sciences and engineering* and *Biomedical and health sciences*, the data from four evaluation periods, and universities in which $P_{\text{top } 1\%}$ is at least 10 using fractional counting. The selection meeting the last criterion included 311 universities in 30 countries in *Physical sciences*

and engineering, and 310 universities in 28 countries in *Biomedical and health sciences* (Supplementary Tables S1 and S2). The scatter plots of $P_{top\ 5\%}/P_{top\ 50\%}$ and $P_{top\ 1\%}/P_{top\ 10\%}$ versus $P_{top\ 10\%}/P$ show good correlations in the case of $P_{top\ 5\%}/P_{top\ 50\%}$ but worse in the case of $P_{top\ 1\%}/P_{top\ 10\%}$. In the field of *Physical sciences and engineering* the dispersion of the data is higher than in the field of *Biomedical and health sciences* (Fig. 5).

Table 2. Classification of universities attending to the variation of the $P_{top\ 10\%}/P$, $P_{top\ 5\%}/P_{top\ 50\%}$, and $P_{top\ 1\%}/P_{top\ 10\%}$ ratios: stable (Type A), decreasing (Type B), or increasing (Type C). Field of Physical sciences and engineering

University	Country	$P_{top\ 10\%}/P$	$P_{top\ 5\%}/P_{top\ 50\%}$	$P_{top\ 1\%}/P_{top\ 10\%}$
Type A				
Pennsylvania State University	United States	0.138	0.129	0.117
Florida State University	United States	0.124	0.121	0.130
University of Virginia	United States	0.121	0.118	0.118
University of Nottingham	United Kingdom	0.141	0.125	0.120
University of Exeter	United Kingdom	0.127	0.108	0.125
Chongqing University	China	0.113	0.106	0.109
Hohai University	China	0.103	0.113	0.089
University of Queensland	Australia	0.140	0.131	0.151
University of Bordeaux	France	0.112	0.109	0.118
Type B				
Harvard University	United States	0.254	0.221	0.170
Stanford University	United States	0.249	0.201	0.160
Massachusetts Institute of Technology	United States	0.235	0.196	0.155
Yale University	United States	0.225	0.182	0.129
Princeton University	United States	0.211	0.177	0.125
University of Colorado, Boulder	United States	0.168	0.165	0.104
Imperial College London	United Kingdom	0.161	0.135	0.120
University of Oxford	United Kingdom	0.167	0.146	0.124
University of Cambridge	United Kingdom	0.170	0.145	0.129
Lanzhou University	China	0.098	0.074	0.052
Fuzhou University	China	0.127	0.121	0.107
Katholieke Universiteit Leuven	Belgium	0.149	0.136	0.113
Heidelberg University	Germany	0.147	0.127	0.116
Type C				
Nagoya University	Japan	0.073	0.081	0.120
Tohoku University	Japan	0.075	0.082	0.103
Drexel University	United States	0.149	0.145	0.183

Data from the CWTS Leiden Ranking 2023, means of four evaluation periods

Next, in each university, I compared the three ratios, which should be equal in the absence of deviations. This allowed classifying the universities into three types: A, B, and C, according to the stability or differences between the ratios. Type A corresponds to stability (deviations up to a maximum of 15% between the highest and

lowest values); and Types B and C correspond to a decrease or increase of the ratios, from $P_{top\ 10\%}/P$ to $P_{top\ 1\%}/P_{top\ 10\%}$. Tables 2 and 3 show some examples of some universities in the fields of *Physical sciences and engineering* and *Biomedical and health sciences*, respectively, and Table 4 summarizes the number of universities of each type across countries (Tables S1 and S2 include all universities). Most universities are of Type B, 53% in both fields, and in a low proportion, they are of Type C, 10% in *Physical sciences and engineering* and 4% in *Biomedical and health sciences*. Consequently, in less than half of the universities the ratios are stable, and therefore they are Type A: 36% in *Physical sciences and engineering* and 43% in *Biomedical and health sciences*.

Table 3. Classification of universities attending to the variation of the $P_{top\ 10\%}/P$, $P_{top\ 5\%}/P_{top\ 50\%}$, and $P_{top\ 1\%}/P_{top\ 10\%}$ ratios: stable (Type A), decreasing (Type B), or increasing (Type C). Field of Biomedical and health sciences

University	Country	$P_{top\ 10\%}/P$	$P_{top\ 5\%}/P_{top\ 50\%}$	$P_{top\ 1\%}/P_{top\ 10\%}$
Type A				
Northeastern University, USA	United States	0.132	0.131	0.139
University of Arizona	United States	0.100	0.090	0.091
Purdue University, West Lafayette	United States	0.100	0.092	0.090
The University of Warwick	United Kingdom	0.142	0.138	0.152
University of East Anglia	United Kingdom	0.146	0.132	0.129
Peking University	China	0.086	0.079	0.080
Xiamen University	China	0.081	0.075	0.074
University of Milan	Italy	0.104	0.096	0.100
The University of Tokyo	Japan	0.081	0.084	0.089
Type B				
Rockefeller University	United States	0.326	0.282	0.182
Massachusetts Institute of Technology	United States	0.298	0.260	0.192
Princeton University	United States	0.267	0.236	0.173
Yale University	United States	0.225	0.182	0.129
University of California, Berkeley	United States	0.214	0.185	0.138
California Institute of Technology	United States	0.213	0.185	0.150
University of Oxford	United Kingdom	0.208	0.178	0.133
University of Cambridge	United Kingdom	0.208	0.174	0.130
Tsinghua University	China	0.137	0.126	0.115
Soochow University	China	0.071	0.061	0.046
University of Toronto	Canada	0.139	0.127	0.107
Universität Hamburg	Germany	0.114	0.099	0.085
Flinders University	Australia	0.111	0.107	0.082
Type C				
Indiana University, Bloomington	United States	0.109	0.103	0.128
Kiel University	Germany	0.109	0.106	0.123
Tohoku University	Japan	0.062	0.071	0.078

Data from the CWTS Leiden Ranking 2023 are means of four evaluation periods

Table 4. Number of universities that belong to the three types described in Tables 2 and 3

Country	Physical sciences and engineering			Biomedical and health sciences		
	Type A	Type B	Type C	Type A	Type B	Type C
Australia	4	12	0	7	9	0
Belgium	2	1	0	3	4	0
Brazil	1	0	0	0	0	1
Canada	7	0	2	6	5	0
China	23	50	1	9	21	0
Denmark	0	4	0	3	0	0
Finland	0	2	0	1	1	0
France	9	2	2	7	6	1
Germany	14	9	2	20	3	2
Greece	0	1	0	1	0	0
India	0	0	2	0	0	0
Iran	1	2	1	0	0	1
Ireland	1	0	0	0	3	0
Israel	0	3	1	3	1	0
Italy	7	0	0	5	10	0
Japan	2	0	6	4	0	1
Malaysia	0	0	1	0	0	0
Netherlands	3	4	0	2	7	0
New Zealand	0	0	1	2	0	0
Norway	0	1	0	2	1	0
Poland	0	0	1	0	0	1
Portugal	3	0	0	1	0	1
Singapore	0	2	0	1	0	0
South Korea	3	4	4	3	1	0
Spain	3	1	2	5	2	0
Sweden	5	1	0	2	3	0
Switzerland	1	4	0	1	6	0
Taiwan	0	0	2	2	1	0
United Kingdom	7	15	1	8	19	0
United States	17	48	3	36	61	4
Total	113	166	32	134	164	12

Type C universities correspond to the above-described countries with an inflated lower tail. In contrast, Type B universities, in which the $P_{\text{top } 1\%}/P_{\text{top } 10\%}$ ratio is lower—in some cases much lower—than the $P_{\text{top } 10\%}/P$ ratio, reveal another type of citation distribution in which the lower tail has to be diminished with reference to the Type A universities, which conform to the ideal model. Confirming this conjecture, Table 5 shows the comparison of two Type A and two Type B universities regarding the proportion of papers in the global 50% less cited. In the two examples of Type A universities, the proportion of papers in the global 50% less cited is 43–46%, close to

the global proportion of 50%, while in the two Type B universities, the proportion is smaller, 24–29%.

Table 5. Proportion of papers from two Type B universities in the 50% less cited papers and comparison with two Type A universities

University	Country	Type	Percent
Physical sciences and engineering			
Florida State University	USA	A	42.9±1.2
Yale University	USA	B	29.0±0.4
Biomedical and health sciences			
Northeastern University	USA	A	46.1±0.8
Rockefeller University	USA	B	23.9±0.9

Universities selected from Tables 2 and 3. The ±figure was calculated from the data of the four evaluation periods investigated




Figure 6. Local versus global ranks of US domestic papers published by the universities of Harvard, Stanford, Yale, and Massachusetts Institute of Technology in immunology. Comparison of the ranks of the papers of these universities (local) with those calculated for the power laws defined by P and $P_{top\ 10\%}$ (left), and $P_{top\ 10\%}$ and $P_{top\ 1\%}$ (right)

To further investigate Type B universities, I studied the publications of four US universities: Harvard, Stanford, Yale, and the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, in the topic of immunity (as in Fig. 1, incorporating these universities into the search). The $P_{top\ 10\%}/P$ and $P_{top\ 1\%}/P_{top\ 10\%}$ ratios corresponding to the retrieved papers were 0.27 and 0.16, respectively, as expected for Type B universities. Fig. 6 shows the comparisons of the double rank plot of these publications with the power laws defined by P and $P_{top\ 10\%}$, and $P_{top\ 1\%}$ and $P_{top\ 10\%}$. In consonance with the results shown in Table 5, the results displayed in Fig. 6 demonstrate that the less-cited 90% of the papers are more cited than expected for the ideal citation distribution. This improvement in the citation of the less-cited papers leads to the conclusion that the probability of a breakthrough calculated

from P and $P_{\text{top } 10\%}$ is higher than it actually is. $P_{\text{top } 1\%}$ and $P_{\text{top } 10\%}$ are better predictors of the capacity of these elite universities to publish breakthroughs.

These findings from universities provide further support to the notion that some common research indicators may be misleading. Especially, the existence of high deviations from an ideal model in the less cited papers makes it clear that $P_{\text{top } 10\%}/P$ and $P_{\text{top } 1\%}/P$ are inappropriate indicators for country and institution comparisons.

5. DISCUSSION

Most research country rankings reported by well-known institutions (European Commission 2018, 2020, 2022; National Science Board 2018, 2020, 2022) are based on two indicators: for the size and quality of the system. Currently, the size indicator, number of publications (P), can be considered flaw-free, but the second indicator based on citation may be misleading, generating country rankings that do not truly reflect the quality of the research system. Common indicators like $P_{\text{top } 10\%}/P$ and $P_{\text{top } 1\%}/P$ define the quality of the research system properly if it adheres to the ideal model: a power law relationship between the citation-based ranks in local and global lists. This study reveals the existence of deviations from this model that make common indicators misleading. This applies whether rankings aim for a general system description, as in most evaluations, or intend to assess the capacity to publish breakthroughs (Gaida et al. 2023). Regardless of the frequency of these deviations across countries and institutions, currently unknown, the evaluation of a country or institution will always be uncertain with citation-based indicators if the absence of deviations is not previously checked.

Considering only the upper tail defined by the top 10% most cited papers, there are two types of deviations at the extreme of this tail, leading to undervaluing or overvaluing the contribution to pushing the boundaries of knowledge. In the first type, a country's capacity is higher than expected from $P_{\text{top } 10\%}$ and $P_{\text{top } 1\%}$ because the country's papers are more cited than expected from the indicators (e.g., South Korea in solar cells; Fig. 2). This may occur if there is a low proportion of highly competitive researchers with very low influence in bulk production but high influence in the most cited papers. In the second type, the number of citations of the most cited papers is lower than expected from $P_{\text{top } 10\%}$ and $P_{\text{top } 1\%}$ (e.g., the USA in immunity; Fig. 1). A

possible explanation for this deviation is more complex and will be discussed below regarding Type B universities.

There are also two types of deviations that occur in the lower tail of the citation distribution of papers, or, in any case, out of the top 50% most cited papers. The first type of deviation is an inflated lower tail (Shahmandi et al. 2020). The most misleading effect of this inflated lower tail is on the $P_{\text{top } 10\%}/P$ and $P_{\text{top } 1\%}/P$ ratios, and therefore on indicators that are derived from these ratios. A clear example is South Korea in solar cells (Figure 4), where the value of $P_{\text{top } 10\%}/P$ is 0.07 (Table 1), despite South Korea being one of the countries with the highest contribution to pushing the boundaries of knowledge in this matter (Fig. 1). This type of deviation may be observed in the double rank analysis, but with difficulties because when the deviation occurs similarly in the country and global distributions, the double rank is not affected or very little affected (not shown data). Therefore, the study of the citation distribution is the best approach to detecting inflated lower tails. The inflated lower tail occurs in solar cells and semiconductors (Fig. 3) and may occur in many technological fields. Although the reason for this type of deviation has not been demonstrated, in countries with high technology, a reasonable hypothesis is that it is due to the coexistence of two different objectives in the research system: pushing the boundaries of knowledge and incremental innovations. The papers with the latter purpose are lowly cited, and many are uncited even in wide citation windows. This infrequent citation is highly in contrast with the research that is focused on pushing the boundaries of knowledge, whose publications are frequently cited (Rodríguez-Navarro and Brito 2021b). Although this study is restricted to three research topics, it can be conjectured that inflated lower tails may be common across disciplines and countries. In fact, a significant proportion of uncited papers have been observed in many scientific fields (Albarrán and Ruiz-Castillo 2011). To avoid the effect of these inflated lower tails in research assessments, $P_{\text{top } 1\%}/P_{\text{top } 10\%}$ and not $P_{\text{top } 10\%}/P$ should be used to estimate the contribution to pushing the boundaries of knowledge.

The second type of deviations in the lower tail was detected in the Leiden Ranking. In this ranking, some universities fit the ideal model, which requires that $P_{\text{top } 10\%}/P$, $P_{\text{top } 5\%}/P_{\text{top } 50\%}$, and $P_{\text{top } 1\%}/P_{\text{top } 10\%}$ are equal (Rodríguez-Navarro and Brito 2019). These are the Type A universities. The Leiden Ranking also reveals the existence

of universities in which the deviation from the ideal model can be explained by an inflated lower tail, as discussed above (Type C universities).

The novelty discovered in the Leiden Ranking was the existence of some universities, Type B universities, in which the $P_{\text{top } 10\%}/P$, $P_{\text{top } 5\%}/P_{\text{top } 50\%}$, and $P_{\text{top } 1\%}/P_{\text{top } 10\%}$ ratios show decreasing values. The mathematical explanation for this trend is that the proportion of papers in the lower part of the citation distribution is lower than in the global distribution. In Type B universities, the number of papers in the global pool of 50% less cited papers is much lower than 50% (Table 5). In other words, a Type A university (conforming to the ideal model) with the P and $P_{\text{top } 10\%}$ values of these universities will be more successful in terms of breakthroughs. In the double rank plot, the papers in the upper tail are worse positioned in the global rank than predicted by $P_{\text{top } 10\%}$ and P (Fig. 6).

Many well-known, research-intensive universities (e.g., Harvard, Stanford, Yale, Cambridge, or Oxford; Tables 2, 3, S1, and S2) fall in the category of Type B. A reasonable explanation for this finding is that the number of lowly funded, less competitive researchers in these universities is much lower than in global research. Therefore, in the absence of both research pursuing incremental innovations and lowly productive researchers, the number and distribution of papers with a low number of citations are shrunken in comparison to the global distribution. Possibly, across the world, the number of Type B universities may not be very high. The high proportion of Type B universities in this study is probably the result of the selection of universities with $P_{\text{top } 1\%}$ higher than nine in the four evaluation periods. This implies a stringent selection of universities and, consequently, an increase in the proportion of Type B universities in the selection. In any case, it seems that the proportion of these universities is notably different across countries (Table 4).

The existence of Type B universities poses an interesting question in research evaluation. In all universities (and in countries), in the absence of deviations in the extreme upper tail, the $P_{\text{top } 1\%}/P_{\text{top } 10\%}$ ratio is an accurate indicator of the contribution to pushing the boundaries of knowledge. In Type A universities, $P_{\text{top } 10\%}/P$ is equal to $P_{\text{top } 1\%}/P_{\text{top } 10\%}$, and both ratios can be used for evaluating the contribution to pushing the boundaries of knowledge. In Type C universities, $P_{\text{top } 10\%}/P$ is an undervaluing indicator,

as already explained. The novelty of Type B universities is that $P_{\text{top } 10\%}/P$ overvalues the capacity to push the boundaries of knowledge.

For example, in *Physical sciences and engineering* (Table 2), in the USA, the $P_{\text{top } 1\%}/P_{\text{top } 10\%}$ ratio of Florida State University is similar to those of Yale University and Princeton University, and the same occurs in the UK with the universities of Nottingham and Exeter in comparison with those of Oxford or Cambridge. In the absence of deviations in the extreme upper tail, the similar $P_{\text{top } 1\%}/P_{\text{top } 10\%}$ ratios of these universities indicate similar contributions to pushing the boundaries of knowledge. In contrast, if the evaluation is based on the $P_{\text{top } 10\%}/P$ ratio, we would reach the conclusion that Florida State University in the USA and the universities of Nottingham and Exeter in the UK are second-level with reference to Yale University and Princeton University in the USA and the universities of Oxford and Cambridge in the UK. Focusing on the contribution to pushing the boundaries of knowledge, this would be an inaccurate and unfair conclusion, which might be extended to many apparent second-level institutions and even countries.

The deviation in the extreme upper tail of the USA in immunity (Fig. 1 and 2) does not have a simple explanation. Type B universities could give a clue to that explanation. It might be speculated that the very low proportion of lowly competitive research in the USA in comparison with the world might lead to a high value of $P_{\text{top } 10\%}$ and $P_{\text{top } 1\%}$ with reference to P and $P_{\text{top } 10\%}$, respectively, a trend that cannot be maintained in the extreme upper tail, e.g., $P_{\text{top } 0.1\%}$ with reference to $P_{\text{top } 1\%}$.

6. CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

Currently, many country rankings reported by the most notable institutions use single quality indicators, which are frequently $P_{\text{top } 10\%}/P$ or $P_{\text{top } 1\%}/P$, or derivatives of these ratios. This study shows that in countries in which the citation-based double rank of papers fits a power law, these evaluations of quality are correct. Furthermore, these indicators allow for calculating the contribution of these countries to pushing the boundaries of knowledge. On the contrary, in countries that deviate from this ideal model, the evaluations will be misleading. This is the case with the evaluations that assign Japan low research excellence, and here it is shown that these misleading evaluations occur in many other countries and institutions. Research assessments based

on $P_{\text{top } 10\%}/P$ or $P_{\text{top } 1\%}/P$ should not be applied without testing deviations from the ideal model. If these deviations are unknown, the rankings are uncertain, and the position of a certain country might not reveal its real research efficiency.

The use of uncertain country rankings in research policy decisions may lead to misguided research goals. In certain cases, the rankings suggest that a highly industrialized country is less competitive than its actual standing, as exemplified by Japan. Conversely, comparing less industrialized countries with highly industrialized ones may yield an indication in the opposite direction. In this comparison, the lower tail may be less inflated in the less industrialized country due to low research activity focused on incremental innovations. Under these conditions, the rank of a less industrialized, medium-level research country may erroneously convey the impression that a country's contribution to pushing the boundaries of knowledge is greater than it truly is.

Although the proposal of indicators is beyond the scope of this study, its results suggest that, taken together, $P_{\text{top } 10\%}/P$ and $P_{\text{top } 1\%}/P_{\text{top } 10\%}$ provide a reasonable general description of the research system, revealing also the deviations from the ideal model. Therefore, while further scientometric studies find better indicators, a reasonable solution for the research assessments of countries and institutions would be to give up creating rankings and put the focus on a general description based on $P_{\text{top } 10\%}/P$ and $P_{\text{top } 1\%}/P_{\text{top } 10\%}$. If the purpose is an evaluation based on breakthroughs, the existence of deviations in the extreme upper tail makes it necessary to use a specific indicator to achieve the purpose.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The author declares that there is no conflict of interest.

REFERENCES

Aksnes, D W, Langfeldt, L, and Wouters, P (2019), 'Citations, citation indicators, and research quality: An overview of basic concepts and theories', *SAGE Open*, January-March: 1-17.

- Aksnes, D W, Piro, F N, and Fossum, L W (2023), 'Citation metrics covary with researchers' assessments of the quality of their works', *Quantitative Science Studies*, 4, 105-26.
- Albarrán, P and Ruiz-Castillo, J (2011), 'References made and citations received by scientific articles', *Journal of the American Society for information Science and Technology*, 62, 40-49.
- Banbury, C M and Mitchel, W (1995), 'The effect of introducing important incremental innovations on market share and business survival', *Strategic Management Journal*, 16, 161-82.
- Bazeley, P (2010), 'Conceptualising research performance', *Studies in Higher Education*, 35, 889-903.
- Bihari, A, Tripathi, S, and Deepak, A (2021), 'A review on h-index and its alternative indices', *Journal of Information Science*, 1-42.
- Bornmann, L and Daniel, H-D (2007), 'What do we know about the h index', *Journal of the American Society for information Science and Technology*, 58, 1381-85.
- Bornmann, L, Leydesdorff, L, and Mutz, R (2013), 'The use of percentile rank classes in the analysis of bibliometric data: opportunities and limits', *Journal of Informetrics*, 7, 158-65.
- Bornmann, L, Ye, A, and Ye, F (2018), 'Identifying landmark publications in the long run using field-normalized citation data', *Journal of Documentation*, 74, 278-88.
- Brito, R and Rodríguez-Navarro, A (2018), 'Research assessment by percentile-based double rank analysis', *Journal of Informetrics*, 12, 315-29.
- (2021), 'The inconsistency of *h*-index: A mathematical analysis', *Journal of Informetrics*, 15, Article 101106.
- Conover, W J and Iman, RL (1981), 'Rank transformations as a bridge between parametric and nonparametric statistics', *The American Statistician*, 35, 124-29.
- Crespo, N and Simoes, N (2021), 'On the measurement of scientific performance: Do we really need to take the distribution of citations into account?', *International Journal of Information Science and Management*, 19, 19-29.
- Docampo, D and Besoule, J-J (2019), 'A new approach to the analysis and evaluation of the research output of countries and institutions', *Scientometrics*, 119, 1207-25.

- European Commission (2018), *Science, Research and Innovation Performance of the EU 2018. Strengthening the foundations for Europe's future* (Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union).
- (2020), *Science, Research and Innovation Performance of the EU 2020. A fair, green and digital Europe* (Luxembourg: Publication Office of the European Union).
- (2022), *Science, Reserach and Innovation Performance of the EU. Building a sustainable future in uncertain times* (Luxembourg: Publication Office of the European Union).
- Gaida, J, et al. (2023), 'ASPI's Critical Technology Tracker. The global race for future power', (Camberra: The Australian Strategic Policy Institute).
- Garfield, E (1955), 'Citation indexes for science', *Science*, 122, 108-11.
- (1973), 'Citation frequency as a measure of research activity and performance', *Essays of an Information Scientist*, 1, 406-08.
- (1999), 'Journal Impact Factor: a brief review', *Canadian Medical Association journal*, 161, 979-80.
- Godin, B (2003), 'The emergence of S&T indicators: why did governments supplement statistics with indicators?', *Research Policy*, 32, 679-91.
- Golosovsky, M (2021), 'Universality of citation distributions: A new understanding', *Quantitative Science Studies*, 2, 527-43.
- Hardeman, S and van Roy, V (2013), *An analysis of national research systems (II): Efficiency in the production of research excellence* (Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union).
- Hirsch, J E (2005), 'An index to quantify an individual's scientific reserach output', *Proceedins of the National Academy of Sciences USA*, 102, 16569-72.
- Hollingsworth, J R (2008), 'Scientific discoveries an institutionalist and path-dependent perspective', in C Hannaway (ed.), *Biomedicine in the Twentieth Century: Practices, Policies, and Politics* (72 of Biomedical and Health Reserach: National Institutes of Health, Bethesda, MD), 317-53.
- Hu, X and Rousseau, R (2019), 'Do citation chimeras exist? The case of under-cited influential articles suffering delayed recognition', *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology*, 70, 499-508.

- Irvine, J and Martin, B R (1989), 'International comparison of scientific performance revisited', *Scientometrics*, 15, 369-92.
- Kuhn, T (1970), *The structure of scientific revolutions* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press).
- Leydesdorff, L (1988), 'Problems with the "measurement" of national scientific performance', *Science and Public Policy*, 15, 149-52.
- Leydesdorff, L and Wagner, C (2009), 'Macro-level indicators of the relations between research funding and research output', *Journal of Informetrics*, 3, 353-62.
- Mcalister, P R, Narin, F, and Corrigan, J G (1983), 'Programmatic evaluation and comparison based on standardized citation scores', *IEEE Transactions on Engineering Management*, EM-30, 205-211.
- Merton, R K (1979), *Foreword. In E. Garfield (Ed), Citation Indexing - Its Theory and Application in Science, Technology, and Humanities* (New York: John Wiley & Sons).
- Min, C, et al. (2021), 'Identifying citation patterns of scientific breakthroughs: A perspective on dynamic citation process', *Information Processing & Management*, 58, 102428.
- Mingers, J and Leydesdorff, L (2015), 'A review of theory and practice in scientometrics', *European Journal of Operational Research*, 246, 1-19.
- Narin, F (1976), *Evaluative bibliometrics: The Use of Publication and Citation Analysis in the Evaluation of Scientific Activity* (Cherry Hill (NJ): Computer Horizon Inc.).
- Narin, F and Hamilton, K S (1996), 'Bibliometric performance measures', *Scientometrics*, 36, 293-310.
- National Science Board (2018), *Science and Engineering Indicators 2018* (National Science Foundation, NSB-2018-1. Alexandria, VA).
- (2020), *Science and Engineering Indicators 2020: The State of U.S. Science and Engineering* (National Science Foundation, NSB-2020-1. Alexandria, VA).
- (2022), *Science and Engineering Indicators 2022: The State of U.S. Science and Engineering*. (National Science Foundation NSB-2022-1. Alexandria, VA, USA).

- Pendlebury, D A (2020), 'When the data don't mean what they say: Japan's comparative underperformance in citation impact', in C Daraio and W Glanzel (eds.), *Evaluative Informetrics: The Art of Metrics-based Research Assessment* (Cham: Springer).
- Perianes-Rodriguez, A and Ruiz-Castillo, J (2016), 'University citation distribution', *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology*, 67, 2790-804.
- Poegel, F, et al. (2019), 'Science quality and the value of inventions', *Science Advances*, 5, eaay7323.
- Prathap, G (2010), 'An iCE map approach to evaluate performance and efficiency of scientific production of countries', *Scientometrics*, 85, 185-91.
- Press, W H (2013), 'What's so special about science (and how much should we spend on it?)', *Science*, 342, 817-22.
- Price, D J de S (1965), 'Networks of scientific papers', *Science*, 149, 510-15.
- Radicchi, F, Fortunato, S, and Castellano, C (2008), 'Universality of citation distributions: toward an objective measure of scientific impact', *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences USA*, 105, 17268-72.
- Rodríguez-Navarro, A (2011), 'Measuring research excellence. Number of Nobel Prize achievements versus conventional bibliometric indicators', *Journal of Documentation*, 67, 582-600.
- Rodríguez-Navarro, A and Brito, R (2018a), 'Technological research in the EU is less efficient than the world average. EU research policy risks Europeans' future', *Journal of Informetrics*, 12, 718-31.
- (2018b), 'Double rank analysis for research assessment', *Journal of Informetrics*, 12, 31-41.
- (2019), 'Probability and expected frequency of breakthroughs – basis and use of a robust method of research assessment', *Scientometrics*, 119, 213-35.
- (2021a), 'Total number of papers and in a single percentile fully describes research impact-Revisiting concepts and applications', *Quantitative Science Studies*, 2, 544-59.

- (2021b), 'The link between countries' economic and scientific wealth has a complex dependence on technological activity and research policy', *Scientometrics*, 127, 2871-96.
- (2024a), 'The extreme upper tail of Japan's citation distribution reveals its research success', *Quality & Quantity*, in press. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11135-024-01837-6>. Preprint available at *arXiv:2201.04031*.
- (2024b), 'Rank analysis of most cited publications, a new approach for research assessments', *Journal of Informetrics*, in press. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joi.2024.101503>. Preprint available at *arXiv:2307.02927*.
- Schlagberger, E M, Bornmann, L, and Bauer, J (2016), 'At what institutions did Nobel laureates do their prize-winning work? An analysis of bibliographical information on Nobel laureates from 1994 to 2014', *Scientometrics*, 109, 723-67.
- Schneider, J W and Costas, R (2017), 'Identifying potential "breakthrough" publications using refined citation analyses: Three related explorative approaches', *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology*, 68, 709-23.
- Schubert, A and Braun, T (1996), 'Cross-field normalization of scientometric indicators', *Scientometrics*, 36, 311-24.
- Science and Technology Observatory (2019), *Dynamics of scientific production in the world, in Europe and in France, 2000-2016* (Paris: Hcéres).
- Shahmandi, M, Wilson, P, and Thelwall, M (2020), 'A new algorithm for zero-modified models applied to citation counts', *Scientometrics*, 125, 993-1010.
- Sorensen, M P, Bloch, C, and Young, M (2016), 'Excellence in the knowledge-based economy: from scientific to research excellence', *European Journal of Higher Education*, 6, 217-36.
- Taylor, C W and Ellison, R L (1967), 'Bibliographical predictors of scientific performance', *Science*, 155, 1075-80.
- Thelwall, M (2016), 'Are there too many articles? Zero inflated variants of the discretised lognormal and hooked power law', *Journal of Informetrics*, 10, 622-33.

- Viiu, G-A (2018), 'The lognormal distribution explains the remarkable pattern documented by characteristic scores and scales in scientometrics', *Journal of Informetrics*, 12, 401-15.
- Waltman, L (2016), 'A review of the literature on citation impact indicators', *Journal of Informetrics*, 10, 365-91.
- Waltman, L and van Eck, N J (2012), 'The inconsistency of the h-index', *Journal of the American Society for information Science and Technology*, 63, 406-15.
- Waltman, L and Schreiber, M (2013), 'On the calculation of percentile-based bibliometric indicators', *Journal of the American Society for information Science and Technology*, 64, 372-79.
- Waltman, L, van Eck, N J, and van Raan, A F J (2012a), 'Universality of citation distributions revisited', *Journal of the American Society for information Science and Technology*, 63, 72-77.
- Waltman, L, et al. (2011), 'Towards a new crown indicator: Some theoretical considerations', *Journal of Informetrics*, 5, 37-47.
- Waltman, L, et al. (2012b), 'The Leiden ranking 2011/2012: Data collection, indicators, and interpretation', *Journal of the American Society for information Science and Technology*, 63, 2419-32.
- Wildgaard, L, Schneider, J W, and Larsen, B (2014), 'A review of the characteristics of 108 author-level bibliometric indicators', *Scientometrics*, 101, 125-58.
- Wuestman, M, Hoekman, J, and Frenken, K (2020), 'A topology of scientific breakthroughs', *Quantitative Science Studies*, 1, 1203-22.