

A proposal to improve the calculation of the disruption index

Leibel, Christian^{1,2}; Lutz Bornmann¹

¹ Science Policy and Strategy Department

Administrative Headquarters of the Max Planck Society

Hofgartenstr. 8,

80539 Munich, Germany.

Email: christian.leibel.extern@gv.mpg.de, bornmann@gv.mpg.de

² Department of Sociology

Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München

Konradstr. 6,

80801 Munich, Germany.

Conceptualization: Christian Leibel, Lutz Bornmann; Formal analysis: Christian Leibel;

Supervision: Lutz Bornmann; Visualization: Christian Leibel; Writing – original draft:

Christian Leibel; Writing – review & editing: Lutz Bornmann, Christian Leibel

Abstract

Wu et al. (2019) proposed the disruption index (DI_1) as bibliometric indicator that measures disruptive and consolidating research. Leibel and Bornmann (2024) recently published a literature overview on the disruption index research in *Scientometrics*. In this letter to the editor, we point out that the method of calculating the DI_1 score of a focal paper contains a logical impact measurement error that leads to a meaningful reduction of the score. We explain why this is problematic and propose a correction of the formula.

Key words

scientometrics, bibliometrics, disruption index, disruption indicator, CD index

1 Introduction

Shortly after Funk and Owen-Smith (2017) introduced the CD index as a measure of technological change, Wu et al. (2019) recognized its potential for the bibliometric study of transformative science. Their proposed disruption index (DI_1) is closely related to measures of betweenness centrality (Freeman, 1977; Gebhart & Russel, 2023). The index uses bibliographic coupling links to quantify historical discontinuities in the citation network of a focal paper (FP) (Leydesdorff & Bornmann, 2021). Bibliographic coupling links connect publications that cite the same references. The DI_1 ranges from -1 (max. consolidation) to 1 (max. disruption) and is equivalent to the following ratio:

$$DI_1 = \frac{N_F - N_B}{N_F + N_B + N_R}$$




Figure 1: How the DI_1 quantifies continuity and discontinuity in citation networks. The illustration is based on Funk and Owen-Smith (2017).

N_B is the number of citing papers that contain at least one bibliographic coupling link with the FP. These papers represent historical continuity because they connect the more recent literature ($t+1$ in Figure 1) with literature that predates the FP ($t-1$ in Figure 1). Conversely, N_F quantifies historical discontinuities by counting the number of papers that cite the FP without citing any of the FP's cited references. A large N_F signals that the ideas that inspired the FP are no longer relevant for future research. One could say that the FP "overshadows" (Liu et al., 2023) previous research. Since N_B indicates consolidation and N_F indicates that the FP disrupts the cumulative progress of science, it makes sense that N_B is subtracted from N_F in the numerator of the DI_1 .

In addition to N_B and N_F , the formula for the calculation of the DI_1 also includes N_R . N_R counts the number of papers that cite the FP's cited references without citing the FP itself. Since it only appears in the denominator, it affects the size, but not the sign of the DI_1 . N_R tends to be very large in practice, which pushes the DI_1 scores of most papers (both disruptive and consolidating) close to zero (Leydesdorff et al., 2021; Wu & Wu, 2019). Compared to N_B and N_F , it is much less clear what N_R is supposed to represent. On the one hand, its function may be to measure the citation impact of all publications cited by the FP. On the other hand, its consideration may be intended to produce index scores close to zero in many cases and to produce high scores in only a few cases. In other words, the distribution of DI_1 scores should follow what one would expect from research outcomes: disruptive research is a rare event.

This letter to the editor is intended to point out a logical measurement error of N_R : Whereas N_B and N_F only include papers that were published after the publication of the FP, N_R may also include papers that were published prior to the FP. This is not only counterintuitive, but it also seems out of place in the context of identifying and quantifying disruptive and consolidating citations. N_B and N_F capture how the FP affects the citing behaviour of its citing papers' authors. Since citation impact always follows the publication event, the FP cannot affect the citing behaviour of authors whose papers were published prior to its appearance. We think that the formula for calculating the DI_1 contains a logical impact measurement error: N_R includes citations of cited publications that were published prior to the appearance of the FP. Given that a paper can only have a disruptive or consolidating influence after researchers have actually had the chance to read and cite it, we propose that N_R only considers cited papers that were published after the FP's appearance in the calculation of the DI_1 .

Table 1: DI_1 score of Fukuda et al. (1998) according to the standard method and our proposed method

	N_F	N_B	N_R	DI_1
Standard method	2,952	1,144	4,163	0.22
New method	2,952	1,144	2,112	0.29
Difference	0	0	-2,051	0.07

To illustrate how our proposed method of calculating N_R affects DI_1 scores, we calculated the DI_1 score of the Nobel Prize winning paper by Fukuda et al. (1998)¹ using the Max Planck Society’s inhouse version of the Web of Science (Clarivate). One of the paper’s authors, Takaaki Kajita, was awarded the Nobel Prize (together with Arthur B. McDonald) “for the discovery of neutrino oscillations, which shows that neutrinos have mass”². Because the paper is associated with a Nobel prize, we expected a high DI_1 score. Table 1 shows that our proposed counting method (only including citing papers that were published in the year following the FP’s publication year or later)³ leads to a significantly lower N_R and a much higher DI_1 score compared to the standard method. The DI_1 score increases by about 32% and is thus more in line with expectations for a Nobel Prize winning paper.

Our empirical results for the paper published by Fukuda et al. (1998) shows that the logical impact measurement error in the DI_1 formula leads to a meaningful reduction of the DI_1 score. Since we cannot expect the DI_1 scores of all papers are affected by the error to the same extent, the error could lead to significant biases in the empirical application (e.g. rankings of the most disruptive papers in a specific field). Hence, we propose that the correction is made in the empirical application of the DI_1 . Although we only focused on the DI_1 in this paper, our proposed method can also be used to improve other variants of the disruption index. An overview of modified variants of the DI_1 is provided by Leibel and Bornmann (2024), who published a literature overview on the disruption index research.

¹ We randomly selected our example paper from the dataset provided by Li et al. (2019).

² <https://www.nobelprize.org/prizes/lists/all-nobel-prizes/>

³ Since the database we used to obtain the bibliometric data does not include information about the exact publication date, we used the publication year to determine whether a paper was published after the FP’s appearance. More precise data about the FP’s publication date enables more precise thresholds for determining which papers should be considered by N_R .

References

- Freeman, L. C. (1977). A set of measures of centrality based on betweenness. *Sociometry*, 40(1), 35-41. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3033543>
- Fukuda, Y., Hayakawa, T., Ichihara, E., Inoue, K., Ishihara, K., Ishino, H., Itow, Y., Kajita, T., Kameda, J., Kasuga, S., Kobayashi, K., Kobayashi, Y., Koshio, Y., Miura, M., Nakahata, M., Nakayama, S., Okada, A., Okumura, K., Sakurai, N., Shiozawa, M., Suzuki, Y., Takeuchi, Y., Totsuka, Y., Yamada, S., Earl, M., Habig, A., Kearns, E., Messier, M. D., Scholberg, K., Stone, J. L., Sulak, L. R., Walter, C. W., Goldhaber, M., Barszczak, T., Casper, D., Gajewski, W., Halverson, P. G., Hsu, J., Kropp, W. R., Price, L. R., Reines, F., Smy, M., Sobel, H. W., Vagins, M. R., Ganezer, K. S., Keig, W. E., Ellsworth, R. W., Tasaka, S., Flanagan, J. W., Kibayashi, A., Learned, J. G., Matsuno, S., Stenger, V. J., Takemori, D., Ishii, T., Kanzaki, J., Kobayashi, T., Mine, S., Nakamura, K., Nishikawa, K., Oyama, Y., Sakai, A., Sakuda, M., Sasaki, O., Echigo, S., Kohama, M., Suzuki, A. T., Haines, T. J., Blaufuss, E., Kim, B. K., Sanford, R., Svoboda, R., Chen, M. L., Conner, Z., Goodman, J. A., Sullivan, G. W., Hill, J., Jung, C. K., Martens, K., Mauger, C., McGrew, C., Sharkey, E., Viren, B., Yanagisawa, C., Doki, W., Miyano, K., Okazawa, H., Saji, C., Takahata, M., Nagashima, Y., Takita, M., Yamaguchi, T., Yoshida, M., Kim, S. B., Etoh, M., Fujita, K., Hasegawa, A., Hasegawa, T., Hatakeyama, S., Iwamoto, T., Koga, M., Maruyama, T., Ogawa, H., Shirai, J., Suzuki, A., Tsushima, F., Koshihara, M., Nemoto, M., Nishijima, K., Futagami, T., Hayato, Y., Kanaya, Y., Kaneyuki, K., Watanabe, Y., Kielczewska, D., Doyle, R. A., George, J. S., Stachyra, A. L., Wai, L. L., Wilkes, R. J., & Young, K. K. (1998). Evidence for oscillation of atmospheric neutrinos. *Physical Review Letters*, 81(8), 1562-1567. <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.81.1562>
- Funk, R. J., & Owen-Smith, J. (2017). A dynamic network measure of technological change. *Management Science*, 63(3), 791-817. <https://doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.2015.2366>
- Gebhart, T., & Russel, F. (2023). *A mathematical framework for citation disruption*. Retrieved September 11, 2023 from <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2308.16363>
- Leibel, C., & Bornmann, L. (2024). What do we know about the disruption index in scientometrics? An overview of the literature. *Scientometrics*, 129(1), 601-639. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-023-04873-5>
- Leydesdorff, L., & Bornmann, L. (2021). Disruption indices and their calculation using web-of-science data: Indicators of historical developments or evolutionary dynamics? *Journal of Informetrics*, 15(4), Article 101219. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joi.2021.101219>
- Leydesdorff, L., Tekles, A., & Bornmann, L. (2021). A proposal to revise the disruption index. *Profesional De La Informacion*, 30(1), Article e300121. <https://doi.org/10.3145/epi.2021.ene.21>
- Li, J., Yin, Y., Fortunato, S., & Wang, D. (2019). A dataset of publication records for Nobel laureates. *Scientific Data*, 6, Article 33. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41597-019-0033-6>
- Liu, X., Zhang, C., & Li, J. (2023). Conceptual and technical work: Who will disrupt science? *Journal of Informetrics*, 17(3), Article 101432. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joi.2023.101432>
- Wu, L., Wang, D., & Evans, J. A. (2019). Large teams develop and small teams disrupt science and technology. *Nature*, 566(7744), 378-382. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-019-0941-9>
- Wu, S., & Wu, Q. (2019). *A confusing definition of disruption*. Retrieved June 16, 2023 from <https://doi.org/10.31235/osf.io/d3wpk>